

Oscillation of Public Administration Paradigms and the Management of Public Service in Nigeria: Trajectory and Lessons

JIDE IBIETAN, COVENANT UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, NIGERIA

Abstract

This paper chronicles various Public Administration paradigms and juxtaposes them with the management of Public Service (as an institution) in Nigeria. Attempts at making the public bureaucracy an effective instrument of development in Nigeria can be located in Public Service Reforms, and it is observable that the country has a long history in this. This study adopts the qualitative approach with a reliance on secondary data which were textually analysed, using the Neo-Weberian State Model as the theoretical framework. It is obvious that Nigeria's experience with administrative reforms typifies an obsession with the traditional Weberian practice, as well as a half-hearted romance with SAP-induced/NPM reforms which labelled the country as a "hesitant reformer". The paper emphasises a re-discovery of the values of Public Service in Nigeria based on the tenets of the NWS model. Other recommendations can also address the issues raised by the paper.

Keywords: *Lessons; Management; Oscillation; Paradigm; Public Administration; Public Service; Trajectory*

1. Introduction

Extant literature in public administration presents scholarship and practice in the field as dynamic in recent times. This may be attributable to the field's a-disciplinary status (Raadschelders 2012) in terms of theoretical and epistemological orientations, or the contextless nature of public administration especially in developing countries (Haque 1996; Jreisat 2010). These underscore public-sector reforms as policy experiments and organisational practices arising from OECD countries, which create "a discrepancy between the thrust of ... reform efforts ... and wider shifts in the nature of governance and contemporary approaches" (Robinson 2015, 1) to the study and practice of public administration.

It is also noteworthy that there is an unsettled debate in Public Administration on the inception of the discipline. For instance, while some scholars represented by Thornhill (2006) traced the origin to the pioneering enterprise of Lorenz von Stein in 1855, there is also the argument that the credit given to Lorenz von Stein is misplaced and that reference and respect should rather be accorded the huge scholarship on the State and Public Service by Christian Wolff, who lived between 1679 and 1754 (Drechsler 1997; Drechsler 2001). Yet others credit Woodrow Wilson through his seminal article on the Study of Administration published in *Political Science Quarterly* in 1887 (Denhardt and Denhardt 2007; Uwizeyimana and Maphunye 2014; Ikeanyibe et al. 2017). Maserumule and Vil-Nkomo (2015, 451), however, argue that Wilson's contentions centred on Administration without the adjective or prefix "public".

The intellectual curiosity and engagements emanating from the above, and the alleged failings of the Weberian practice, fed into the expansive discussions that laid the basis for the oscillation of paradigms, or what Pollitt (2010, 293) pungently refers to as "paradigm wars in which scholars attack the very foundations of each other's work." He expatiated by identifying the construction (in recent times) of "magic concepts ... [that have] multiple definitions, are abstract and challenging to operationalise, and tend to wax and wane quite quickly over time." One of the earliest and celebrated expositions on "Paradigms of Public Administration" accrues to Henry (1975, 1999) with a characterisation of five paradigms as outlined below.

Paradigm 1: The Politics/Administration Dichotomy (1900-1926); Paradigm 2: The Principles of Administration (1927-1937); the Era of Challenge to the field of Public Administration by some scholars (1938-1950), and the Reaction to the Challenge (1947-1950) are located within this paradigm. Paradigm 3: Public Administration as Political Science (1950-1970); Paradigm 4: Public Administration as Administrative Science/Management (1956-1970); Paradigm 5: Public Administration as Public Administration (1970-?) (Henry 1975, 379-385; 1999, 22-46).

It is pertinent to note that some scholars have broadened, extended or modified the paradigms listed above, with the first three kept intact, while Paradigm 4 spanning the 1950s to 1970s has been re-christened "The New Public Administration Era." Paradigm 5, which is periodised from the 1970s to the 1990s heralded the New Public Management, and Paradigm 6 commencing from the 1990s to date is the Governance period (Uwizeyimana and Maphunye 2014, 94).

There are, however, additions and refinements to the above paradigms which include: Neo-Weberian State from the late 1990s to date (traceable to Pollitt and Bouckaert 2004; Drechsler 2005 and his Estonian colleagues; Lynn 2008); Governance/New Public Governance (represented by Osborne 2006 and others); New Public Service by Denhardt and Denhardt (2007); Public Value Management and Public Value Failure typified by the separate works of Mark Moore (1995, 2013) and Barry Bozeman (2007). See details in Xu et al. (2015); Rutgers (2015); Katsamuniska (2016); Turkel and Turkel (2016).

The question that arises logically from the above description or oscillation of paradigms is: Whose interest is served by these narratives? Academics/Scholars? Practitioners or public servants? Or society at large? If the purpose of this education is to "form the mind" or "train the citizen" (Russell in Raadschelders 2012, 1), then we can claim that it serves altruistic interests. It is also noteworthy that Public Administration scholarship derives from a community of interests, "has a multiple personality ... (and) it is attempting to get to different destinations" (Pollitt 2010, 292), and this informs the take that its practice should impact the "true public" through effective and qualitative service delivery. It is predicated on this realisation that this paper explores the rotation between and from Traditional Public Administration to new trends in the management of Public Service (bureaucracy) in Nigeria, with a view to identify the implications and draw lessons therefrom.

2. Method, main argument and limitations of the paper

This is a qualitative study, in which data collection was mainly through secondary sources and internet materials from international and local contexts, with a view to exploring the dynamics inherent in the oscillation of paradigms from the Traditional Public Administration to Emerging Trends in the management of public bureaucracy in Nigeria, and this finds expression in the various Public Service Reforms (PSRs). The adoption of the Neo-Weberian model as a framework for textual analysis of issues invigorated the discussion, conclusion and recommendations of the paper.

The review and discussion of issues in this paper reveal that Nigeria's pre-occupation with PSRs is not fully grounded. They represent half-hearted attempts by a non-committed reformer, and this points to the fact that the leadership requirements of reforms are as critical as the environment and the paradigm tools engaged. This realisation calls for a more comprehensive approach that weaves various issues and goal attainment with Academic-Practitioner synergy as bastions for robust reform outcomes in the public bureaucracy.

Research limitations/implications: The discussion in this paper presents Nigeria's scant experience with very few PA paradigms. The dominance of Weberian practice in the Nigerian federal bureaucracy is patently manifest. Attempts at applying some NPM tools have not yielded impressive results. It is predicated on these that the extensive paradigmatic reviews serve pedagogical purposes, advance frontiers of knowledge (in Nigeria) and re-awaken the consciousness of technocrats and elites (governing and bureaucratic) to the existence of very robust PA paradigms as alternative reform choices for better results. It is particularly noteworthy that this paper is not inclined towards hypothetical propositions. As a qualitative study that seeks to explore and possibly locate Public Service in Nigeria within the paradigms of Public Administration, its reliance on secondary data makes empirical orientation (which it does not lay claim to) quite redundant. Future studies can utilise this approach in order to compare results or research outcomes.

3. Conceptual discourse

The following will receive attention in this section: The Meaning of the Traditional Model in Public Administration; The Concept of Public Service and Pathologies of the Nigerian Public Bureaucracy; the Explanation of Emerging Trends in Public Administration.

3.1 The meaning and trajectory of the traditional model in Public Administration

There is a consensus of opinion and unanimity in the documentation by scholars and writers that the Traditional Public Administration can be traced to Woodrow Wilson's 1887 seminal article on the "Science of Administration" and was largely underscored by Max Weber's ideas on bureaucracy anchored on the principles of hierarchy, meritocracy (Robinson 2015); anonymity, political neutrality (Oyedemi 2016) and impartiality. Thornhill (2006, 797), however, interjects that "although Wilson is considered as the father of the study of Public Administration, he only re-invented the Science that had been developed much earlier in Europe." This remark is a veiled reference to the works of Lorenz von Stein.

Available records present the practice of public administration as being traceable to the history of mankind (Uwizeyimana and Maphunye 2014, 91). This may just be a restatement of the treatise by Olaopa (2012, 27-37) in which administrative practices were traced to the Pharaonic and Moses era in the Bible. Farazmand (2012, 488) is, however, more specific thus: "Public Administration has more than eight millennia of practice and intellectual development." This averment was built on the works of various scholars ranging from 1948 to 1993.

The traditional model of Public Administration can be characterised this way:

... an administration under the formal control of the political leadership based on a strictly hierarchical model of bureaucracy, staffed by permanent, neutral and anonymous officials, motivated by public interest, serving any governing party equally, and not contributing to policy but merely administering those policies decided by the politicians (Hughes 2003, 17).

The theoretical foundations of the above inhere in the pioneering scholarly enterprise of Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Taylor in USA, Max Weber in Germany and the 1854 Northcote-Trevelyan Report in the United Kingdom. Although Weber's research on organisations centred on why people throughout history obey their leaders, and the responses obtained correspond to the three types of authority (traditional, charismatic and legal-rational), the bulk of his theoretisation was on the legal-rational, otherwise known as "ideal type". Building on the works of earlier scholars, Ibietan and Oni (2013, 35) documented the features of Weber's ideal construct as follows:

- Hierarchy which implies structure.
- Promotion based on professional merit and skill as guides for recruitment.
- The development of a career service in the bureaucracy.
- Impersonality of relationships among career professionals in the bureaucracy and with their clientele (Henry 1999, 54-55).
- Specialisation along functional lines.
- Authority and responsibility.
- Documentation or record keeping.

It is perhaps predicated on the above that Pfiffner (2004, 444) affirms that "there is no realistic alternative to bureaucratic organisations," and, with a convergence that "the traditional model of Public Administration remains the longest standing and most successful theory of management in the public sector" (Hughes 2003, 17). It is against this background, therefore, that the ambivalence created by Katsamunka (2012, 75) in alluding to this model as "the most successful theory of public sector management ... although it does not have a ... coherent intellectual foundation" appears quite curious. Pfiffner (2004) cannot understand why recent critics see the model as old, outmoded and inefficient. Ibietan and Oni (2013) align with Gal (2014, 66) that "since its inception, the Weberian model has received a substantial amount of criticism," but Basheka and Sebola (2015, 54) responded that "... it has shown unmatched resilience ... (and) remains alive in most administrative jurisdictions."

The history of the traditional model can also be located within Henry's (1975, 1999) discussion on Paradigms 1 to 4. The systematic study of Public Administration commenced from 1887 with Wilson's celebrated essay. Paradigm 1 therefore spanned 1887 to 1926, and the important features of this era are: politics-administration dichotomy with administration being concerned with policy implementation, not formulation; Frank Goodnow's book on Politics and Administration in 1900, which corroborated Wilson's separation of administration from politics and further elaborated on separation of powers between the Judiciary, Legislature and Executive (Goodnow in Uwizeyimana and Maphunye 2014, 92). Another important development of this period was Leonard Dupee White's book *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, written in 1926 and recognised as the first textbook on the subject (Basu 2009, 16).

Henry (1975, 379-380) captured Paradigm 2 as the epoch of "The Principles of Administration" from 1927 to 1937. Willoughby's book titled *Principles of Administration* was published in 1927 as the second full-fledged text in the discipline. This period witnessed orthodoxy in Public Administration and accelerated the march towards efficiency, which reached a crescendo with Luther Gulick's 1937 publication, wherein he espoused the famous acronym (POSDCORB) meaning: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting (Ikeanyibe et al. 2017, 4). Lyndall Urwick's papers on the Science of Administration were also published at this time, in which focus gained pre-eminence over locus of the field, as principles were more important to Gulick and Urwick, even as Public Administration scholars were highly

sought after from then till the early 1940s by governments and the industry, because of their managerial knowledge (Henry 1999, 24). It is particularly striking that Gulick and Urwick were invigorated by Frederick Taylor's scientific management and Henri Fayol's theories of (business) administration in their writings.

An extension to Paradigm 2 spanning 1938 to 1950 was christened the "Period of Challenge" by Henry (1975, 380), and widely referred to as an "Era of Conceptual Challenge and Heterodoxy". The assault came from the publication of a classic text in 1938 by Chester Barnard titled the "Executive Functions" and Herbert Simon's "Administrative Behavior" (much later) as a devastating critique of the field. The submissions were that the politics-administration separation cannot be a hard-line issue, and "that the principles of administration were something less than the final expression of managerial rationality" (Henry 1999, 26). Thereafter, many texts appeared and underscored the above position, highlighted further issues (such as values in administration), including a book of Readings titled *Elements of Public Administration*, edited by Fritz Mark in 1946, and "The Proverbs of Administration" by Herbert Simon published the same year in *Public Administration Review*. In this publication, the principles of administration were punctured and relegated to proverbs.

Other important features of this period are: the neo-classical revolution leading to Hawthorne Experiments anchored on human relations and behavioural theories of industrial and social psychology. The reaction to the challenge occasioned by the decimation of traditional foundations of the field also emanated from Herbert Simon (between 1947 and 1950), who suggested a new paradigm of public administration anchored on harmony between a group of scholars developing a pure science of administration pivoted on social psychology and the other concerned with "prescribing for public policy". Simon posits that the two can become mutually re-enforcing components (Henry 1999, 29), for they do not conflict with or contradict each other. Meier (2015, 15) would argue that "Simon's objective of a general theory of public administration was highly ambitious, even by today's standards."

There is an observation of an overlap of features in Paradigms 2 and 3 by some writers/scholars. For instance, Paradigm 3, periodised as 1950 to 1970 by Henry (1975) thus: Public Administration as Political Science, was similarly dated by Uwizeyimana and Maphunye (2014, 94). This was tagged as Stage 4 with the following characteristics recorded in Henry (1975, 1999) as Paradigm 2 and labelled as the era of identity crisis; rejection of both the principles of administration and politics-administration dichotomy. Other notable features of this epoch include Simon's book on *Administrative Behavior* and Robert Dahl's (1940s) essay on "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems"; widening the scope of Public Administration and relating it to other subjects such as Psychology, Sociology, Economics and Political Science.

The above phase was also referred to as the New Public Administration (NPA) era. Lamidi (2015, 5, 21) agrees with the characterisation of this epoch as NPA, and equated it with Postmodernism in Administration, which he subsequently linked to the writings of Dwight Waldo and the first Minnowbrook Conference in 1968, when the concept of New Public Administration was born, courtesy of Waldo. Apart from occasional face-offs and hostilities with Political Scientists, Henry (1999, 31) records that two developments occurred during this period, which are: increasing use of case studies as an epistemological tool, plus the rise and fall of Comparative and Development Administration as subfields of Public Administration. These dovetailed into and fostered an alternative Paradigm 4, which presented Public Administration as Administrative Science.

3.2 The concept of Public Service

The concept of Public Service lends itself to distortions and semantics due to its synonymous or interchangeable use with civil service, which can be viewed as a narrower term. To buttress this point, Ibietan (2013, 55–56) cited two instances based on previous studies. The first is Okoli and Onah (2002, 76), which expressly excluded the "Armed Forces, the quasi-governmental corporations and statutory bodies" from their usage of the term "public service". Secondly, Nwosu in Obi (2007, 14) also omitted "employees of statutory corporations and boards" in his distinction between civil service and public service. These characterisations are not only naive and inadequate, they can be quite misleading.

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) in Section 318 illuminates our understanding by its definition of public service as "the service of the Federation in any capacity in respect of the Government of the Federation," and includes the following:

- Clerk or any other staff of the National Assembly or of each House of the National Assembly;
- Member of staff of the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal, the Federal High Court, the High Court of the Federal Capital Territory Abuja, the Sharia Court of Appeal of FCT, the Customary Court of Appeal of FCT or other Courts established for the Federation by this Constitution and by an Act of the National Assembly;
- Member or staff of any commission or authority established for the Federation by this Constitution or by an Act of the National Assembly;
- Staff of any Area Council;
- Staff of any Statutory Corporation established by an Act of the National Assembly;
- Staff of any educational institution established or financed principally by the Government of the Federation;
- Staff of any company or enterprises in which the Government of the Federation or its agency owns controlling shares or interests; and
- Members or Officers of the armed forces of the Federation or the Nigeria Police Force or other government security agencies established by law.

It is noteworthy that the above constitutional elucidation of Public Service is more comprehensive and explanatory than those offered by Okoli and Onah (2002) and Nwosu in Obi (2007). The same constitution differentiates the civil service from the public service and defines the former as: service of the Federation in a civil capacity as staff of the Office of the President, the Vice-President, a Ministry or Department of the Government of the Federation, assigned with the responsibility for any business of the Government of the Federation. The public and civil service of a state are similarly defined to cover staff in the service of state governments in the same capacities as those of the Federation (Ibietan 2013). A further clarification or simplification of these confused terms is given by Adamolekun (2002, 17–18) thus: civil service "refers to the body of permanent officials appointed to assist the political executive in formulating and implementing government policies." It also refers to ministries and departments within which specific aspects of government work are carried out. Public service on the other hand "usually indicates a wider scope than the civil service [and] ... means the totality of services that are organized under public (i.e. government) authority." It covers ministries, departments, agencies of the central government, its field administration, local government, the military, other security forces and the judiciary. These clarifications converge with the constitutional explications of the terms.

Olaopa (2008, 35–42) cautions that the 1999 Constitution did not recognise the term "the Nigerian Public Service," but Public Service of the Federation and services at the sub-national levels, consisting of all officials of "government at the federal, state and local government levels in the ministries, parastatals, extra-ministerial departments and the paramilitary

organizations." The Nigerian Public Service, otherwise referred to as the Nigerian Public Bureaucracy, is a product of the British colonial public service. In other words, the arrangement of ministries, departments and agencies of government drew heavily from the British system of colonial administration, with the major structural division of personnel aligning with the 1954 Gorsuch (Report) classification: administrative/professional class; technical/higher executive; clerical/artisan; and messengerial/manipulative. Ibieta and Oni (2013, 32) submit that "these categorizations which have been ... modified due to successive reforms explain the academic standards/requirements pursuant to entry into such grades."

The above colonial legacy of public bureaucracy, which has been highly extolled by some scholars (Agagu 2008; Awosika 2014) did not escape incisive analysis by Jreisat (2010, 617) thus: "the colonial regime had no developmental policies of human resources practiced in any African state. There were no positive efforts or policies by the colonizers to create indigenous civil service systems suited to the people ... it is not surprising that the continent's human resources have been and still are either underutilised or maladministered ..." It is perhaps predicated on averments like the above that scholars (Ibieta 2013, 56; Oyedele 2016) infer that the: "utilization of the public service and its personnel [were] to exploit and expropriate indigenous natural resources to develop the metropole."

Predicated on the notion that no nation can develop beyond the competence and capacity of its public service (Mustapha and Omorede 2017), Oladipo (2007, 363) chronicles the contributions of the Nigerian civil/public service as an indispensable instrument of governance thus:

- Formulation of government policies and programmes;
- Planning and implementation of government policies and programmes on social services provision;
- Preparation of annual budgets and development plans;
- Revenue collection such as taxes, fines and duties;
- Making by-laws, regulations and orders under powers granted by the Parliament and other quasi-judicial functions;
- Keeping government records and properties;
- Information dissemination and public enlightenment.

Ibieta and Oni (2013, 33) added the following paramount roles of the Nigerian public bureaucracy: provision of social or public goods/services; security, which is being serially punctuated and violated in recent times; acts as agents of and catalyst for development.

3.2.1 Pathologies of the Nigerian Public Bureaucracy

Most Writers on this topic and adjoining themes are wont to creating hypes and consequently over-flogging the discourse, thus creating the avoidable scenario of analysis by paralysis. Peter in Awosika (2014, 85) operationalises bureau-pathology as "negative administrative behaviours of professionals and experts ... which thwart the achievement of public goods and delivery of quality public service ..." It includes "... bureaucratic insensitivity, misuse of administrative power and discretion ... and misuse of monopoly in service delivery." As a matter of fact, bureau-pathology is a disease of the public service. Stretching this point further, Ajibade and Ibieta (2016, 11) posit that "this dysfunctional characteristic of bureaucracy manifests in the Nigerian factor." This (Nigerian) factor is a euphemism and subtle reference to why policies fail in Nigeria, but work elsewhere. This is purely attitudinal or behavioural in nature. Another fallout of or dimension to bureau-pathology is that "bureau-professionalism and its potentials for the service ... [thus] making the MDAs flexible, proactive and performance

oriented is undermined by the acute lack of competencies ..." (Olaopa 2016b, 20) and low capacity readiness and utilisation.

Ibietan and Oni (2013, 44-45) highlighted other issues/problems of the Nigerian public bureaucracy to include corruption, unnecessary and unhelpful politicisation, favouritism, ethnicity, nepotism, lack of transparency and accountability, the unbalanced application of Federal Character principle as well as the tragic role of the Military (and its unitary command structure) with negative effects not only on the Public Service, but on public administration and governance in Nigeria. Besides complementing the aforementioned issues, a similar study invigorated by the Udoji Report added the following: "... elitism, inability of superiors to delegate responsibilities, unreliability of junior staff in executing delegated tasks, failure ... to apply specialized knowledge and training skills in the management of the public service, and failure to appreciate the importance of timeliness or efficiency in the performance of tasks" (Awosika 2014, 86), and with the final verdict "that the entire Nigerian bureaucracy was not results-oriented." Narratives like these validate our assertion on the creation of hypes and over-dramatisation of discourse on this subject without recourse to the instrumental and catalytic roles of the Public Service in national development, and for stabilising the machinery of government in critical times, especially during the thirty-month (1967-1970) Nigerian civil war.

Building on the works of other scholars, Ibietan and Joshua (2015) added these points to the discussion: overstaffing; over-centralisation; apathy; red tape and tardiness, to mention but a few. It is perhaps in a bold move to attenuate these challenges that Adamolekun (2007, 17) suggests a "redefinition of the mission and scope of the public service [and] ... the critical importance of the values that should underpin a public administration system." More recently, the author underscored this point this way: "A fundamental rethinking of governance and ... public service is required – one that is targeted at rebuilding the culture of a merit-based civil service with the ... key elements (of) a professional bureaucracy that has integrity ... intelligence and is committed to the public interest" (Adamolekun and Olowu 2015, 109). He added that to avoid state capture and ensure social embeddedness, such Public Service Institutions must be "functioning as a rational bureaucracy" pivoted on the principles of meritocracy and professionalism.

3.3 Explanation of emerging trends in Public Administration

A meaningful understanding of the discussion on this sub-theme shall necessarily re-connect from where Section 3.1 stopped with the exposition on Paradigm 4. It is also useful to state that this Section will highlight the oscillation of paradigms from New Public Management; through Neo-Weberian State; New Public Service; (New) Public Governance to Public Value Management.

According to Henry (1975, 1999), Paradigm 5 captioned "'Public Administration as Public Administration' [a return to its roots] is periodised from 1970, but was expected to continue ad-infinitum. However, the intellectual conspiracy against the Traditional/Weberian model of Public Administration, rooted in the developments emanating from Thatcher's and Reagan's administration in the United Kingdom and United States of America respectively, in which public bureaucracy was seen as being ineffective, inefficient and largely wasteful" (Basheka 2012, 51), presented the public sector as grappling with problems that only market principles and private-sector methods and techniques could resolve.

The notable features of Paradigm 5 are: No focus yet in the field in the form of pure science of administration; considerable progress made in refining applied techniques of management science; less progress in ascertaining a locus for the field; the traditional and rigid demarcation of the field between the "public" and "private" spheres seems to be waning, even as the new and flexible locus of the field is emboldened. Public Administrationists became increasingly interested in related areas of policy science, political economy, public policy-making process and analysis, to mention but a few. Additionally, there was a marked reduction in the number of Public Administration programmes housed in the Departments of Business Administration or Management, witnessing a gravitation towards an autonomous academic field for Public Administration (Henry 1999, 44-45).

Beyond Henry (1999), our understanding of paradigmatic development and milestones is illuminated by Basheka (2012), who proceeded to identify Period Five (which shall be tagged as Paradigm 6) titled: From Public Administration to (New) Public Management, spanning 1970 to 1990. The landmark event of this period was the emergence of New Public Management (NPM), anchored on Managerialism and ideas arising from new international economics with heavy emphasis on markets and competition. NPM as a global reform initiative or movement started around the 1980s and extended to countries like Sweden, New Zealand, USA and some OECD countries (Olaopa 2008, 54). It is traceable to the works of celebrated Economists like James Buchanan, Gordon Tullock, Christopher Hood and Mancur Olson among others, with a theoretical anchor on Public Choice theory and Transaction Cost Economics.

The major tenets of NPM are: decentralised decision-making; cost recovery; alternative service delivery; performance-contracting; commercialisation; citizens' charter; and public reporting. Maserumule and Vil-Nkomo (2015, 454) assert that NPM "... trivialised Public Administration. Its ideological context is neo-liberalism, which called for a minimalist state. Its version of re-inventing the state is based on the assumption that the private sector is more efficient than the public sector." The Authors contend further that "the whole concept of NPM was based on what Public Administration is not." The emergence of NPM was traced to the Bretton Woods Institution's Structural Adjustment Programmes.

Meier and O'Toole (2009, 4-22) proceed to develop or identify the following proverbs of NPM: contracting out improves efficiency and performance; the best organisations are lean; get rid of layers of management and trim the bureaucracy; good management benefits everyone; organisations need to be flexible and able to change; organisations are at the mercy of their environments, alternatively organisations must adapt to their environments in predictable ways; prospectors are more effective than defenders, and the effectiveness of prospecting is contingent on resources; when politics is dysfunctional, so will management be; good managers can make all the difference; good management comes in patterns; and managers must choose among competing goals. These could not stop Drechsler (2005); Osborne (2006); Drechsler and Kattel (2008); Drechsler (2010); Osborne et al. (2012); Farazmand (2012); Olaopa (2016b); Ibietan and Ikeanyibe (2017) from criticising the intellectual foundations and applications of NPM. A synopsis of the rebuttal by Drechsler (2010); Farazmand (2012); and Olaopa (2016a) will suffice here.

To be sure, Drechsler (2005, 96) started laying the foundations confronting NPM in an article titled "The Re-Emergence of Weberian Public Administration after the fall of New Public Management: The Central and Eastern European Perspective", in which he accused NPM of not being based on genuine economics and markets. He affirms that the state and its structures are "neither dead nor incapacitated, as is perhaps more visible now than a decade ago." Drechsler and Kattel (2008) resonate with an acerbic title "Conclusion: Towards the

Neo-Weberian State? Perhaps, but certainly Adieu, NPM!" This would reach a crescendo with a 2010 Keynote address, in which he reverberates with a poser thus: "So am I suggesting that people who have pushed NPM should now say they are sorry for doing the wrong kind of PA?" (Drechsler 2010, 19).

Drechsler (2010) seems modest and cautious in his verdict as noted above. Farazmand (2012, 500) appears pungent and assertive in affirming that "NPM has reached its high point and begun to lose its power and appeal in many parts of the world; it will likely die on the altar of its inherent contradictions. Hopefully, it is destined to be just another passing fad in the history of contemporary public administration." He posits that NPM has corrosive effects on public service and administration's intellectual and institutional capacities which are ultimately damaged and paralysed. Olaopa (2016b, 11-12) submits that "the NPM story of managerial revolution is ... one-sided ... in theory and practice." He corroborates that "NPM ends up achieving greater corruption through the discretion it gives the public manager ... facilitated by the unbridled market dynamics ... introduced to the running of the public service ... [and] a 'one-size-fits-all' model which fails to take into consideration the unique administrative context of the third world." The foregoing presents the trajectory and balance sheet of NPM. The next section takes on the Neo-Weberian State and its basic features.

The Neo-Weberian classification as a reform or normative model refers to the application of Weberian principles with "neo elements" to a modern state or organisation. Although Lynn (2008) refreshes our memory with the different usages in political-science, sociology and public-administration literatures, as a reform model, the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) accrues to Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004). These authors taxonomise countries into groups based on governance as follows: "maintainers;" "modernizers;" and "marketizers." The two groups that are of exceptional interest are: the Anglo-American NPM marketisers and Continental European modernisers, and it is the reform model of these two groups that Pollitt and Bouckaert classify as the Neo-Weberian State (Lynn 2008, 17).

The Weberian elements or tenets include:

- Reaffirmation of the state as the main facilitator of solutions to the new problems of globalization, technological change, shifting demographics and environmental threat;
- Reaffirmation of the role of representative democracy;
- Reaffirmation of the role of administrative law;
- Preservation of the idea of a public service with a distinctive status, culture, terms and conditions. Lynn (2008, 23) summarised the "neo" elements as compromising: citizens' needs; an external orientation and consultation. We shall revisit NWS in greater details in Section 4, which is the Theoretical Framework of this paper.

We now turn attention to the New Public Service (NPS), which Robinson (2015, 10) refers to as "perhaps the most coherent of these approaches." It is pivoted on the fact that the focus of public management should be citizens, community and civil society. The argument stretches further that in this conception, "the primary role of public servants is to help citizens articulate and meet their shared interests, rather than to control or steer society." The major exponents of this model are Janet Denhardt and Robert Denhardt through the book *The New Public Service: Serving Not Steering*, published in 2000 and expanded in 2007.

The major ideas or thrust of NPS are: serve citizens, not customers; seek the public interest; value citizenship over entrepreneurship; think strategically, act democratically; recognise that accountability is not simple; serve rather than steer; value people, not just productivity (Denhardt and Denhardt 2007, 42-43). It is pertinent to note the NPS evolved as a response to a number of critical normative questions about Public Administration as a field and direct repudiation of the NPM orientation with a gospel of running government and public bureaucracy as business, and not democracy or non-profit/social services. Maserumule and Vil-Nkomo (2015, 455) refer to this as the concept of humanitarian public service.

Basheka (2012, 57-63) returns us to the discussion of paradigms with his caption of Period Six: From Public Management to Governance (late 1990s to 2008); Period Seven: From Governance to Global Crisis (2008-2010); Period Eight: From Governance to New Public Governance (from 2010 to date). We shall be constrained to consolidate the above listed phases for discussion based on the averment by Robinson (2015, 9) that "these approaches do not yet form a coherent paradigm and they have different frames of reference." Support for this assertion is typified by the classification of governance as: hierarchically-oriented; market-oriented; and network-oriented in Gal (2014, 74).

Uwizeyimana and Maphunye (2014, 96) traced the first use of governance as a term to the 1989 World Bank Study on "Sub-Saharan Africa – from Crisis to Sustainable Growth". The term according to these authors "describe[s] the need for institutional reform and a better and more efficient public sector ..." The features of (good) governance as highlighted are: improvement of administration and civil services; strengthening of parliamentary oversight; promotion of participatory decision-making; and adoption of judicial reforms among others. The characteristics of New Public Governance (NPG) include: emphasis on dispersion of power; stressing the coordinating role of government and movement away from undue paternalism; forming a complex network that integrates social organisations and individuals; the network formed by public products and services can provide its members abundant social resources to exchange (such as currency, information and technology); governance network relies on trust and stability of the contract; NPG values the role of social public organisations, pays attention to output and the result of the public sector, regards the subjects of public service as customers not citizens (Xu et al. 2015, 14). The convergence or overlap of these features with the market-oriented attributes of NPM is clearly discernible.

The discourse on Public Value Management (PVM) and Public Value Failure (PVF) owes largely to the intellectual excursions of Mark Moore (1995, 2013) and Barry Bozeman (2002, 2007), respectively. Mark Moore made his debut in public-management thinking with a book titled *Creating Public Value* (CPV) in 1995 and a 2013 follow-up monograph on *Recognizing Public Value* (RPV). He would later realise that his undue emphasis on operational capacity-building efforts of focal organisations was too narrow in conception, compared to global trends on the impact of co-production, co-creation (Voorberg et al. 2017) and inter-organisational forms of operational capacity in the contemporary networked world (Alford et al. 2017).

Mark Moore formulates how public managers should analyse values in the public sector, noting that values are rooted in the desires and perceptions of individuals. In addition, he avers that the public sector satisfies two general desires of individuals, like the provision of goods and services that cannot be done through the market; securing individual rights and clarifying responsibilities (Turkel and Turkel 2016, 3). Moore further asserts that public values are based on a reciprocal relationship between administrators and the citizenry. There is a seeming overlap here with the "Whole of Government" approach, which seeks to place citizens at the centre of reforms (Christensen and Laegreid 2007). It is also submitted that

leadership goals based on the strategic triangle must satisfy three criteria thus: they must be substantively valuable; politically sustainable and administratively feasible. When these elements are combined, the public manager using this approach must maximise the value being created (Alford et al. 2017).

The contention, however, in Public Value Failure (PVF) by Bozeman (as cited in Rutgers 2015, 36) is that public values impede private values and consequent actions, even though "only legitimate public values are reducible to individual's [private] values ... [and] concern mere market failure." It is particularly difficult to identify the cogent planks or thrust of these approaches, and this validates Rutger's (2015, 40) curiosity that the "study of PVs is scattered and fragmented ... because it is not a theoretically precise concept, but primarily a pedagogical instrument." Paradoxically, Vyas-Doorgapersad (2011, 244) documents that the PVM paradigm is described as being part of wider networked governance; politics and management go hand in hand; many stakeholders are involved to make good decisions in order to leverage service delivery and implementation. PVM believes in a system of dialogue and exchange in relation to networked governance, plus the reconciliation of democracy with management and their ultimate delivery.

The foregoing review bears eloquent testimony to Pollitt's (2010) observation on the existence of aggravated paradigm wars in Public Administration.

4.1 Theoretical framework: Neo-Weberian State Model

This paper has its theoretical basis laid on the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) model. The NWS model derives from the huge scholarship of Christopher Pollitt and Geert Bouckaert (2004). Other notable scholars include Wolfgang Drechsler and Rainer Kattel (2008); Laurence Lynn (2008); Cepiku and Mititelu in Ajibade and Ibieta (2016), to mention but a few. The NWS has clear empirical origins backed by a strong normative meaning for middle-income and less developing countries, and according to Drechsler and Kattel (2008, 96), "the basis of the NWS remains the Weberian structure to which some of the NPM elements have been added [rather than Weberian elements added to NPM]." The fundamental premises of this according to Bouckaert in Drechsler and Kattel (2008, 95) are as follows:

- to keep the state as the primary framework;
- to use the law as the steering instrument of the framework; and
- not to experiment with state, administration and other such important issues.
- The Weberian elements of the NWS model according to Lynn (2008, 27) are:
- Re-affirmation of the state as the main facilitator of solutions to the new problems of globalization, technological change, shifting demographics and environmental threat;
- Re-affirmation of the role of representative democracy (central, regional and local) as legitimating elements within the state apparatus;
- Re-affirmation of the role of administrative law – suitably modernized – in preserving the basic principles pertaining to the citizen-state relationship including equality before the law, legal security, and the availability of specialized legal scrutiny of state actions;
- Preservation of the idea of a public service with a distinctive status, culture, and terms and conditions.

The "Neo" elements include:

- Shift from an internal orientation towards bureaucratic rules in favour of external orientation targeted at meeting citizens' needs and wishes. The primary route to achieving this is not the employment of market mechanisms, but the creation of a professional culture of quality and service;
- Supplementation (not replacement) of the role of representative democracy by a range of devices for consultation with, and direct representation of citizens' views;
- In the management of resources within government, a modernization of the relevant laws to encourage a greater orientation on the achievement of results rather than merely the correct following of procedure;
- A professionalization of the public service, so that the bureaucrat becomes not simply an expert in the law relevant to his or her sphere of activity, but also a professional manager oriented to meeting the needs of his or her citizens/users.

The combination of Weberian and "Neo" elements highlighted above dovetails into the synopsis of five principles of the Neo-Weberian framework identified by Cepiku and Mititelu in Ajibade and Ibietan (2016, 13-14) thus:

- Bureaucracy as external orientation to the fulfilment of citizens' needs;
- The strategic role of professional managers in the implementation of policies;
- Collaboration of public and private sectors;
- Representative democracy which is supported by public consultation and public participation;
- The separation of politics from administration with an emphasis on administration professionalization.

It is arguable that the Weberian bureaucratic model remains a strong pivot of intellectual foundation for continuous and robust thinking about institutions of the state and governance in general, notwithstanding that it has received several knocks and reform attempts directed at it. The NWS logic, therefore, is to uphold the vital features of probity and accountability of the ideal-type bureaucracy and complement same with the efficiency value of the New Public Management. The paper in the next section attempts to situate the five principles summarised above within the operations of the Nigerian public bureaucracy, and further underscoring their relevance or gaps.

4.2 Application or relevance of theory to the Nigerian Public Service

A good starting point in this section anchors on the NWS tenet which hinges on the external orientation of public bureaucracy in meeting citizens' needs. It is common knowledge that from its colonial origin, the Nigerian Public Service rested on the traditional model of Public Administration pivoted on Weberianism, which has suffered several assaults due to its emphasis on command and control in internal orientation (Robinson 2015). In an attempt to overcome the problems associated with internal orientation and make the Public Service more result-oriented, the 1974 Udoji Reform Commission recommended the adoption of proactive management techniques, such as Management by Objectives (MBO); Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) among others. The prominence accorded the wage or salary component, in addition to other omnibus contents/recommendations of this Committee account for its failure in addressing social challenges (Okorie and Onwe 2016).

Another feature of the NWS model as highlighted earlier is the strategic role of professional managers in the implementation of policies. Policy implementation is the domain or responsibility of bureaucracy, and this is anchored on Public Administration (theoretical) orthodoxy, built on Wilson's and Goodnow's works. It is pertinent to note that effective implementation of policies is a function of competent and professionalised bureaucracy. Professionalising the Nigerian public bureaucracy appears to be a work in progress, even as Olaopa (2016a, 81) notes that "... rescuing the profession of public service requires reforming the accountability mechanisms throughout the service, it is accountability that forms the basis of the public service in the first place, it is what tied the public servant to the public s/he is serving." The argument here is that trust is underscored by effective accountability which should earn public servants their places in the bureaucracy. Seteolu (2017, 59) submits that "the 1988 reform was designed to foster professionalisation of the ... service". The attendant politicisation of the workforce which made the Permanent Secretary a political appointee whose tenure became co-existent and co-terminus with the appointing regime eroded the expected gains of this reform. In Nigerian parlance, this development was interpreted as "beheading the civil service" until the 1994/1995 Ayida Panel reversed this to status quo.

The need for collaboration between the public and private sectors as a third plank upon which the NWS model rests, cannot be overemphasised in the current Nigerian economic situation and public affairs. The economy is vulnerable, due to fiscal dependence on oil, which is arguably subject to the vagaries of the OPEC oligopolistic market and global swings. This has reduced government revenue in the face of high cost of governance in Nigeria. This inevitably calls for co-production (Olowu in Ibieta and Ikeanyibe 2017) and other forms of collaboration in the delivery of services to the populace. The 1988 reform anchored on conditionalities of International Monetary Fund induced by the New Public Management/ Structural Adjustment Programme failed to address this malaise. Instead, it ushered in an era of bourgeoisie bureaucracy, institutionalised corruption and monumental havoc in public governance (Okorie and Onwe 2016).

Public consultation and participation as platforms for representative democracy based on the NWS model are desiderata in Nigeria's elitist and highly monetised electoral and governance spheres. Ibieta (2010) posits that this explains the gap between the governing elites and the masses. This is due largely to the absence of inclusive institutions (Acemoglu and Robinson 2013) which are consultative, participatory, thrive on consensus building, people-centred in goal orientation and policy formulation. The political/governing elite in Nigeria do not seem ready to initiate appropriate reforms that are required to redress this trend and ultimately serve as a bulwark against state failure.

The separation of politics from administration in undertaking bureau-professionalisation as a final tenet of the NWS model derives from the prodigious essays of the academic fathers of the discipline. It must be stated that undue politicisation and interference in bureaucratic activities circumscribe efficiency and professionalism in the Public Service. The Nigerian public bureaucracy is not immune to this, as typified by the mass purge of 1975 and 1984 (Adebayo 2000), and the 1988 Civil Service reforms, which decapitated the public service until the 1994/95 Ayida Review panel changed the situation, bear eloquent testimony to this.

Oyediji (2016, 12-13) documents the following issues in the politicisation of public service: the very nature of most civil-service functions makes them politically attracted; excessive centralisation of governance which has its roots in military incursion into governance and public administration with their centralising tendencies; monetisation of politics; and other sundry issues. Olaopa (2016b, 12), however, underscores the relevance of the NWS model in

the Nigerian public bureaucracy this way: "it is therefore the function of public administration research to formulate research models that will articulate the synthesis of ... 'Theta-type core values' of the Weberian public administration and the private managerial values of the NPM. One of the beautiful results of this synthesis is neo-Weberianism, a creative blend of several administrative models, especially the NPM and traditional administration." This is partly realisable by forging a community of practice built on Academic-Practitioners synergy, and this highlights the imperative of resuscitating the Nigerian Association of Public Administration and Management (NAPAM) to play roles akin to that of the South African Association of Public Administration and Management (SAAPAM). The journal of this association (*JOPA*) is very robust. The *Journal of Public Administration* and the annual conferences of SAAPAM offer a necessary interface between Academics and practice, with the ultimate goal of advancing governance and leveraging bureaucratic effectiveness within the Southern African countries/region.

5. Public administration paradigms and the management of public service in Nigeria: An evaluation

The Nigerian public bureaucracy as an offshoot of British colonial administration is arguably one of the strongest legacies nurtured on the traditional Weberian structure and principles of anonymity, neutrality and impartiality. It is trite to add that civil-/public-service architecture and frameworks were pivoted on the 1854 Northcote-Trevelyan Report in Britain (Olaopa 2014). It is particularly striking to note that public service reforms (PSRs) in Nigeria inhere in the impinging nuances and requisites of Development Administration (DA). In other words, just as the evolution of DA in developing countries can be deconstructed to be largely prescriptive (Ibietan 2014), the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) induced NPM reforms commencing from the 1980s have exogenous origins that are traceable to the Bretton Woods and global capitalist institutions (Omoyefa 2008; Fatile and Adejuwon 2010). Attempts or efforts at administrative development (improving skills/managerial capacity and institutional capabilities) as a cardinal plank of DA in Nigeria witnessed the institution of administrative reforms in the public bureaucracy.

A synopsis of the various reform panels, commissions/committees are: 1934 Hunt Commission; 1941 Bridges Commission; 1945 Tudor Davies Commission; 1946 Harragin Commission; 1947 Miller Commission; 1948 Whitley Commission (Anyim et al. 2011, 64-65); 1948 Foot Commission (Okorie and Onwe 2016, 16); 1954 Gorsuch Commission; 1958/59 Newns Committee; 1959 Mbanefo Commission; 1963 Morgan Commission; 1966 Elwood Grading Team; 1968 Wey Panel on Public Service Management and Salary Administration; 1971 Adebo Commission (Okafor and Onuigbo 2015, 339); 1972-1974 Udoji Commission; 1975 Williams & Williams Commission (Olaopa 2014, 67); 1976 Falae Committee (Ehiyamen 2017, 45); 1981 Onosode Commission (for Parastatals); 1981 Cookey Commission (for Universities); 1981 Adamolekun Commission (For Polytechnics, Teachers' Training Colleges and Technical Colleges) (Anyim et al. 2011, 65).

Others include: 1985 Dotun Philips Panel; 1988 Civil Service Reform (Koshoni Report) Decree No 43 (Oyededeji 2016, 7-8); 1990 Damachi Commission (Anyim et al. 2011); 1990 Fatai Williams Committee; 1991 Longe Commission; 1994 Ayida Panel; 1997 Vision 2010 Committee Report; 1998 Committee on Harmonisation of Remuneration in the Public Service (Olaopa 2014, 67); 1999 Minimum Wage Commission; 2002 Ekaette Presidential Committee on Monetization of Fringe Benefits in the Public Service; 2004 Pension Reform and Allied Civil Service Renewal Initiatives; 2004 Edozien Relativity Panel; 2005 Shonekan Presidential Committee on Consolidation

of Emoluments in the Public Sector (Olaopa 2014, 184); 2009 Onosode Commission for Universities (Anyim et al. 2011); 2012 Oronsaye Public Service Panel (Ikeanyibe 2015); and 2013 Fika Committee (Okorie and Onwe 2016, 22).

From the foregoing, one can deduce that the majority of the commissions/panels on PSR had their terms of reference and activities solely devoted to wages, salary administration, improvement in motivation and other conditions of service. It is also observable that in some circumstances where the recommendations of panels covered the expansive (areas of) strategies for raising productivity in the public service through better training/retraining techniques, adoption of technology, and robust managerial methods, the expected gains were sacrificed on the altar of salary increment, which has never been quite satisfying. This is, however, in sharp contrast to the state of affairs in Central and Eastern European countries, where civil servants are "paid far too well ..." (Randma-Liiv and Drechsler 2017, 597).

It is therefore expedient to focus the attention of this section on the few reform panels/committees that are predicated on the sound philosophy of PA paradigmatic orientation, which are taxonomised into three phases by Olaopa (2011, 184-186) thus: the first is SAP-induced reforms of the 1980s, which was succeeded by series of reforms in the 1990s, pivoted on the need for capacity development with a thrust on better policy formulation and implementation through the public bureaucracy. Thirdly, there were waves of reform commencing from the year 2000 anchored on improved service delivery to the citizens.

It is proper to preface our discussion with the landmark contributions of the Udoji Commission (1972-1974) report. This panel's work was modeled on the 1968 Fulton report in Britain, and was mandated to examine the organisation, structure and management of the public service, evaluate methods of recruitment, pension legislation, carry out job evaluation and establish salary scales corresponding to each grade. It proposed a "New Style Public Service" based on the adoption of management styles like MBO, PPBS among others (Anazodo et al. 2012, 23). The commission in its recommendations further highlighted the issue of manpower development through effective planning, training and retraining, which would lead to professionalised civil/public service (Omitola 2012).

Additionally, the commission made far-reaching suggestions on enhancing efficiency and effectiveness in the public bureaucracy; design for an improved open performance evaluation reporting system; recommended a unified grading and salary structure covering all cadres (Ehiyamen 2017). The controversies that greeted the salary component of the report and the half-hearted attempts at implementing the provisions robbed the federal public bureaucracy of an opportunity to recalibrate and reinvigorate itself as an effective institution for service delivery. This situation was exacerbated by the mass purge of 1975, in which over ten thousand public servants were dismissed (Adebayo 2000) from the public service on various allegations. The attendant human capital losses from this experience has remained too heavy to recover from.

The 1981 Onosode Commission (on the review of parastatals) in its report introduced the neo-liberal/capitalist lexicon of privatisation and commercialisation into the Nigerian public affairs. Apart from endorsing earlier reports, the panel raised a fundamental issue concerning public-sector efficiency compared to the private sector. The public enterprises were construed as loss leaders and huge drains on national resources, hence the suggestions that they would be more efficiently managed as privatised entities (Ibietan 2014). It is therefore not surprising that scholars (Amuwo 2008; Omoyefa 2008; Fatile and Adejuwon 2010) posit that reforms in Africa suggest neo-liberal terms or concepts, but these led to the "destruction of public

administration institutions without putting in place any viable alternative to them" (Olaopa 2011, 184). The privatisation process which was consummated during the Obasanjo presidency between 1999 and 2007 has not yielded the desired results in most sectors. For instance, in the power sector, despite the unbundling of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) into Distribution and Generation Companies (DISCOs and GENCOs) with one Transmission Company, the Federal Government continues to fund/subsidise the operations of these companies.

The above situation raises a big query on the genuineness or credibility of the purported privatisation exercise. This validates Farazmand's (2012) view that despite attempts to shrink the public sphere and de-legitimise public administration via sweeping global capitalism and neo-liberal reforms, the state apparatus ultimately rescues private capital from collapse as it did during the 2008 global melt down. To further buttress this point, Drechsler and Randma-Liiv (2015, 5) resonate that "... NPM [as] that lesson might not exactly be the optimal advice, [and] for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), such a recommendation makes even less sense". On the strength of the foregoing issues and analyses, and bearing in mind the questions raised in the Introduction section of this paper, it is doubtful if the NPM paradigm serves the interest of the Nigerian populace or public servants. Perhaps, scholars and technocrats are simply entertaining themselves with these highfalutin and esoteric concepts/ideas.

The 1988 civil service reforms, besides being SAP-induced, has been described as warehousing NPM-related issues of decentralisation, professionalism and privatisation of public enterprises, arising from non-performance and unwieldiness of government (Ikeanyibe 2015), although there is an earlier contention that "... African bureaucracies are not as large as it is often depicted" (Amuwo 2008, 47). These arguments were invigorated and located in the imperial motives of the Bretton Woods institutions (Agagu 2008; Fatile and Adejuwon 2010). Ibietan (2014) documents that the 1988 reforms made three innovations calculated at enhancing public service performance, namely: improved remuneration through Elongated Salary Structure (ESS); Professionalisation along career paths and the operationalisation of team/democratic management. This reform has the unenviable and strange record of decapitating the civil service by making the position of Permanent Secretary to be political and the tenure co-terminus and co-extensive with the appointing administration.

The above provisions were aimed at neutralising the roles of Permanent Secretaries, which hitherto had been preponderant. The reform also scrapped the office of Head of Service of the Federation – the occupant of this office technically speaking is the Chief Public Servant of the country. These pitfalls and other misgivings against this reform led to its unimpressive impact, notwithstanding its lofty aspirations. Predicated on these and many other facts, scholars (Jreisat 2010; Olaopa 2011; Basheka and Sebola 2015) were unanimous in their submissions that the SAP/NPM reforms decimated public-administration institutions and left them prostrate and famished.

The Ayida Panel was inaugurated on 10 November 1994 to review the 1988 reforms among other issues. It dispassionately re-examined the major provisions of the 1988 reforms and reversed the acrimonious matters (including those highlighted above) to status quo. There was also a recommendation for the repeal of Decree 17 of 1984, which promoted impunity via arbitrary abbreviation of tenure and employment of civil/public servants (Oyededeji 2016).

The President Obasanjo administration's Service Renewal Initiatives spanned 1999 to 2007 and were targeted at managerialism, service delivery through SERVICOM and professionalism as reincarnated effigies of NPM, but they produced limited results. The main components

of PSRs during this administration are: pension reform with an emphasis on a contributory saving scheme as a departure from the hitherto non-contributory one which placed heavy burden on governments; monetisation policy in which fringe benefits and allowances in kind were converted to cash in an attempt to reduce cost of governance. Other aspects of the reform include restructuring of pilot Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) through the establishment of the Bureau of Public Service Reforms in September 2003 (Oyededeji 2016, 9) to ensure the re-organisation and re-assignment of all MDAs and units of the federal government.

The SERVICOM (Service Compact with Nigerians) was targeted at a smooth execution of government decisions with the underlying motive of enhancing efficiency and optimal service delivery. As canvassed by Barabashev (2016), supplementing service delivery with co-production by individuals and groups enhances service quality, and this underscores the new public governance (NPG). However, research shows that the governance paradigm as precursor to the NPG is not yet practiced in Nigeria, let alone the NPG paradigm (Ikeanyibe et al. 2017). Additionally, the downsizing of human resources in MDAs and payroll reform anchored on Integrated Payroll and Personnel Information System (IPPIS) aimed at addressing the ghost-workers syndrome, and illicit payroll practices/fraud are cardinal planks of this PSR. There was also a review and update of Public Service Rules, Financial Regulations and the introduction of the Due Process Act.

The above lofty initiatives notwithstanding, the expected results diverged from the aspirations; it is therefore not surprising that Jreisat (2010, 623) submits that "reform for Nigeria ... was equated with de-regulation, privatization and commercialization. The direct effects on public administration were retrenchment, downsizing, and the sale of public enterprises". The lackluster performance of NPM reforms in Nigeria has been attributed to conception-reality gaps attending implementation and the role of basic institutional frameworks in assessing reform projects (Olaopa 2011). Although, the NPM reforms were necessitated by the supposed obsolescence of the traditional Weberian administrative practice, Olaopa (2014, xxxiii) affirms that, "... [it] was essentially not an attempt to root out the Weberian system, but to rehabilitate its service delivery modalities." This has not worked because productivity and service delivery have consistently been at low levels, as measured by institutional reports contained in Ikeanyibe et al. (2016), and this explains why SERVICOM's utility to PSRs is suspect and questionable. The implication of this is that economic philosophy pivoting PSRs was on the market, and as previous studies (Agagu 2008; Drechsler 2010; Sanusi and Abdullahi 2011) show, this is a very wrong thing to do.

The PSRs of Presidents Yar'adua and Jonathan's administrations were foregrounded on the previous (President Obasanjo) administration's service renewal initiatives with a special focus on the Seven-Point National Restoration Programme and Transformation Agenda as the operational mantra, respectively. The PSR efforts of these successive administrations according to Olaopa (2014, 256) had a "significant dose of [the] NPM paradigm". The Oronsaye Committee, which was inaugurated in 2010 but re-christened in March 2011 as Presidential Committee on the Rationalisation and Restructuring of Federal Government Parastatals, Commissions and Agencies, had the mandate of reviewing the structure of public institutions. As one of the recent reform efforts in Nigeria which aimed at deepening the neo-liberal/NPM reform process that characterised Obasanjo's presidency, its numerous recommendations seem unappreciated, as they were not implemented, thus validating the take by Adamolekun (2005) that Nigeria is a hesitant reformer.

Resulting from the failings of NPM/SAP-induced administrative reforms in Nigeria, and being mindful of the fact that the Nigerian state as led by the political and bureaucratic elites seems deficient in political will and alertness to contemplate and tap into the robust benefits of the governance paradigm as documented by scholars (Olaopa 2011; Ikeanyibe 2015; Farazmand 2017), the Neo-Weberian State theoretical anchor of this paper is considered suitable. This model has the tendency to capacitate the developmental agenda of Nigeria through a professionalised and re-calibrated public service targeted at qualitative service delivery to the populace.

6. Oscillation of public administration paradigms: Lessons for the Nigerian public bureaucracy

It is axiomatic from the reviews highlighting the trajectory and milestones in the development of Public Administration that there is an unsettled debate which underlines Public Administration scholarship, and this feeds into paradigmatic oscillation. This possibly results from the multiple personality and community of interests in the discipline as underscored by the various paradigms. In light of these, this section attempts to respond to the following questions: is it beneficial to the Nigerian public service to run on oscillating paradigms in Public Administration, and what lessons can be learnt from this? Answers to these questions are presented in the discourse below on the basis of studies on this theme and ancillary issues.

Haque (1996, 316) identifies the role of culture and different contexts as planks for bureaucratic performance, affirming as follows:

With regard to the political context, state bureaucracy in Western nations is compatible with advanced and stable political institutions, division between politics and administration, bureaucratic neutrality and accountability, and a liberal democratic atmosphere, whereas such bureaucracy in Third World societies is often incongruent with their weak and unstable political systems, politicized administrative apparatus and relatively undemocratic ideological orientation ... the normative features of modern bureaucracy ... have been compatible with Western cultural values ... bureaucratic norms are often contradictory with Third World cultures.

The above averment was reinforced by Olaopa (2010, 5, 8), who calls for a deconstruction of the public service after many years of independence and its subsequent reconstitution in tandem with the local trajectories of African history and culture. Other requirements for bureaucratic effectiveness include: a supporting socio-economic and political infrastructure; a properly functioning state; and a democratically ordered polity among others. This author would later corroborate this with an allusion to the NPM model "which fails to take into consideration the unique administrative context of the third world" (Olaopa 2016b, 12).

Stretching further the argument on non-suitability of the NPM model, SAP-induced reforms and the invention of several reforms to the Nigerian bureaucracy, Agagu (2008, 248) posits that "there are some flaws in using market and market competitiveness as model for public administration." This, he affirms, has led to the erosion of confidence and the loss of prestige in the public service, which remains a custodian of rules/regulations and an engine of national development. Jreisat (2010, 63) notes that "reform for Nigeria and many other states,

was equated with deregulation, privatization, and commercialization. The direct effects on public administration were retrenchment, downsizing and the sale of public enterprises." He underscores that "the shrinking of the public sector in Africa was not limited to Nigeria; it was a pervasive policy throughout the Continent."

The above submissions converge with the views of several authors, namely: Agagu (2008); Sanusi and Abdullahi (2011); and Farazmand (2012). Sanusi and Abdullahi (2011, 78) affirm that "the reforms ... were primarily aimed at making the state or governmental institutions market friendly, lean, managerial, decentralized and customer-friendly ..." Farazmand (2012, 494) sees the effects of these reforms (managerialism in particular) as "paralyzing the state and its institutional capacities; taking over the public sector via sweeping privatization and the de-legitimization of public administration; shrinking the public sphere ... degrading the state and public administration ..." He alludes to the stabilising and protective roles of the state and bureaucracy in the event of market and privatised system collapse as typified by the 2008 Wall Street meltdown. Perhaps, his identification of a "hybrid or mixed model of public administration based on indigenous values, traditions and cultures supplemented ... [with] ... models of organization, management, rationality, bureaucracy ..." (Farazmand 2012, 510) can leverage and bolster public administration and governance systems in Nigeria for people-centred service delivery and development outcomes.

It is also noteworthy that reforms anchored on these oscillating paradigms are oblivious to the "incompatibility between ... African value system and the Western values" (Basheka and Sebola 2015, 65) upon which these paradigms are predicated. It is based on this realisation that these authors advocate a re-launched public service anchored on African values. This is in tandem with Haque's (1996) and Farazmand's (2012) averments on this issue. There is also a convergence of opinion among some writers (Fatile 2008; Omoyefa 2008; Olaopa 2010) that the bane of public-sector reforms pivoted on these paradigms and neo-liberal policies inhere in their suggestion and imposition on African countries by donor nations, multinationals, and the Bretton Woods institutions. Omoyefa (2008, 25, 27-28) adds poignantly that "... not all developing countries as known in Africa ... necessarily require reform of their public sectors." He cautions on wholesale acceptance of the proposals by these donor agencies and financial institutions, concluding with a counsel "to exploit indigenous knowledge in carrying out any required reform in the public sector."

Jreisat (2010, 619) observes that "reform strategies failed to advocate accountability and democratization as objectives," even as Olaopa (2016b, 24) echoes on "challenges of re-professionalization," with Ibietan and Ikeanyibe (2017, 6) being "doubtful if public sector reforms in Nigeria underscored by Managerialism at central and sub-national units have yielded many results, especially in this Fourth Republic." Olaopa (2016b) locates the revitalisation of the community of practice for public administration at an intersection between theory and practice. Hopefully, the Nigerian Association of Public Administration and Management (its resuscitation) will make it sit comfortably at this coveted intersection.

7. Concluding remarks

The paper discussed milestones/epochs in the development of Public Administration as a field of study, and this partly illuminates our understanding on the dynamism inherent in the discipline's scholarship. The foundation for the discourse was laid on Henry's (1975, 1999) conventional narrative and the exposition by several authors, up to the current debate or contention on PVM as paradigm or academic movement. The multiple personality of Public

Administration and its community of interests underline the discipline's status, with a tendency to circumscribe it as a self-conscious field of study. Notwithstanding these, the paper argues that the practice of public administration must recognise the context/environment in which it operates, and it takes a well-capacitated public bureaucracy, calibrated on bureau-professionalism and robust accountability mechanisms to deliver qualitative and people oriented services.

It is worthy of emphasis to state that Nigeria has not been able to experiment with or re-calibrate its federal public bureaucracy along the lines and tenets/tools of many PA paradigms. The narrative shows an allure with the orthodoxy of Weberian practice, even the haphazard attempts or engaging temptation with SAP-induced/NPM reforms were targeted at rehabilitating its service delivery abilities and techniques. It is therefore not surprising that NPM reforms outcomes have not been quite satisfactory, and this submission finds numerous bases in literature and the discourse in this paper. This informs the adoption of the NWS model as theoretical framework and textual analysis of secondary data which invigorated the discussion of various themes of the paper and the recommendations. The paper therefore calls for better-informed political will or robust leadership of reform exercise/process that can capacitate the requisite institutional frameworks. Doing this will in no small measure reverse the dismal reform results and re-position the Nigerian public bureaucracy for optimal service delivery. Public Administration Scholars and Researchers should be concerned about the future of the discipline, especially in the face of rapidly encroaching predatory capitalism and globalisation tendencies against the discipline. They should also be alert enough to wean the discipline from the onslaught and annexation by rivals from Business Administration, Economics and Political Science.

A re-discovery of the values of Public Service in Nigeria built on the tenets (professionalism and co-production) of the NWS model is seriously canvassed by this paper. Additionally, the Nigerian Public Service cannot afford to be oscillating with Public Administration paradigms, it should rather operate on any model that is productive or result-oriented, which satisfies the yearnings or desires of the citizens. The governing elite should endeavour to reverse the current anti-intellectual culture in the public domain by translating from consumers of knowledge to creation and application of same. This would necessitate Academic-Practice synergy, which makes the resuscitation of the Nigerian Association of Public Administration and Management an imperative. The South African Association of Public Administration and Management (SAAPAM) is a model in this respect. The Nigerian government should make efforts to solve social problems through the research approach; thus creating special funds for this purpose. The culture of research for development, not research and development should be encouraged.

There is also a continuous need for the entrenchment of civilian administration predicated on democratic ethos and governance, in order to curtail democratic reversals, impunity, unnecessary politicisation, and centralisation tendencies which constrain bureau-effectiveness and tenure in the Nigerian Public Service. Training and re-training of civil/public servants must be taken seriously to imbue them with necessary skills and expertise to deliver people-oriented services. Consistent ethical and moral re-orientation and enlightenment should be mounted by agencies (National Orientation Agency, Code of Conduct Bureau) saddled with this mandate and moral rectitude in public service/affairs, in order to reduce the incidence of bureau-pathology in the Nigerian public bureaucracy. As a corollary, the accountability mechanisms should be invigorated to curb potential or real resource plunder, mismanagement and conversion of public wealth to private gain.

Periodic review (in line with the prevailing economic realities) in remuneration and motivational packages in the public bureaucracy, devoid of a combative/adversarial industrial relations process, is advocated. The objective implementation of the Federal Character Principle that upholds merit, while seeking to achieve proportional geo-political representation, will engender competence and efficiency in the Nigerian Public Service, which ultimately galvanises development through qualitative service delivery.

8. References

- Acemoglu, D. and J.A. Robinson. 2013. *Why Nations Fail: The Origin of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Adamolekun, L. 2002. "Central Government Organization." In L. Adamolekun (ed.). *Public Administration in Africa: Main Issues and Selected Country Studies*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books, 17-27.
- Adamolekun, L. 2005. "Re-orienting Public Management in Africa: Selected Issues and Some Country Experiences." *African Development Bank Economic Research Working Paper* 81 (November).
- Adamolekun, L. 2007. "Nigeria Notes: Rethinking Public Service in Nigeria." *Vanguard Newspapers*, 22 April, back page.
- Adamolekun, L. and D. Olowu. 2015. "Africa: Revitalising Civil Service Systems to Enhance Economic Performance." In F.M. Van der Meer, J.C.N. Raadschelders and T.A Toonen (eds). *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century*. 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 95-113.
- Adebayo, A. 2000. *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria*. 2nd edn. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Agagu, A.A. 2008. "Re-Inventing the Nigerian Public Service in an Age of Reforms." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 5(3), 243-252.
- Ajibade, O. and J. Ibieta. 2016. "Public Bureaucracy and Service Delivery in Nigeria: The Neo-Weberian Explanation." *The Public Administration and Social Policies Review* 17(2), 5-18.
- Alford, J., S. Douglas, K. Geuijen and P. Hart. 2017. "Ventures in Public Value Management: Introduction to the Symposium." *Public Management Review* 19(5), 589-604.
- Amuwo, K. 2008. "Constructing the Democratic Developmental State in Africa: A Case Study of Nigeria, 1960-2007." *Occasional Paper* 59. South Africa: Institute for Global Dialogue.
- Anazodo, R.O., J.C. Okoye and E.E.O. Chukwuemeka. 2012. "Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria: The Journey So Far in Service Delivery." *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences* 3(1), 17-29.
- Anyim, C.F., T. Elegbede and M.A. Gbajumo-Sheriff. 2011. "Collective Bargaining Dynamics in the Nigerian Public and Private Sectors." *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research* 1(5), 63-70.
- Awosika, F.O. 2014. "Transforming Public Service Performance in West Africa through Innovations: Experiences from Ghana and Nigeria." *Africa Public Service Delivery & Performance Review* 2(4), 72-100.
- Barabashev, A.G. 2016. "Are Existing Administrative Paradigms Capable of Producing the Tools to Resolve the Contemporary Administrative Crisis?" *Public Administration Issues* 5, 6-25.
- Basheka, B.C. 2012. "The Paradigms of Public Administration Re-Examined: A Reflection." *Journal of Public Administration* 47(1), 25-67.
- Basheka, B.C. and M.P. Sebola. 2015. "Good Government in Africa: What is the Role of Bureaucratic Governance?" *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology* 12(20), 54-66.
- Basu, R. 2009. *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New York: Sterling Publishers.
- Bozeman, B. 2002. 'Public-Value Failure: When Efficient Markets May Not Do'. *Public Administration Review* 62(2), 145-161.
- Bozeman, B. 2007. *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism*. USA: Georgetown University Press.
- Christensen, T. and P. Laegreid. 2007. "The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform." *Public Administration Review* 67(6), 1059-1066.

- Denhardt, J.V. and R.B. Denhardt. 2007. *The New Public Service*. Expanded edn. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Drechsler, W. 1997. "Christian Wolff (1679-1754): A Biographical Essay." *European Journal of Law and Economics* 4, 111-128.
- Drechsler, W. 2001. "On the Viability of the Concept of Staatswissenschaften." *European Journal of Law and Economics* 12, 105-111.
- Drechsler, W. 2005. "The Re-Emergence of Weberian Public Administration after the Fall of New Public Management: The Central and Eastern European Perspective." *Halduskultuur* 6, 94-108.
- Drechsler, W. 2010. "Public Administration in Times of Crisis." In R. Kattel, W. Mikulowski and B.G. Peters (eds). *Public Administration in Times of Crisis*. Bratislava: NISPAcee Press, 15-25.
- Drechsler, W. and R. Kattel. 2008. "Conclusion: Towards the Neo-Weberian State? Perhaps, but Certainly Adieu, NPM!" *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy* 1(2), 95-99.
- Drechsler, W. and T. Randma-Liiv. 2015. "In Some Central and Eastern European Countries, Some NPM Tools May Sometimes Work: A Reply to Dan and Pollitt's 'NPM Can Work'." *Public Management Review*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1114137>, 1-7.
- Ehiyamen, O. 2017. "Administrative and Financial Reforms in the Nigerian Public Sector." *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law* 11, 37-48.
- Farazmand, A. 2012. "The Future of Public Administration: Challenges and Opportunities: A Critical Perspective." *Administration & Society* 44(4), 487-517.
- Farazmand, A. 2017. "Governance Reforms: the Good, the Bad and the Ugly; and the Sound: Examining the Past and Exploring the Future of Public Organizations." *Public Organization Review*. DOI 10.1007/s 11115-017-0398-y.
- Fatile, J.O. and K.D. Adejuwon. 2010. "Public Sector Reform in Africa: Issues, Lessons and Future Directions." *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12(8), 145-157.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. 1999. *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Lagos: Government Printers.
- Gal, M. 2014. "The Clash of Public Management Reform Models. Where Do We Go From Here?" *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti* 8, 65-77.
- Haque, M.S. 1996. "The Contextless Nature of Public Administration in Third World Countries." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 62, 315-329.
- Henry, N. 1975. "Paradigms of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 35(4), 378-386.
- Henry, N. 1999. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. 6th edn. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Hughes, O.E. 2003. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*. 3rd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ibieta, J. 2010. "The Role of Local Government in Rural Development Issues." *Knowledge Review* 20(2), 30-38.
- Ibieta, J. 2013. "New Public Management and Public Service Effectiveness in Nigeria: A Pragmatic Discourse." *Public Policy and Administration Research* 3(7), 53-61.
- Ibieta, J. 2014. "Conceptual Issues in Development Administration." *International Journal of Innovative Education Research* 2(2), 19-31.
- Ibieta, J. and O. Ikeanyibe. 2017. "Decentralisation and Local Government Autonomy: Implications for Grassroots Development in Nigeria's Fourth Republic." *Halduskultuur: Administrative Culture* 18(1), 5-25.
- Ibieta, J. and S. Joshua. 2015. "New Public Management and Developmental State: Revising the Institutional Imperatives in Nigeria." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 6(3), 52, 58-66.
- Ibieta, J. and S. Oni. 2013. "The Weberian Bureaucratic Principles and Nigerian Public Bureaucracy: An Evaluation." *Quarterly Journal of Administration* 33(2), 31-51.
- Ikeanyibe, M.O. 2015. "New Public Management and administrative Reforms in Nigeria." *International Journal of Public Administration*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1023446>.
- Ikeanyibe, M.O., O. Eze' Ori and A.E. Okoye. 2017. "Governance Paradigm in Public Administration and Dilemma of National Question in Nigeria." *Cogent Social Sciences* 3(1), 1-16.

- Jreisat, J. 2010. "Comparative Public Administration and Africa." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 76(4), 612-631.
- Katsamunskas, P. 2016. "The Concept of Governance and Public Governance Theories." *Economic Alternatives* 2, 133-144.
- Lamidi, K.O. 2015. "Theories of Public Administration: An Anthology of Essays." *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance* 6(4), 1-35.
- Lynn, L.E. 2008. "What Is a Neo-Weberian State? Reflections on a Concept and Its Implications." *NISPACE Journal of Public Administration and Policy* 1(2), 17-30.
- Maserumule, M.H. and S. Vil-Nkomo. 2015. "Science of Public Administration: Critiquing the Past, Recognising the Present and Imagining the Future." *Journal of Public Administration* 50(3), 439-465.
- Meier, K.J. and L.J. O'Toole. 2009. "The Proverbs of New Public Management: Lessons from an Evidence-Based Research Agenda." *American Review of Public Administration* 39(1), 4-22.
- Meier, K.J. 2015. Proverbs and the Evolution of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 75(1), 15-24.
- Moore, M.H. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* (Reprint Edition). USA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M.H. 2013. *Recognising Public Value*. USA: Harvard University Press.
- Mustapha, A.I. and C.K. Omorede. 2017. "Nigerian Public Service and the Challenge of Productivity from 2000-2015: A Theoretical Perspective." *Sahel Analyst: Journal of Management Sciences* 15(1), 1-15.
- Obi, E.A. 2007. "The Origin and Evolution of the Nigerian Public Service." In E.A. Obi and M.Y. Dalhatu (eds). *Current Practices and Problems of Nigerian Public Administration*. Onitsha: Bookpoint Educational, 39-59.
- Okafor, C. and R.A. Onuigbo. 2015. "Re-thinking Public Administration Professionalism in Nigeria." *African Research Review* 9(4), 333-347.
- Okoli, F.C. and F.O. Onah. 2002. *Public Administration in Nigeria: Nature, Principles and Application*. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers.
- Okorie, C.O. and S.O. Onwe. 2016. "Appraisal of Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria and Options for Stability." *Public Policy and Administration Research* 6(9), 15-24.
- Oladipo, J.A. 2007. "Reforming the Civil Service." In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme: Issues and Challenges*. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers, 342-362.
- Olaopa, T. 2008. *Theory and Practice of Public Administration and Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Olaopa, T. 2010. "The Complex Institutional Context and Dynamics of Reforms in Africa: New Orientations, New Approaches and New Contexts of the 21st Century." Paper Presented at the 6th Pan-African Forum on the Modernization of Public Services and State Institutions, Rabat-Morocco, 7-8 June.
- Olaopa, T. 2011. *Managing Complex Reforms: A Public Sector Perspective*. Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- Olaopa, T. 2012. *Innovation and Best Practices in Public Sector Reforms: Issues, Strategies and Conditions*. Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- Olaopa, T. 2014. *The Nigerian Civil Service of the Future: A Prospective Analysis*. Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- Olaopa, T. 2016a. "Rebranding the Civil Service: From Profession to Professionalism." *This Day*, 4 September, 81.
- Olaopa, T. 2016b. "The State of Public Administration and Sustainable Development in Africa: Towards a Bold and Functional Public Administration." Lecture Delivered at a Conference Organized by the Department of Public Administration, Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria, 28-30 November.
- Omitola, B.O. 2012. "Nigerian Public Service Reforms and the Fourth Republic Experience: Challenges and Prospects." *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 5(1), 142-154.
- Omoyefa, P.S. 2008. "Public Sector Reforms in Africa: A Philosophical Re-Thinking." *Africa Development* 33(4), 15-30.
- Osborne, S.P. 2006. "Editorial: The New Public Governance." *Public Management Review* 89(3), 377-387.

- Osborne, S.P., Z. Radnor and G. Nasi. 2012. "A New Theory for Public Service Management? Toward a (Public) Service-Dominant Approach." *American Review of Public Administration* 43(2), 135-158.
- Oyedemi, B. 2016. "Politicisation of the Civil Service: Implications for Good Governance." *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research* 4(1), 1-16.
- Pfiffner, J.P. 2004. "Traditional Public Administration versus the New Public Management: Accountability versus Efficiency." In A. Benz, H. Sipdientopf and K.P. Sommerman (eds). *Institutionenbildung in Regierung und Verwaltung: Festschrift für Klaus König*. Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 443-454.
- Pollitt, C. And Bouckaert, G. 2004. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C. 2010. "Envisioning Public Administration as a Scholarly Field in 2020." *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 292-294.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. 2012. "An A-disciplinary Public Administration for a Diverse Society: Historical, Ontological, Epistemological and Axiological Reflections." An Inaugural Lecture of Universiteit Leiden, 18 June.
- Randma-Liiv, T. and W. Drechsler. 2017. "Three Decades, Four Phases: Public Administration Development in Central and Eastern Europe, 1989-2017." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 30(6/7), 595-605.
- Robinson, M. 2015. *From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service: Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. Singapore: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.
- Rutgers, M.R. 2015. "As Good as It Gets? On the Meaning of Public Value in the Study of Policy and Management." *American Review of Public Administration* 45(1), 29-45.
- Sanusi, A. and A. Abdullahi. 2011. "Nigeria's Public Service and New Public Management Reform." *Journal of Administrative Science* 8(1), 75-86.
- Seteolu, D. 2017. "The State and Public Sector Reform in Nigeria: A Political Economy Interpretation." In C.P. Maduabum and I. Akhakpe (eds). *The Dynamics of Public Sector Management: A Reader*. Ibadan: John Archers, 52-67.
- Thornhill, C. 2006. "The Domain of Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration* 41(4.1), 793-806.
- Turkel, E. and G. Turkel. 2016. "Public Value Theory: Reconciling Public Interests, Administrative Autonomy and Efficiency." *Review of Public Administration and Management* 4(2), 1-7.
- Uwizeyimana D.E. and K.J. Maphunye. 2014. "The Changing Global Public Administration and Its Theoretical and Practical Implications for Africa." *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research* 6(4), 90-101.
- Voorberg, W., V. Bekkers, K. Timeus, P. Tonurist and L. Tummers. 2017. "Changing Public Service Delivery: Learning in Co-creation." *Policy and Society* 36(2), 178-194.
- Vyas-Doorgapersad, S. 2011. "Paradigm Shift from New Public Administration to New Public Management: Theory and Practice in Africa." *Td: Journal of Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa* 7(2), 235-250.
- Xu, R., Q. Sun and W. Si. 2015. "The Third Wave of Public Administration: The New Public Governance." *Canadian Social Sciences* 11(7), 11-21.

JIDE IBITAN PhD is an Associate Professor of Public Administration in the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Covenant University, Ota-Nigeria. His research interests include: Local Government; Administrative Theory; Public Policy; Governance and Development. He is widely leading in reputable journals internationally and in Nigeria. Email: olajide.ibietan@covenantuniversity.edu.ng and jidebetan@gmail.com