


**COURSE
GUIDE**

POL 343

THEORIES AND PRACTICE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Course Developer/Writer: Professor Kamal Bello
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences
National Open University of Nigeria

Course Editor: Professor Anyebe, Adam Adem
Department of Public Administration
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria.

Course Coordinator: Ifeyinwa M. Ogbonna-Nwaogu
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences
National Open University of Nigeria
Abuja.

Programme Leader: Aminu Umar (Ph.D)
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences
National Open University of Nigeria
Abuja.



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

University Village, Plot 91, Cadastral Zone,
Nnamdi Azikiwe Express Way,
Jabi- Abuja.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Pages</i>
Introduction	1
Course Aims.....	2
Course Objectives.....	3
Working Through This Course.....	4
Course Materials.....	5
Study Units.....	6
Self-Assessment Exercise	6
Tutors Marked Assignments (TMA)	7
Final Examination and Grading.....	8
Course Marking Scheme.....	9
How to get the most from this course.....	10
Tutors and Tutorials.....	11
Summary.....	11

1.1 Introduction

Welcome to **POL 343: Theories And Practice Of Public Administration.**

This course is a three (3) unit course for undergraduate students in Political Science. The course guide gives you an overview of what Theories and Practice of Public Administration is all about. It equally provides you with the necessary information on the organization and requirements of the course. Indeed, the overall objective of this course is to expose you to the concept of administration, public administration, management, organization and their attendant relevance in the political development of a nation. It provides the theoretical underpinnings and practical applications of broad-based knowledge of democratic ethos, transparency and accountability, and abilities required for improving the delivery of public services and implementation of government policies and programs. This is important because the critical issues of underdevelopment in most communities across the world are not unconnected with the failure of governance or public administration. The reasons why there are successes and failures of the use of power and authority by leaders or government officials and different perception of governance across the world will be made clear in this course.

1.2 Course Aims & Objectives

The course ensures you:

- (1) Have background information and knowledge in Theories and Practice of Public Administration;
- (2) Be up to date with the theoretical perspectives as well as methodological issues which the course has to grapple with;
- (3) Understand the different descriptions of administration
- (4) Explain the similarities between public and private administration, and discuss the ecology of administration
- (5) Identify and operationalise the concept of organisation, types of organisation, characteristics of organization, theories of organization, leadership, its skills and styles as well as leadership theories;
- (6) Identify and operationalise the concept of public administration
- (7) Understand and discuss the relationships between administration and politics as well as the various debates on the relationships that exist between them.

- (8) Identify and operationalise the concepts of administration and political institutions.
- (9) Understand and discuss the orthodoxy in thinking concerning how the political system functions in relation to administration.
- (10) Identify and operationalise the concept of decision making and its theoretical bases.
- (11) Explain the meaning of personnel management, recruitment, selection and placement of personnel,
- (12) Discuss the compensation of personnel in terms of wages and salary
- (13) Describe the scientific management theory and trace its philosophy, evolution and relation with mechanization and automation as well as its impact in planned economies.

1.3 Working through this course

The course is written in study units within Modules. You are also provided with related reading materials for each topic examined. At the end of each unit, you will be required to attempt Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs) for assessment purposes. And at the end of the course, you will write a final examination.

1.4 Study Units

There are twenty-one units in this course spanning five modules. These are as follows:

MODULE 1: CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

Unit 1: Administration

Unit 2: Management

Unit 3: Organisation

Unit 4: Public Administration

MODULE 2: POLITICS/POLICY/ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY

Unit 1: Administration and Politics

Unit 2: Inter play of Political Institutions and Administration

Unit 3: Institutional Setting and Administration

Unit 4: Decision Making in Administration

Unit 5: Personnel Administration

MODULE 3: SELECTED THEORIES OF ADMINISTRATION I

Unit 1: Scientific Management Theory

Unit 2: Bureaucratic Management Theory

Unit 3: Functional Management Theory

Unit 4: Human Relations Movement

MODULE 4: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES II

Unit 1: Administrative Management Theory

Unit 2: Behavioral Science Theory

Unit 3: Systems Theory

Unit 4: Group Theory

MODULE 5: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES III

Unit 1: Elite Theory

Unit 2: Radical Marxist Theory

Unit 3: New Public Management

Unit 4: Chinese Developing Bureaucracy

1.5 Textbooks and References

Every unit contains a list of references and further readings. Try to get as many as possible of those textbooks and materials listed. The textbooks and materials are meant to deepen your knowledge of the course. For this course, it is highly recommended that you consult widely in your further choice of reading materials.

1.6 Assignment File

An assessment file and a marking scheme will be made available to you. In the assessment file, you will find details of the works you must submit to your tutor for marking. There are two aspects of the assessment of this course; the tutor marked and the written examination. The marks you obtain in these two areas will make up your final marks. The assignment must be submitted to your tutor for formal assessment in accordance with the deadline stated in the presentation schedule and the assignment file.

The work you submit to your tutor for assessment will account for 30% of your total score.

1.7 Tutor Marked Assignment (TMAs)

You will have to submit a specified number of the (TMAs). Every unit in this course has a Tutor-Marked Assignment. You will be assessed on four of them but the best three performances from the (TMAs) will be used for computing your 30%. When you have completed each assignment, send it together with a Tutor marked Assignment form to your Tutor. Make sure each assignment reaches your tutor on or before the deadline for submissions. If for any reason, you cannot complete your work on time, contact your tutor for a discussion on the possibility of an extension. Extensions will not be granted after the due date unless under exceptional circumstances.

1.8 Final Examination and Grading

The final examination will be a test of three hours. All areas of the course will be examined. Find time to read the unit all over before your examination. The final examination will attract 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of questions, which reflect the kind of self-assessment exercise, and tutor marked assignment you have previously encountered. You should use the time between completing the last unit, and taking the examination to revise the entire course.

1.9 Course Marking Scheme

The following table lays out how the actual course mark allocation is broken down.

Assessment	Marks
Three Assignments	= 30%
Final Examination	= 70%
Total	= 100%

Presentation Schedule

The dates for submission of all assignment will be communicated to you. You will also be told the date of completing the study units and dates for examinations.

Course Overview

Unit	Title of Work	Week(s) Activity	Assessment
	Course Guide		
Module 1	<i>CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS</i>		
1	Administration	Week1	Assignment1
2	Management	Week2	Assignment2
3	Organisation	Week3	Assignment3
4	Public Administration	Week4	Assignment4
Module 2	<i>POLITICS/POLICY/ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY</i>		
1	Administration and Politics	Week1	Assignment1
2	Inter play of Political Institutions and Administration	Week2	Assignment2
3	Institutional Setting and Administration	Week3	Assignment3
4	Decision Making in Administration	Week4	Assignment4
5	Personnel Administration	Week5	Assignment5
Module 3	SELECTED THEORIES OF ADMINISTRATION I		
1	Scientific Management Theory	Week1	Assignment1
2	Bureaucratic Management Theory	Week2	Assignment2
3	Functional Management Theory	Week3	Assignment3
4	Human Relations Movement	Week4	Assignment4
Module 4	<i>SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES II</i>		
1	Administrative Management Theory	Week1	Assignment1
2	Behavioral Science Theory	Week2	Assignment2
3	Systems Theory	Week3	Assignment3

4	Group Theory	Week4	Assignment4
Module 5	<i>SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES III</i>		
1	Elite Theory	Week1	Assignment1
2	Radical Marxist Theory	Week2	Assignment2
3	New Public Management	Week3	Assignment3
4	Chinese Developing Bureaucracy	Week4	Assignment4

Getting the Most from this Course

You will be required to study the units on your own. However, you may arrange to meet with your tutor for tutorials on an optional basis at a Study Centre. Also, you can organize interactive sessions with your course mates.

In distance learning, the study units replace the University lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning, you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your pace, and at a time and place that suits you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do, the study units tells you when to read, and which are your text materials or set of books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you an in-class exercise. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with the other units as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chances of passing the course. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your set books or from the reading section.

The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

1. Read this course guide thoroughly; it is your first assignment.
2. Organize a study schedule. Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the Course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units. Important information, e.g. details of your tutorials, and the date of the first day of the semester is available from the Study Centre. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.
3. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind with their course work. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please, let your tutor know before it is too late for help.
4. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.
5. Assemble the study materials. You will need your text books and the unit you are studying at any point in time.
6. Work through the unit. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.
7. Keep in touch with your Study Centre. Up-to-date information on your course subjects will be continuously available there.
8. Well before the relevant due date (about 4 weeks before due dates), keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination. Submit all assignments not later than the due date.
9. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor.
10. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to pace your study so that you keep yourself on schedule.
11. When you have submitted an assignment to your tutor for marking, do not wait for its return before starting on the next unit. Keep to your schedule. When the assignment is returned, pay particular attention to your tutor's comments, both on the tutor marked assignment form and also the written comments on the ordinary assignments.
12. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the Course Guide).

Tutors and Tutorials

Information relating to the tutorials will be provided at the appropriate time. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, keep a close watch on your progress and on any difficulties you might encounter and provide assistance to you during the course. You must take your tutor-marked assignments to the study centre well before the due date (at least two working days are required). They will be marked by your tutor and returned to you as soon as possible. Do not hesitate to contact your tutor if you need help. Contact your tutor if you experience any of the following:

- *Not understanding any part of the study units or the assigned readings;

- *Having difficulty with the exercises;

- *You have a question or problem with an assignment or with your tutor's comments on an assignment or with the grading of an assignment.

Moreover, you should try your best to attend the tutorials. This is the only chance to have face-to-face contact with your tutor and ask questions which are answered instantly. You can raise any problem encountered in the course of your study. To gain the maximum benefit from course tutorials, prepare a question list before attending them. You will learn a lot from participating in discussions actively.

Summary

The course guide gives you an overview of what to expect in the course-Theories and practice of Public Administration such as: Administration, Management, Organisation, Public Administration and Management dynamics as it affect politics. Public Administration theories and subsequently policy-making process. We wish you success in the course and hope that you will find it both interesting and useful.

CONTENTS

MODULE 1: CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

Unit 1: Administration

Unit 2: Management

Unit 3: Organisation

Unit 4: Public Administration

MODULE 2: POLITICS/POLICY/ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY

Unit 1: Administration and Politics

Unit 2: Inter play of Political Institutions and Administration

Unit 3: Institutional Setting and Administration

Unit 4: Decision Making in Administration

Unit 5: Personnel Administration

MODULE 3: SELECTED THEORIES OF ADMINISTRATION I

Unit 1: Scientific Management Theory

Unit 2: Bureaucratic Management Theory

Unit 3: Functional Management Theory

Unit 4: Human Relations Movement

MODULE 4: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES II

Unit 1: Administrative Management Theory

Unit 2: Behavioral Science Theory

Unit 3: Systems Theory

Unit 4: Group Theory

MODULE 5: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES III

Unit 1: Elite Theory

Unit 2: Radical Marxist Theory

Unit 3: New Public Management

Unit 4: Chinese Developing Bureaucracy

MODULE 1: CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

MODULE 1 Unit 1: Administration

1.0 Introduction

The thrust of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concept of administration. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguities surrounding the concept of administration arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

- a. Understand the different descriptions of administration,
- b. Describe the differences between public and private administration,
- c. Explain the similarities between public and private administration, and
- d. Discuss the ecology of administration

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Administration

Administration is a universal practice and is also of universal importance (Adebayo, 1984). It is said to commence immediately two people agree to co-operate to undertake a task which none of them can take alone. According to Nwosu (1985, p.3);

Administration is...inevitable in any given situation where a piece of work has to be done, and this piece of work requires the effort of more than one person to accomplish it. We are involved in administrative behavior when we co-operate with other people to accomplish such objectives as erecting a community town hall, constructing and managing schools, hospitals, vehicles, assembly plants.

Thus, administration exists whenever people co-operate to achieve the goals of their groups and such achievements require planning, organization, command, co-operation and control. It involves the mobilization, development and direction of human and material resources to attain the specified objectives. When viewed from this perspective, certainly administration is rightly considered a very old and global phenomenon which exists even in the most basic human group. We may therefore define administration as the capacity to co-ordinate and execute many and often conflicting social demands in a single

organism so perfectly that they should all operate as a unit (Adebayo, 1984). Increasingly, those definitions and explanations, among others point to the fact that administration is both public and private. Furthermore, there is another sense in which the term administration may be used. This is in the sense whereby the term administration is used to refer to senior personnel in the executive branch of government. It is in this sense that the term is employed when people speak of the “Shagari Administration”, “Babangida Administration”, “Obasanjo Administration” etc. In whatever sense it is used, administration has a long history which dates back to the beginning of the history of mankind with research revealing administrative tasks and practices since recorded history. Indications are that what we have today as modern systems of administration have emerged, in one way or the other, from the old practices and experiences of the ancient Egyptians, Chinese, the Greeks and Romans and much later from the Christian Church and the German Cameralists of the Middle Ages.

3.2 Differences between Private and Public Administration

Administration usually takes place within an organisation, for example in churches, mosques schools, universities, companies, and government departments and agencies. While some of the organisations are recognised as public organisations, others are identified as private organisations. Public organisations are those which are concerned with the attainment of the aims of the government or the state. Among such organisations are ministries, corporations, companies and parastatals. Most of the time public sector organisations are established to provide services to the people at no cost directly on them, or such services may be provided at subsidized cost.

The term private sector is often used as a collective phrase to refer to organisations which are neither state-owned nor operating specifically to achieve state goals. Examples of those include privately owned or public-quoted companies like Lever Brothers Plc; Mobil Nigeria Plc, Texaco, United Bank For Africa (UBA), etc. Other such privately owned organisations are humanitarian groups and those known as Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Administration within these two categories of organisation i.e. public and private differ in a number of important respects which are discussed as follows:

(i) The principle of “to whose benefit”; Public organisations are expected to promote the overall public interest. Accordingly, the public as a whole is the major beneficiary of any public organisation, no matter what its functions are; e.g. Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), Water Corporation. With respect to private organisations, except humanitarian organisations like the Red Cross, Red Crescent, or Advocacy Groups such as Civil/Human Rights Organisations, the

major objective of private administration is to maximize profit or other goals of the owner(s) or group(s). In effect, the main beneficiary of the private organisation is the individual owner or private group.

(ii) Focus on service or profit: The overriding aim of most private organisations is to make profit. Accordingly, administration within such organisations is concerned with the management of men and materials to attain private aims, usually the maximisation of profit. This is not the case with administration in public organisations. The primary purpose administration in public organisation is service to the public. Even when government establishes agencies which undertake commercial activities such as electricity, telecommunication, and transportation, the major aim of such enterprises is to provide service. Profit is accorded a secondary place.

(iii) Accountability and measure of Success: Private organisations are usually established and financed by individuals, and groups. Administration within private organisations is answerable to the owners and its success or efficiency is usually measured in terms of the amount of profit it makes. By contrast, public organisations are usually established by the acts of the parliament or orders of the executive arm of government. The goals of the organisations are expected to reflect the needs and aspirations of the citizens. Besides, public organisations are supported with public funds. For these reasons, public officials who manage public organisations are made accountable to the public. The parliament, the press, and even ordinary citizens have the right to inquire into the activities of such public officials in order to ensure that the public purpose is served, and that resources are not misappropriated. It is to be noted also that while efficiency can easily be measured in private organisations by reference to profit, this is not so in most public organisations. Indeed, it is not possible to measure the profitability of some of the services provided by public agencies because of the nature of such services. Furthermore, in order to promote public welfare, government often undertakes unprofitable projects or provides services at subsidised rates.

(iv) Level of complexity: It has been suggested that public administration is more complex than private administration. The reason for this viewpoint is that public agencies much more than private organisations need to respond to more conflicting demands of the public. For instance, public administration is required to respond to demands for fair treatment of citizens, representation of different sectors of the society in addition to efficient provision of services. These demands are too many to be responded to at the same time.

(v) Organisational procedure: The process of administration in government organisations is much slower when compared with the process in private organisations. This is the problem that people refer to when they accuse public agencies of 'red-tape'. For instance, the processes of hiring, promoting and disciplining staff are usually very sluggish in public agencies. Public organisations also respond more slowly to the wishes of the people. One major

reason for the delays in procedure is the need to ensure adherence to established rules and to protect public funds.

(Vi)Public administration is usually engaged in providing services and in some cases goods whose scope and variety are determined not by direct wishes of the people but by the decision of government while the private sector services are voluntary.

3.3 Similarities Between Public and Private Administration

In spite of the differences between them, administration in the public and private sectors share important similarities. Administration in both sectors requires effective mobilisation and use of human and material resources to achieve specified goals. Both public and private administrators face the challenge of regularly reviewing their goals in the context of existing resources.

1. Although profit still remains the critical focus of private organisations, they are also being urged to ‘treat employees fairly and take account of the effect of the firms’ activity on the community it serves and, the environment, in which it functions. For instance, oil-prospecting companies are now being pressured to contribute more meaningfully to the development of their host communities.
2. Many private organisations have grown greatly in size, numerous businesses raise their capital from the public through the Stock Exchange, and the management of these firms is in the hands of professionals who are different from the shareholders. For instance, the administration of companies such as the UAC, Lever Brothers, etc. is undertaken by managers who may not be shareholder in the companies. These developments come to mean that administration in the private sector has grown in complexity and is also sometimes marked by ‘red-tapism.’ as in the public sector. In recent times, governments have adopted many management practices that were hitherto exclusive to private business organization. Government adoption of private management practices is as a result of changing times, particularly rapid changes in technology which government bureaucracy cannot ignore. Some of these changes are also brought about by the environment under which public administration takes place. We may now examine those environmental influences under “ecology” of administration.

3.4 Ecology of Administration

Ecology of administration examines all the natural, historical, socio-cultural and religious factors, and other significant national experiences which could have in one way or the other influenced the growth and development of public administration. In the case of Nigeria, the first influence arose from British colonialism. The fact that Britain colonised Nigeria and established British public service structure and procedures in the administration of the colonial

territory influenced the growth and development of public administration in Nigeria. Indeed, it was the colonial public administration which managed the colonial territory (Nigeria) from about 1861 to 1954 when regional governments were created, and made the territory to operate federal structure. Thus, the public services of the then regional governments from 1954 to 1960, and up to 1966, were direct offshoots of the early British colonial public service administrative structure in terms of ethics or values, culture and tradition, training, procedures and *esprit de corp* associated with the public service. Nigeria's socio cultural conditions or the social Setting made up of very many ethnic and cultural groups, and many languages also have affected the growth and development of public administration in Nigeria. Those factors have created problems of balancing management and control in the public service. In fact, they are partly responsible for the problem of nepotism, and tribalism often associated with the management of the public service in Nigeria.

Another influence on the public administration, closely related to social setting, is Nigeria's federal structure adopted in the 1954 Lyttleton Constitution. That constitution was largely responsible for the regionally oriented development of the public service administrative structure. The federal structure enabled the creation of federal and regional services, and also the regional outlook and consciousness of the services, particularly from 1960 to 1966.

The civil war of 1967 to 1970 was another significant influence on public administration in Nigeria. The impact of the war was felt in all segments of the Nigerian society: At the end of the War, the military apparently had such power and authority in the federation which could not be easily challenged by any of the constituents of the federation. That enabled the military to establish what was called a results-oriented and unified grade structure public service for the entire country through the recommendations of the 1974 Public Service Review Commission (Udoji Commission). That public service reform has continued influence on the structure and procedures of public administration in Nigeria till date.

Even at the level of the private sector administration, there was also the influence of capitalist mode of production, the capitalist values "profit and loss" "demand and supply", "market forces" etc. which have determined management at the area of private business administration. Thus, till this day, capitalist values and mode of production still dictate the dynamics of business organisation and practice in Nigeria. Also to a very large extent, all these considerations have influenced the nature and scope of public administration as it is studied in Nigeria, and indeed in the rest of the world.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to operationalise the basic concepts that are central to understanding administration. The learner has been exposed to the basic facts that there are various definitions of the concepts as presented by various scholars. Despite the multidimensional and multidisciplinary approach to the concept certain key characteristics are paramount.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to conceptualise administration, the differences and similarities between public and private administration and ecology of administration.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is administration?
2. Attempt a historical sketch of the development of the discipline.
3. Make a distinction between private and public administration.
4. What is ecology of administration?

7.0 References/Further Readings

- Ademolekun, L. (ed.) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.
- Anifowose, R. and F. Enemuo, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.
- Ashiru, A.T. (2001), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.
- Jones, G. R. *et. al.* (1998), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.
- Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.
- Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Unit 2: Management

1.0 Introduction

The thrust of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concept of management, types of management, scope of management and historical development of management. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the concept of management arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

- a. Identify the different descriptions of management,
- b. Describe the different types of management,
- c. Explain the scope of management, and
- d. Narrate the history of management.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Management

One of the relative confusions that strike every scholar is the seeming synonyms between the concepts of administration and management. This is because a lot of works seem to portray both concepts in the same light. It has become common to use administration and management inter-changeably. A lot of scholars tend to think that to administer is to 'manage'. This is to say the words are different but they have the same meaning. To a large extent this is literally true. However, there is slight distinction between the concepts. This distinction can be located within institutional and operational usage. Public administration and public sector prefers the word "administration" while in the private sector the word 'manager' is preferred (Aghayere, 1995). Administration generally refers to the top executive functions while on the other hand management relates to the process of operational supervision. It can be used to refer to all people who supervise at various levels. The administrator views the organization in macro or strategic terms, he formulates policies and must possess the ability to coordinate or relate organizational variables to achieve desired over all goals. On the other hand, the manager implements policies formulated by the administrator. Operative managers in all cases require technical skills. Technical skill is less emphasized in the case of an administrator. The most required skill is the conceptual skill.

Both administrators and managers are obsessed with the question of efficiency and effectiveness; that is how best to achieve organizational objectives. Thus, no matter the nature of what is being discussed whether it is administrative or management theory, it invariable boils down to the same thing i.e. the proper

structuring of organization in its capacity to function effectively (Adamolekun, 2002).

The English verb "manage" comes from the Italian *maneggiare* (to handle, especially tools or a horse), which derives from the two Latin words *manus* (hand) and *agere* (to act). The French word for housekeeping, *ménagerie*, derived from *ménager* ("to keep house"; compare *ménage* for "household"), also encompasses taking care of domestic animals. *Ménagerie* is the French translation of Xenophon's famous book *Oeconomicus* (Greek: Οἰκονομικός) on household matters and husbandry. The French word *mesnagement* (or *ménagement*) influenced the semantic development of the English word *management* in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Management or managing is the administration of an organization, whether it is a business, a not-for-profit organization, or government body. Management includes the activities of setting the strategy of an organization and coordinating the efforts of its employees (or of volunteers) to accomplish its objectives through the application of available resources, such as financial, natural, technological, and human resources.¹ The term "management" may also refer to those people who manage an organization.

Social scientists study management as an academic discipline, investigating areas such as social organization and organizational leadership. Some people study management at colleges or universities; major degrees in management include the Bachelor of Commerce (B.Com.) and Master of Business Administration (MBA.) and, for the public sector, the Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree. Individuals who aim to become management specialists or experts, management researchers, or professors may complete the Doctor of Management (DM), the Doctor of Business Administration (DBA), or the PhD in Business Administration or Management.

According to Henri Fayol, "to manage is to forecast and to plan, to organise, to command, to co-ordinate and to control." Fredmund Malik defines it as "the transformation of resources into utility." Management included as one of the factors of production – along with machines, materials and money. Ghislain Deslandes defines it as "a vulnerable force, under pressure to achieve results and endowed with the triple power of constraint, imitation and imagination, operating on subjective, interpersonal, institutional and environmental levels". Peter Drucker (1909–2005) saw the basic task of management as twofold: marketing and innovation. Nevertheless, innovation is also linked to marketing (product innovation is a central strategic marketing issue). Peter Drucker identifies marketing as a key essence for business success, but management and marketing are generally understood as two different branches

of business administration knowledge. Administration has an input-dominated structure with output being only incidental. In trying to control everything, the administrators become so obsessed with how things should be done that they ignore result.

3.2 Types of Management

Larger organizations generally have three levels of managers, which are typically organized in a hierarchical, pyramid structure:

1. Senior managers, such as members of a Board of Directors and a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or a President of an organization. They set the strategic goals of the organization and make decisions on how the overall organization will operate. Senior managers are generally executive-level professionals, and provide direction to middle management who directly or indirectly report to them.

2. Middle managers, examples of which would include branch managers, regional managers, department managers and section managers, provide direction to front-line managers. Middle managers communicate the strategic goals of senior management to the front-line managers.

3. Lower managers, such as supervisors and front-line team leaders, oversee the work of regular employees (or volunteers, in some voluntary organizations) and provide direction on their work.

In smaller organizations, an individual manager may have a much wider scope. A single manager may perform several roles or even all of the roles commonly observed in a large organization.

3.3 Scope of Management

Numerous theories as regard to how best to design an organization, how organization should be structured and how it can function better to guarantee goals achievements have been postulated at various times by various theorists based on their experiences and predicaments. While some theories are more in use today than others, each has been an important source of inspiration for administrators and managers and together they form the basis for the knowledge of management theory.

Management involves identifying the mission, objective, procedures, rules and manipulation of the human capital of an enterprise to contribute to the success of the enterprise. This implies effective communication: an enterprise environment (as opposed to a physical or mechanical mechanism) implies human motivation and implies some sort of successful progress or system

outcome. As such, management is not the manipulation of a mechanism (machine or automated program), not the herding of animals, and can occur either in a legal or in an illegal enterprise or environment. From an individual's perspective, management does not need to be seen solely from an enterprise point of view, because management is an essential function to improve one's life and relationships. Management is therefore everywhere and it has a wider range of application. Based on this, management must have humans. Communication and a positive endeavor are two main aspects of it either through enterprise or independent pursuit. Plans, measurements, motivational psychological tools, goals, and economic measures (profit, etc.) may or may not be necessary components for there to be management. At first, one views management functionally, such as measuring quantity, adjusting plans, meeting goals. This applies even in situations where planning does not take place. From this perspective, Henri Fayol (1841–1925) considers management to consist of six functions:

1. forecasting
2. planning
3. organizing
4. commanding
5. coordinating
6. controlling

According to Fayol, management operates through five basic functions: planning, organizing, coordinating, commanding, and controlling.

- a. **Planning:** Deciding what needs to happen in the future and generating plans for action (deciding in advance).
 - b. **Organizing** (or staffing): Making sure the human and nonhuman resources are put into place.
 - c. **Coordinating:** Creating a structure through which an organization's goals can be accomplished.
 - d. **Commanding** (or leading): Determining what must be done in a situation and getting people to do it.
 - e. **Controlling:** Checking progress against plans.
-
1. **Interpersonal:** roles that involve coordination and interaction with employees. Figurehead, leader
 2. **Informational:** roles that involve handling, sharing, and analyzing information. Nerve centre, disseminator
 3. **Decision:** roles that require decision-making. Entrepreneur, negotiator, allocator

Management skills include:

- i. political: used to build a power base and to establish connections
 - ii. conceptual: used to analyze complex situations
 - iii. interpersonal: used to communicate, motivate, mentor and delegate
 - iv. diagnostic: ability to visualize appropriate responses to a situation
 - v. leadership: ability to lead and to provide guidance to a specific group
 - vi. technical: expertise in one's particular functional area.
 - vii. Behavioral: perception towards others.
-
- a. All policies and strategies must be discussed with all managerial personnel and staff.
 - b. Managers must understand where and how they can implement their policies and strategies.
 - c. A plan of action must be devised for each department.
 - d. Policies and strategies must be reviewed regularly.
 - f. Contingency plans must be devised in case the environment changes.
 - g. Top-level managers should carry out regular progress assessments.
 - h. The business requires team spirit and a good environment.
 - i. The missions, objectives, strengths and weaknesses of each department must be analyzed to determine their roles in achieving the business's mission.
 - j. The forecasting method develops a reliable picture of the business' future environment.
 - k. A planning unit must be created to ensure that all plans are consistent and that policies and strategies are aimed at achieving the same mission and objective

In another way of thinking, Mary Parker Follett (1868–1933), allegedly defined management as "the art of getting things done through people". She described management as philosophy. Critics, however, find this definition useful but far too narrow. The phrase "management is what managers do" occurs widely, suggesting the difficulty of defining management without circularity, the shifting nature of definitions and the connection of managerial practices with the existence of a managerial cadre or of a class.

One habit of thought regards management as equivalent to "business administration" and thus excludes management in places outside commerce, as for example in charities and in the public sector. More broadly, every organization must "manage" its work, people, processes, technology, etc. to maximize effectiveness. Nonetheless, many people refer to university

departments that teach management as "business schools". Some such institutions (such as the Harvard Business School) use that name, while others (such as the Yale School of Management) employ the broader term "management".

English-speakers may also use the term "management" or "the management" as a collective word describing the managers of an organization, for example of a corporation. Historically this use of the term often contrasted with the term "labor" – referring to those being managed. But in the present era the concept of management is identified in the wide areas and its frontiers have been pushed to a broader range. Apart from profitable organizations even non-profitable organizations (NGOs) apply management concepts. The concept and its uses are not constrained. Management on the whole is the process of planning, organizing, coordinating, leading and controlling.

In profitable organizations, management's primary function is the satisfaction of a range of stakeholders. This typically involves making a profit (for the shareholders), creating valued products at a reasonable cost (for customers), and providing great employment opportunities for employees. In nonprofit management, add the importance of keeping the faith of donors. In most models of management and governance, shareholders vote for the board of directors, and the board then hires senior management. Some organizations have experimented with other methods (such as employee-voting models) of selecting or reviewing managers, but this is rare.

3.4 Historical Development of Management

Some see management as a late-modern (in the sense of late modernity) conceptualization. On those terms it cannot have a pre-modern history - only harbingers (such as stewards). Others, however, detect management-like thought among ancient Sumerian traders and the builders of the pyramids of ancient Egypt. Slave-owners through the centuries faced the problems of exploiting/motivating a dependent but sometimes unenthusiastic or recalcitrant workforce, but many pre-industrial enterprises, given their small scale, did not feel compelled to face the issues of management systematically. However, innovations such as the spread of Hindu numerals (5th to 15th centuries) and the codification of double-entry book-keeping (1494) provided tools for management assessment, planning and control.

Machiavelli wrote about how to make organisations efficient and effective. The principles that Machiavelli set forth in *Discourses* (1531) can apply in adapted form to the management of organisations today. An organisation is more stable if members have the right to express their differences and solve their conflicts within it. While one person can begin an organisation, "it is lasting when it is left in the care of many and when many desire to maintain it". A weak manager

can follow a strong one, but not another weak one, and maintain authority. A manager seeking to change an established organization "should retain at least a shadow of the ancient customs". With the changing workplaces of industrial revolutions in the 18th and 19th centuries, military theory and practice contributed approaches to managing the newly-popular factories.

Given the scale of most commercial operations and the lack of mechanized record-keeping and recording before the industrial revolution, it made sense for most owners of enterprises in those times to carry out management functions by and for themselves. But with growing size and complexity of organizations, a distinction between owners (individuals, industrial dynasties or groups of shareholders) and day-to-day managers (independent specialists in planning and control) gradually became more common.

Management (according to some definitions) has existed for millennia, and several writers have produced background works that have contributed to modern management theories. Some theorists have cited ancient military texts as providing lessons for civilian managers. For example, Chinese general Sun Tzu in his 6th-century BC work *The Art of War* recommends (when re-phrased in modern terminology) being aware of and acting on strengths and weaknesses of both a manager's organization and a foe's. The writings of influential Chinese Legalist philosopher Shen Buhai may be considered to embody a rare pre-modern example of abstract theory of management.

Various ancient and medieval civilizations produced "mirrors for princes" books, which aimed to advise new monarchs on how to govern. Plato described job specialization in 350 BC, and Alfarabi listed several leadership traits in AD 900. Other examples include the Indian *Arthashastra* by Chanakya (written around 300 BC), and *The Prince* by Italian author Niccolò Machiavelli (c. 1515).

Written in 1776 by Adam Smith, a Scottish moral philosopher, *The Wealth of Nations* discussed efficient organization of work through division of labour. Smith described how changes in processes could boost productivity in the manufacture of pins. While individuals could produce 200 pins per day, Smith analyzed the steps involved in manufacture and, with 10 specialists, enabled production of 48,000 pins per day.

Classical economists such as Adam Smith (1723–1790) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) provided a theoretical background to resource-allocation, production, and pricing issues. About the same time, innovators like Eli Whitney (1765–1825), James Watt (1736–1819), and Matthew Boulton (1728–1809) developed elements of technical production such as standardization, quality-control procedures, cost-accounting, interchangeability of parts, and work-planning. Many of these aspects of

management existed in the pre-1861 slave-based sector of the US economy. That environment saw 4 million people, as the contemporary usages had it, "managed" in profitable quasi-mass production. Salaried managers as an identifiable group first became prominent in the late 19th century.

By about 1900 one finds managers trying to place their theories on what they regarded as a thoroughly scientific basis (see scientism for perceived limitations of this belief). Examples include Henry R. Towne's *Science of management* in the 1890s, Frederick Winslow Taylor's *The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911), Lillian Gilbreth's *Psychology of Management* (1914), Frank and Lillian Gilbreth's *Applied motion study* (1917), and Henry L. Gantt's charts (1910s). J. Duncan wrote the first college management-textbook in 1911. In 1912 Yoichi Ueno introduced Taylorism to Japan and became the first management consultant of the "Japanese-management style". His son Ichiro Ueno pioneered Japanese quality assurance.

The first comprehensive theories of management appeared around 1920. The Harvard Business School offered the first Master of Business Administration degree (MBA) in 1921. People like Henri Fayol (1841–1925) and Alexander Church (1866–1936) described the various branches of management and their inter-relationships. In the early-20th century, people like Ordway Tead (1891–1973), Walter Scott (1869–1955) and J. Mooney applied the principles of psychology to management. Other writers, such as Elton Mayo (1880–1949), Mary Parker Follett (1868–1933), Chester Barnard (1886–1961), Max Weber (1864–1920), who saw what he called the "administrator" as bureaucrat, Rensis Likert (1903–1981), and Chris Argyris (born 1923) approached the phenomenon of management from a sociological perspective.

Peter Drucker (1909–2005) wrote one of the earliest books on applied management: *Concept of the Corporation* (published in 1946). It resulted from Alfred Sloan (chairman of General Motors until 1956) commissioning a study of the organisation. Drucker went on to write 39 books, many in the same vein.

H. Dodge, Ronald Fisher (1890–1962), and Thornton C. Fry introduced statistical techniques into management-studies. In the 1940s, Patrick Blackett worked in the development of the applied-mathematics science of operations research, initially for military operations. Operations research, sometimes known as "management science" (but distinct from Taylor's scientific management), attempts to take a scientific approach to solving decision-problems, and can apply directly to multiple management problems, particularly in the areas of logistics and operations.

Some of the more recent developments include the Theory of Constraints, management by objectives, reengineering, Six Sigma, the Viable

system model, and various information-technology-driven theories such as agile software development, as well as group-management theories such as Cog's Ladder.

As the general recognition of managers as a class solidified during the 20th century and gave perceived practitioners of the art/science of management a certain amount of prestige, so the way opened for popularised systems of management ideas to peddle their wares. In this context many management fads may have had more to do with pop psychology than with scientific theories of management.

Towards the end of the 20th century, business management came to consist of six separate branches, namely; financial management, human resource management, information technology management (responsible for management information systems), marketing management, operations management and production management and strategic management

In the 21st century, observers find it increasingly difficult to subdivide management into functional categories in this way. More and more processes simultaneously involve several categories. Instead, one tends to think in terms of the various processes, tasks, and objects subject to management. Branches of management theory also exist relating to nonprofits and to government: such as public administration, public management, and educational management. Further, management programs related to civil-society organizations have also spawned programs in nonprofit management and social entrepreneurship. Note that many of the assumptions made by management have come under attack from business-ethics viewpoints, critical management studies, and anti-corporate activism.

As one consequence, workplace democracy (sometimes referred to as Workers' self-management) has become both more common and more advocated, in some places distributing all management functions among workers, each of whom takes on a portion of the work. However, these models predate any current political issue, and may occur more naturally than does a command hierarchy. All management embraces to some degree a democratic principle—in that in the long term, the majority of workers must support management. Otherwise, they leave to find other work or go on strike. Despite the move toward workplace democracy, command-and-control organization structures remain commonplace as *de facto* organization structures. Indeed, the entrenched nature of command-and-control is evident in the way that recent layoffs have been conducted with management ranks affected far less than employees at the lower levels. In some cases, management has even rewarded itself with bonuses after laying off lower-level workers. According to leadership-academic Manfred F.R. Kets de

Vries, a contemporary senior-management team will almost inevitably have some personality disorders.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to operationalise the basic concepts that are central to understanding management, its types, scope and history. The learner has been exposed to the basic facts that there are various definitions of the concepts as presented by various scholars. Despite the multidimensional and multidisciplinary approach to the concept certain key characteristics are paramount.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to conceptualise management, its types, scope and historical development.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe management.
2. Mention and explain the different types of management.
3. What is the scope of Management?
4. What was Management in the 20th century?

7.0 References/Further Readings

- Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.
- Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.
- Ashiru, A.T. (2001), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.
- Craig, S. (2009, January 29). Merrill Bonus Case Widens as Deal Struggles. *Wall Street Journal*. [1]
- Deslandes G., (2014), "Management in Xenophon's Philosophy: a Retrospective Analysis", 38th Annual Research Conference, Philosophy of Management, 2014, July 14–16, Chicago
- Frank, Prabbal (2007). *People Manipulation: A Positive Approach (2 ed.)*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd (published 2009). pp. 3-7. ISBN 9788120743526. Retrieved 2015-09-05.
- Giddens, Anthony (1981). *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism. Social and Political Theory from Polity Press. I. University of California Press.* p. 125. ISBN 9780520044906. Retrieved 2013-12-29.
- Gomez-Mejia, Luis R.; David B. Balkin; Robert L. Cardy (2008). *Management: People, Performance, Change, 3rd edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill. p. 19-20. ISBN 978-0-07-302743-2.
- Holmes, Leonard (2012-11-28). *The Dominance of Management: A Participatory Critique. Voices in Development Management. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd. (published 2012).* p. 20. ISBN 9781409488668. Retrieved 2015-08-29.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.
- Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.
- Jones, Norman L. (2013-10-02). "Chapter Two: Of Poetry and Politics: The Managerial Culture of Sixteenth-Century England". In Kaufman, Peter Iver. *Leadership and Elizabethan Culture. Jepson Studies in Leadership. Palgrave Macmillan (published 2013).* p. 18. ISBN 9781137340290. Retrieved 2015-08-29.
- Jean-Louis Peaucelle (22 July 2015). *Henri Fayol, the Manager*. Routledge. pp. 55–.
- Khurana, Rakesh (2010) [2007]. *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession*. Princeton University Press. p. 3. ISBN 9781400830862. Retrieved 2013-08-24.

Legge, David; Stanton, Pauline; Smyth, Anne (October 2005). "Learning management (and managing your own learning)". In Harris, Mary G. *Managing Health Services: Concepts and Practice*. Marrickville, NSW: Elsevier Australia (published 2006). p. 13. ISBN 9780729537599. Retrieved 2014-07-11.

Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries: "The Dark Side of Leadership" – *Business Strategy Review* 14(3), Autumn p. 26 (200).

Melling, Joseph; McKinlay, Alan, eds. (1996). *Management, Labour, and Industrial Politics in Modern Europe: The Quest for Productivity Growth During the Twentieth Century*. Edward Elgar. ISBN 9781858980164. Retrieved 2015-08-29.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960). *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988). *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Stoner, James A.F. (1995). *Management (sixth edition)*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. p. 30. ISBN 978-0-13-149444-2.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Weber, M. (1984). "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Waring, S.P., (2016). *Taylorism transformed: Scientific management theory since 1945*. UNC Press Books.

Unit 3: Organisation

1.0 Introduction

The thrust of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concept of organisation, types of organisation, characteristics of organization, theories of organization, leadership, its skills and styles as well as leadership theories. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the concept of organisation arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

- At the end of this unit, students should be able to;
- a. Identify the different descriptions of organisation,
 - b. Describe the different types of organization,
 - c. Explain the characteristics of organization,
 - d. Describe leadership and its skills and styles, and
 - e. Discuss the theories of leadership.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Organisation

Organisation is defined in many ways and 'each definition tries to reflect a particular perspective which scholars adopt about organisations, One of such definitions views organisation as “a highly rationalized and impersonal integration of a large number of specialists cooperating to achieve some announced specific objective” Another definition sees organisation as a system of consciously co-ordinated personal activities or forces of two or more persons. Yet another view defines organisation as a continuing system of differentiated and co-ordinated human activities utilizing, transferring, and welding together a specific set of human;' material, capital, land natural resources into a unique, problem solving whole, whose function is to satisfy particular human needs in interaction with other systems of human activities and resources in its particular environment.

Sociology can be defined as the science of the institutions of modernity; specific institutions serve a function, akin to the individual organs of a coherent body. In the social and political sciences in general, an organisation may be more loosely understood as the planned, coordinated and purposeful action of human beings working through collective action to reach a common goal or construct a tangible product. This action is usually framed by formal membership and form (institutional rules). Sociology distinguishes the term organisation into planned formal and unplanned informal (i.e. spontaneously formed) organisations. Sociology analyses organisations in the first line from an institutional

perspective. In this sense, organisation is an enduring arrangement of elements. These elements and their actions are determined by rules so that a certain task can be fulfilled through a system of coordinated division of labour.

Economic approaches to organisations also take the division of labour as a starting point. The division of labour allows for (economies of) specialisation. Increasing specialisation necessitates coordination. From an economic point of view, markets and organisations are alternative coordination mechanisms for the execution of transactions.

An organisation is defined by the elements that are part of it (who belongs to the organisation and who does not?), its communication (which elements communicate and how do they communicate?), its autonomy (which changes are executed autonomously by the organisation or its elements?), and its rules of action compared to outside events (what causes an organisation to act as a collective actor?).

By coordinated and planned cooperation of the elements, the organisation is able to solve tasks that lie beyond the abilities of the single elements. The price paid by the elements is the limitation of the degrees of freedom of the elements. Advantages of organisations are enhancement (more of the same), addition (combination of different features) and extension. Disadvantages can be inertness (through co-ordination) and loss of interaction.

An **organization** is an entity comprising multiple people, such as an institution or an association, that has a particular purpose. The word is derived from the Greek word *organon*, which means "organ". There are a variety of legal types of organisations, including corporations, governments, non-governmental organisations, political organisations, international organisations, armed forces, charities, not-for-profit corporations, partnerships, cooperatives, and educational institutions. A hybrid organisation is a body that operates in both the public sector and the private sector simultaneously, fulfilling public duties and developing commercial market activities. A voluntary association is an organisation consisting of volunteers. Such organisations may be able to operate without legal formalities, depending on jurisdiction, including informal clubs. Organisations may also operate secretly or illegally in the case of secret societies, criminal organisations and resistance movements.

Committees or juries

These consist of a group of peers who decide as a group, perhaps by voting. The difference between a jury and a committee is that the members of the committee are usually assigned to perform or lead further actions after the group comes to a decision, whereas members of a jury come to a decision. In common law countries, legal juries render decisions of guilt, liability and quantify damages; juries are also used in athletic contests, book awards and similar

activities. Sometimes a selection committee functions like a jury. In the Middle Ages, juries in continental Europe were used to determine the law according to consensus among local notables.

Committees are often the most reliable way to make decisions. Condorcet's jury theorem proved that if the average member votes better than a roll of dice, then adding more members increases the number of majorities that can come to a correct vote (however correctness is defined). The problem is that if the average member is subsequently *worse* than a roll of dice, the committee's decisions grow worse, not better; therefore, staffing is crucial. Parliamentary procedure, such as Robert's Rules of Order, helps prevent committees from engaging in lengthy discussions without reaching decisions.

Ecologies

This organisational structure promotes internal competition. Inefficient components of the organisation starve, while effective ones get more work. Everybody is paid for what they actually do, and so runs a tiny business that has to show a profit, or they are fired. Companies who utilise this organisation type reflect a rather one-sided view of what goes on in ecology. It is also the case that a natural ecosystem has a natural border - ecoregions do not, in general, compete with one another in any way, but are very autonomous.

Matrix organisation

This organisational type assigns each worker two bosses in two different hierarchies. One hierarchy is "functional" and assures that each type of expert in the organisation is well-trained, and measured by a boss who is super-expert in the same field. The other direction is "executive" and tries to get projects completed using the experts. Projects might be organised by products, regions, customer types, or some other schemes.

As an example, a company might have an individual with overall responsibility for products X and Y, and another individual with overall responsibility for engineering, quality control, etc. Therefore, subordinates responsible for quality control of project X will have two reporting lines.

Pyramids or hierarchical

A hierarchy exemplifies an arrangement with a leader who leads other individual members of the organisation. This arrangement is often associated with the basis that there are enough imagine a real pyramid, if there are not enough stone blocks to hold up the higher ones, gravity would irrevocably bring down the monumental structure. So one can imagine that if the leader does not have the support of his subordinates, the entire structure will collapse. Hierarchies were satirised in *The Peter Principle* (1969), a book that introduced *hierarchiology* and the saying that "in a hierarchy every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence."

3.2 Types of Organisation

An organisation that is established as a means for achieving defined objectives has been referred to as a formal organisation. Its design specifies how goals are subdivided and reflected in subdivisions of the organisation. Divisions, departments, sections, positions, jobs, and tasks make up this work structure. Thus, the formal organisation is expected to behave impersonally in regard to relationships with clients or with its members. According to Weber's definition, entry and subsequent advancement is by merit or seniority. Each employee receives a salary and enjoys a degree of tenure that safeguards him from the arbitrary influence of superiors or of powerful clients. The higher his position in the hierarchy, the greater his presumed expertise in adjudicating problems that may arise in the course of the work carried out at lower levels of the organisation. It is this bureaucratic structure that forms the basis for the appointment of heads or chiefs of administrative subdivisions in the organisation and endows them with the authority attached to their position.

Informal organisations

In contrast to the appointed head or chief of an administrative unit, a leader emerges within the context of the **informal organisation** that underlies the formal structure. The informal organisation expresses the personal objectives and goals of the individual membership. Their objectives and goals may or may not coincide with those of the formal organisation. The informal organisation represents an extension of the social structures that generally characterise human life – the spontaneous emergence of groups and organisations as ends in themselves.

In prehistoric times, man was preoccupied with his personal security, maintenance, protection, and survival. Now man spends a major portion of his waking hours working for organisations. His need to identify with a community that provides security, protection, maintenance, and a feeling of belonging continues unchanged from prehistoric times. This need is met by the informal organisation and its emergent, or unofficial leaders.

Leaders emerge from within the structure of the informal organisation. Their personal qualities, the demands of the situation, or a combination of these and other factors attract followers who accept their leadership within one or several overlay structures. Instead of the authority of position held by an appointed head or chief, the emergent leader wields influence or power. Influence is the ability of a person to gain cooperation from others by means of persuasion or control over rewards. Power is a stronger form of influence because it reflects a person's ability to enforce action through the control of a means of punishment.

3.3 Characteristics of Organisation

The various definitions help to identify some common characteristics of organisations.

1. Organisations are purposeful, complex human collectivities;
2. They are characterised by secondary (or impersonal) relationships;
3. They have specialised and limited goals;
4. They are characterised by sustained co-operative activity;
5. They are integrated within a larger social system;
6. They provide services and products to their environment;
7. They are dependent on exchanges with their environment;

In relation to public organisations, they draw their resources (taxes and legitimacy) from the polity and are mediated by the institutions of the state. If we carefully examine these characteristics, they jointly reproduce what may be referred to as working universal principles of organisations. They are three in number.

- a. There must be division of labour;
- b. There must be identification of the services of the authority;
- c. There must be the establishment of relationships.

These characteristics and the working principles in a guarded manner summarize the content of the theories which explain organisations. The theories attempt to explain what things make organisations tick, how organisations behave, and what accounts for differences among them. Four of the theories are outstanding: bureaucratic theory, scientific management, administrative management and human relations theory. -A brief account of each of the theories will be sufficient at this stage:

3.4 Organisation Theory

In the social sciences, organisations are the object of analysis for a number of disciplines, such as sociology, economics, political science, psychology, management and organisational communication. The broader analysis of organisations is commonly referred to as organisational structure, organisational studies, organisational behaviour, or organisation analysis. A number of different perspectives exist, some of which are compatible:

1. From a functional perspective, the focus is on how entities like businesses or state authorities are used.
2. From an institutional perspective, an organisation is viewed as a purposeful structure within a social context.

3. From a process-related perspective, an organisation is viewed as an entity is being (re-)organised, and the focus is on the organisation as a set of tasks or actions.

Among the theories that are or have been influential are:

Activity theory is the major theoretical influence, acknowledged by de Clodomir Santos de Morais in the development of Organisation Workshop method. Actor–network theory, an approach to social theory and research, originating in the field of science studies, which treats objects as part of social networks. Complexity theory and organisations, the use of complexity theory in the field of strategic management and organisational studies. Contingency theory, a class of behavioural theory that claims that there is no best way to organize a corporation, to lead a company, or to make decisions. Critical management studies, a loose but extensive grouping of theoretically informed critiques of management, business, and organisation, grounded originally in a critical theory perspective. Economic sociology, studies both the social effects and the social causes of various economic phenomena. Enterprise architecture, the conceptual model that defines the coalescence of organisational structure and organisational behaviour. Garbage Can Model, describes a model which disconnects problems, solutions and decision makers from each other. Principal–agent problem, concerns the difficulties in motivating one party (the "agent"), to act in the best interests of another (the principal) rather than in his or her own interests. Scientific management (mainly following Frederick W. Taylor), a theory of management that analyses and synthesises workflows. Social entrepreneurship, the process of pursuing innovative solutions to social problems. Transaction cost theory, the idea that people begin to organise their production in firms when the transaction cost of coordinating production through the market exchange, given imperfect information, is greater than within the firm.

3.5 leadership

The term leadership has many meanings depending on the person defining it. Some see it as referring to outstanding personalities while to other it has no overtones of greatness; people are leaders because the organization defines their job in that way. Despite this we can still examine some definitions. According to Appleby (1961) leadership simply refers to "the ability of management to induce subordinate to work toward organizational goals with confidence and zeal". Drucker (1962) argues that when we talk of leadership, we are talking of making common men into uncommon men. To him leadership "is the lifting of a man's vision to higher sights, the raising of man's performance to a higher standard, the building of a man's personality beyond its normal limitations". Generally, therefore leadership occurs whenever one person influences another to work toward some predetermined goal, willingly and enthusiastically. It is

also important to note that leadership plays a major role in the motivation of employees and in the direction of the firm.

A leader in a formal, hierarchical organisation, who is appointed to a managerial position, has the right to command and enforce obedience by virtue of the authority of his position. However, he must possess adequate personal attributes to match his authority, because authority is only potentially available to him. In the absence of sufficient personal competence, a manager may be confronted by an emergent leader who can challenge his role in the organisation and reduce it to that of a figurehead. However, only authority of position has the backing of formal sanctions. It follows that whoever wields personal influence and power can legitimise this only by gaining a formal position in the hierarchy, with commensurate authority.

3.6 Leadership Skills and Styles

Research by Robert Kats classified three leadership skills which are essential to effective leadership. These skills include technical, human/social and conceptual skills.

- a) **Technical skill** - This refers to the abilities required from a leader that relates to the knowledge of the job i.e. ability to use tools, procedures and techniques in a specialized area. This skill is more important at a lower level to enable supervisors and operating staff to correct deviations from the production process.
- b) **Human/Social skill** - This is the leader's ability to work with and understand and motivate people as individuals or group. This skill is required at all levels of management in an organization.
- c) **Conceptual skill** - Although this skill is required at all levels of management, but it is more required at the top management. It refers to mental ability to co- ordinate and integrates all of an organization's activities especially long-term plans and decisions affecting the organization.

Personal qualities of a leader:

- 1) **Honesty and Integrity** - He must be honest in dealing with his subordinates and customers.
- 2) **Persuasiveness** - This is the ability to persuade which involves a sense of understanding of the point of view, the interest, and the conditions of those to be persuaded. It is a process in which a source affects change in targets attitudes by changing their beliefs relevant to that attitude (Organ and Hamner, 1982:149).
- 3) **Fairness** - A leader should be fair in dealing with people. E.g. first come, first serve, no nepotism etc.

- 4) Inquisitiveness - A leader should be inquisitive and new things and ideas should always interest him.
- 5) Spirit of competition - He must always welcome competition and should make effective use of his personal and business resources to succeed and survive in a volatile and competitive environment.

Leadership style is the pattern of behaviour that the person exhibits over time in leadership situations. That is, situations in which he/she most influence other people. There are different leadership styles as discussed below. This is divided into three?

- i. **Autocratic (authoritarian):** This style requires complete obedience on the part of the subordinates and the leader restricts the subordinate's ability to contribute their ideas to decision-making. He leads by using reward and punishment system to influence his subordinates.
- ii. **Democratic (permissive):** This type of leader engages the employees in deciding how the work is to be done and how the problems are to be surmounted/tackled. This is the participative kind of leader. The employees here can contribute their own ideas in the process of decision-making.
- iii. **Laissez Fair/free rain leader (do-nothing):** A laissez faire leader takes little interest in how his employees do their work but leaves them to carry on with their jobs however they see fit. This type of leader exercises little control over their actions and may appear uninterested in their activities.

3.7 Theories of leadership

There are three major approaches to the study of leadership namely:

Trait Theory

This theory got its origin from the 'great man' theory of leadership, which contended that leaders are born not made. The theory holds that leaders are born with certain personality traits. Those who follow this theory believe that by studying the personalities and backgrounds of great leaders, they can be able to develop a combination of traits that made these people outstanding leaders. So, they attempt to identify the traits of character and personality that make a leader. These traits they assure distinction between leaders and non-leaders.

The following traits characterize a leader:

- a) Intelligent - Various set of studies have discovered that leaders tend to be more intelligent than their subordinates although they may not be more intelligent when compare with members of another group.
- b) Self-confidence - This is the ability of the leader to appear self-confident.

- c) Initiation - A person who does not initiate vision or ideas cannot be called a leader.

In other studies, it was discovered that leaders tend to be brighter, better adjusted psychologically, display better judgment etc. than non-leaders.

Behavioural Theory

This theory focuses on what leaders do on the job rather than on what traits or characteristics they possess. The central argument among behavioural theorists is that since behaviour can be changed, leaders can be 'made' or trained rather than 'born'.

Situational Theory

There is no one best way to leadership. Situational theory is gaining ground and is more accepted today than the theories discussed above. According to Dale (1978), this theory is saying that, "leadership is specific to the particular situation under investigation". Thus, the choice of a leader will depend on the problem facing the group and the character of the group itself.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to operationalise the basic concepts that are central to understanding organisation, its types, characteristics and theories. Included is leadership, leadership skills, styles and theories. Despite the multidimensional and multidisciplinary approach to the concept certain key characteristics are paramount.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to conceptualise organisation, its types, characteristics and theories as well as leadership, its skills, styles and theories.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is an organisation?.
2. List the common characteristics of organisations.
3. Outline the theories of organisation known to you.
4. What is leadership in an organization?
5. What are leadership skills and styles?
6. Mention and explain three leadership theories.

7.0References/Further Readings

Coase, Ronald (1937). "The Nature of the Firm" *Economica*, 4(16), pp. 386–405.

Douma, Sytse; Schreuder, Hein (2013) [1991]. Economic Approaches to Organizations (5th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. ISBN 978-0-273-73529-8.

Gibb, Cecil A. (1970). Leadership: Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. ISBN 0140805176. OCLC 174777513.

Handy, Charles (1990). Inside Organizations: 21 Ideas for Managers. London: BBC Books. ISBN 978-0-563-20830-3.

Handy, Charles (2005). Understanding Organizations (4th ed.). London: Penguin Books. ISBN 978-0-14-015603-4.

Hewlett, Roderic. (2006). The Cognitive leader. Rowman & Littlefield Pub Inc.

Johnson, Richard Arvid (1976). Management, systems, and society: an introduction. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Pub. Co. ISBN 0-87620-540-6. OCLC 2299496.

Katz, Daniel; Kahn, Robert Louis (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley. OCLC 255184.

Knowles, Henry P.; Saxberg, Borje O. (1971). Personality and Leadership Behavior. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. pp. 884–89. OCLC 118832.

March, James G.; Simon, Herbert A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley. ISBN 0-471-56793-0. OCLC 1329335.

Marshak, Thomas (1987). "organization theory," *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, v. 3, pp. 757–60.

Mintzberg, Henry (1981). "Organization Design: Fashion or Fit" *Harvard Business Review* (January February)

Rogers, Carl R.; Roethlisberger, Fritz Jules (1990). Barriers and gateways to communication. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Review. OCLC 154085959.

Samson, D., Daft, R. (2005). *Management: second Pacific Rim edition*. Melbourne, Victoria: Thomson

Satir, Virginia (1967). Conjoint family therapy; a guide to theory and technique. Palo Alto, Calif: Science and Behavior Books. OCLC 187068.

Scott, William Richard (2008). Institutions and Organizations (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd. ISBN 978-1-4129-5090-9.

Unit 4: Public Administration

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concept of public administration. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the concept of public administration arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

- a. Understand the different definitions of public administration,
- b. Describe the evolution of public administration, and
- c. Assess the relevance of theoretical underpinning of public administration

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Definition of Public Administration

Public administration (lower case) means the institutions of public bureaucracy within a state. That is, the organizational structure, which form the basis of public decision-making and implementation. In other words, the arrangements by which public services are delivered. At the heart of public administration in modern state is the civil service but it also includes all of the public bodies at regional, local, military, paramilitary levels. Public Administration (upper case) on the other hand is an academic discipline, which is the study of public administration by means of institutional description, policy analysis and evaluation, and intergovernmental relations analysis. The main thrust of Public Administration is the development of a public sector organization theory different from the intellectual leaning of private sector organization theory and market principle (Bradbury, 1996).

Public Administration is a phrase that contains two words, namely; Public and Administration. To fully comprehend the true meaning of the two words therefore, it is pertinent to explain each of the concepts involved. The New Webster's Dictionary (1995:807) defines the word public as:

1. Of, or relating to or affecting all the people or the whole area of a nation or state;
2. Of, or relating to a government or being in the service of the community or nation;
3. Of, or relating to business or community interest as opposed to private affairs; exposed to general view.

From the same dictionary, administration has been defined as the act or process of administering:

- a. The performance of executive duties;
- b. The execution of public affairs as distinguished from policy making;
- c. The term of office of an administrator.

It thus implies that the meaning 'public' relates to public affairs, public service, public servant, public figure and that which is exposed to public view. Similarly the term administration is derived from two Latin words, "ad" and "minister" which means, 'to serve or to manage'. It denotes something to administering a nation, or state or a group of people. The major strand in this definition is that administration deals with national service and with community interest at heart, as opposed to private affairs. Moreover, this type of administration has to be assessable to all members of the community. Therefore, the business of any government should be open to the public it governs for scrutiny and review, and never a closed-door affair of those who carry it out.

A simple definition of administration perhaps is that given by Chapman (1960) as the science and art of getting things done using material resources and cooperative efforts of people. Similarly, Adebayo (2000) defines administration as the organization and direction of people in order to accomplish a specified end. He went further to elaborate: "when two men cooperate to roll a stone that neither could move alone, the rudiments of administration have appeared".

Ikelegbe (1995) on his part sees administration as a way of conceptual thinking for attaining predetermined goals through group effort. According to him, such concepts must have universal application, should emerge with human race and will continue to be employed as long as mankind survives. This definition rhymes with that given by Pfiffner and Presthus (1960:43) when they assert that administration is "an activity or process concerned with the means for carrying out prescribed ends".

From the above definitions therefore, public administration is concerned with the coordination of individual and group efforts to carry out public policy. This makes a sense when we use Adamolekuns definition that says "public administration is used to refer to both the activities concerned with the management of governmental business and the study of these activities. This in other words means that public administration could be used in two broad senses, - as Practice and as Knowledge".

As practice, it means the activities of the executive branches of national, state and local governments, independent boards and commissions set up by both state and national legislatures, government corporations and other agencies of specialized character. As a body of knowledge, public administration is directed

towards the understanding of governmental administration, accomplishment of the authoritative purposes of the state and as a field of study considered as a branch of the social science. Rhodes (1976:77) believes that the study of public administration is "the multi-disciplinary study of the political-management system (structures and processes) of public bureaucracies". In a less recent definition, White (1926) defined it as the "management of man and materials in the accomplishment of the purposes of the state".

The scope of public administration in modern advanced countries is enormous and continually growing, reflecting such factors as population growth and demands for the state to provide more and more services. The study also encompasses not only the activities of agencies in central and local governments but also quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations. In addition, the subject is continually changing in broad general terms because of the different conceptions of the role of the state held by various governments at different times, and because there are so many and so frequent changes in the structures and functions of particular governmental agencies.

The preceding definitions may be summed up in two distinctive characters. First, public administration is a science, a body of knowledge consisting of the social sciences - political science, sociology, law, economics, accounting, philosophy and psychology. This means that as a field of study, it is multi disciplinary. Second, public administration is an art, a practice, a professional or career preoccupation of managers in the public sector. This explains why public administrators are suppose to acquire the relevant knowledge, skills, values and behavioural traditions to enable them formulate policies, organize complex public services and to execute programmes and policies.

Generally speaking, public administration is concerned with managing change in pursuit of publicly defined societal values. In the definition of public administration there are serious theoretical issues. While having common interest, theorists have ranged widely in their approaches to developing theories of public organizations. Efforts in public administration theory include work by public administrationist in empirical theory, normative theory, ethical theory, public-choice theory, phenomenology, critical theory, psychoanalytic theory and so on. In other words, theories related to public administration grew out of political science, management, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics and a host of other disciplines in the social and management sciences (Denhardt, 1992).

As noted earlier, public administration is viewed differently by different academic disciplines. This in turn gave rise to different theoretical paradigm of public administration. To the political science, public administration means rule

by appointed officials. In the field of sociology, it is understood as a particular type of organization rather than as a system of government. To the Economists, what is viewed as public organizations are characterized by the fact that being funded through the tax system they are neither disciplined by the profit motive nor responsive to market pressures.

3.2 Evolution of Public Administration

Public Administration is a field with two parents: political science and management. In a more appropriate manner public administration could be said to have a parent and a foster parent. That is, the mother discipline is political science while its foster parent is management. However, public Administration is a discipline of many forces with the influence of parents and foster parents not the least of them (Henry, 1992). The importance of this exposition is that to know where we are, we sometimes must know where we have been. Both political science and management added important and integral components of what we now know as the field of public administration. To recognize that component therefore is to capitalize on them (Downs, 1982). It should also be noted in passing that the study of public administration at the beginning was centered on refining the applied techniques and methodologies of public organizations theory with emphasis on such areas as state and local government, executive management, administrative law, and public interest in a technobureaucratic (big democracy) but later development provided for such disciplines as environment of public administration (the role of bureaucracy in a democracy), quantitative methods, public budgeting and financial management, organizational theory and personnel administration (Denhardt, I 992).

Importantly, political science, the parent of public administration has had more profound effects on the field than has management, its foster parent. This is because public administration was born in the house of political science and its early rearing occurred in its backyard. Therefore, the fundamentals of political science such as democracy, pluralistic polity, political participation, rule of law and due process among others continue to be held by the most independently minded of public Administrationists. Thus, the environment of political science sharpened and deepened the commitment of public Administrationists to core constitutional concepts. Consequently, if public administration had been born and bred in the business schools there wouldn't have been the same kind of academic field as it is today. Invariably, it could be argued that political science was the one that laid the philosophic and normative foundation of public administration but at the end public administration has been able to define its identity as something apart and distinct from both political science and management (Gaus, 1950).

In other words, political science was profoundly influential on the evolution of public administration, whereas management was less so. But in many ways, the impact of management on public administration has been more positive. This was partly because management entered into the upbringing of public administration when the field was beginning its adolescence but unlike political science it was not a blood relative, consequently, public administration, was granted more independence and breathing space to grow and develop on its own. This is not to say that the household environment created by the field of management for public administration was warmth and succor. But instead of treating public administration like an abusive parent, management allow public administration to stay in its house like an absent-minded aunt who was never quite sure of who was living in which room and who often forgot to serve meals.

However, management had at least three distinct influences on public administration. One, it forced public administration to examine more closely what the public administration meant. This is in regard to the distinction between public and private administration. Though this distinction later became difficult to define empirically because of development such as the role of regulatory agencies and their relations with industry, the expensive growth of government corporations and privatization of public enterprises.

Two, it convinced many public administrationists that a whole new set of methodologies of both political science and management were needed. Initially, the existing methodologies of both political science and management were adopted on selective basis, such as survey research method (from political science) and operational research (from management). But by and large new methods were adopted such as evaluation research or programme evaluation, which is associated with many of the developing bundles or methodologies that public administration calls it own (Weiss, 1972). The emphasis of these methodologies is on whether public programmes are effective, efficient and needed. They borrow techniques from the variety of disciplines and have a clearly applied research cast. Closely related to evaluative research are the continually evolving methods of finance and budgeting (White. 1985). Added are the quantity techniques, which became part of public administration. These include probability theory, statistical comparison, linear correlation and linear programming, critical part method: benefit cost analysis, queuing theory, public choice theory, simulation and management system among others (Welch and Comer, 1983). Three, it provided public administration with a model or how to assess what as a field it was teaching and why. That is, learning how to take one's profession seriously by putting it through the long-term self-examination and critical assessment.

3.3 Theoretical underpinning of Public Administration

Essentially, the theory of public administration draws its greatest strength and its most serious limitation from its diversity. Therefore, public administration theorists are required to understand a broad range of perspectives relevant to their theory-building task. This implies that, there is a tremendous richness and complexion built into public administration theory. Unequivocally, there is diversity and complexity of the theoretical enterprise in public administration theory. The public administration theorists have continued to address many traditional concerns of public administrationist such as the role of public organizations in the governance process. The increased attention now is paid to the ethics of public service along with related topics such as citizenship. There is also more positive approach of epistemologists and the new interest in psychological studies, as well as in inter-organisational networks and economic models of bureaucratic behaviour.

To Burrell and Morgan (1979), all theories of organization are based upon a philosophy of science and a theory of society. That, there are two dimensions on which theories of organization can be arranged. One, the assumptions about the nature of social science in relation to ontology, epistemology, human nature, and methodology. And that discussion on them could take two dimensions, which could be further grouped into the subjective-objective dimension. This dimension ranges from- German idealism, which emphasizes the subjective nature of human affairs to the sociological positivism, which seeks to apply the natural science procedures to the collection and analysis of human behaviour. Two, the assumption about "the sociology of regulation" and "sociology of radical change". The former emphasizes the underlying order to cohesiveness of human systems while the latter seeks explanations for radical changes in society.

Furthermore, there is no-doubt in the fact that at various points in the history of public administration other disciplines have been eager to embrace it under their own theoretical banner. Based on this posture many early public administration theorists and some still today have argued that public administration is distinct by its relationship to the governmental process. In contrast other theorists have argued that the behaviour of individuals within organizations and the behaviour of organizations themselves is much the same regardless of the kind of organization being studied. But contemporary theorists accept that public administration is best viewed as a profession drawing from many different perspectives. This is because there is no single discipline that can currently provide the range of knowledge needed by administrators in the public sector than it seems reasonable to bring coherence to programme through their professional orientation (Denhardt, 1992).

According to Heywood (2003) in order to make sense out of the various usages of administration three contrasting theories emerged; rational-administrative machine, conservative power bloc model and source of government theory. In discussing the rational-administrative machine theory, the work of Max Weber on bureaucracy could be made use of whereby he sees bureaucracy as an "ideal type" of rule based on a system of rational rules as opposed to either tradition or charisma. The set of principles that characterized this bureaucratic organization are;

1. Jurisdictional areas are fixed and official, and ordered by laws or rules,
2. Firmly ordered hierarchy which ensures that specific higher ones within a chain of command supervise lower offices,
3. Business is managed on the basis of written documents and a filing system,
4. The authority of official is impersonal and stems entirely from the post they hold, not from personal status,
5. Bureaucratic rules are strict enough to minimize the scope of personal discretion, and
6. Appointment and advancement within a bureaucracy are based on professional criteria, such as training, expertise and administrative competence.

The central feature of administration from this Weberian perspective is its rationality. Because it reflects the advance of a reliable, predictable and above all efficient means of social organization. The development of this type of administration by Weber was closely linked to the emergence of capitalist economies particularly to the greater pressure for economic efficiency and the emergency of large-scale business units. Further influence of democracy is noted in the development of bureaucracy whereby ideas such as tradition, privilege and duty are weakened and replaced with belief in open competition and meritocracy. This is also supported by the convergence thesis of Burnham (1987) which submits that regardless of their ideological differences all industrial societies are governed by a class of managers, technocrats and state officials whose power is vested in their technical and administrative skills.

The view of public administration as a power bloc stems largely from socialist analysis particularly Marxism. Marx linked bureaucracy to the specific requirements of capitalism. He was concerned with the class role played by the state bureaucracy seeing it as a mechanism through which bourgeois interests are upheld and capitalist system defended. Further analysis by neo-Marxist such as Morgan (1983) paid attention to the capacity of senior servants to act as conservative veto group that dilutes or even blocks the radical initiatives of socialist government. In other words, top civil servants are conservative because

they are within their allocated sphere and consciously or unconsciously allies of existing economic and social elites. This is because despite the formal requirements of political neutrality, top civil servants share the same educational and social background as industrialists and business managers and are likely share their ideas, prejudices and general outlook. This conservative outlook of higher civil servants is reinforced by their ever-increasing closeness to the world of corporate capitalism. This was the consequence of state intervention in economic life, ensuring an ongoing relationship between business groups and civil servants who define national interest in terms of the long-term interest of private capitalism. The implication of this analysis is that if senior civil servants are wedded to the interests of capitalism, a major obstacle is created for any attempt to achieve socialism through constitutional means.

The oversupply model on the other hand is drawn from the emergence of rational choice motivations of bureaucrats. Rational theory is based on the same assumptions about human nature as those in neoclassical economics. That is, individuals are rationally self-seeking creatures or utility maximizers. The public choice theory applied this economic model of decision-making to the public sector.

Furthermore, public service contains a powerful inner dynamic, leading to the growth of government and expansion of public responsibilities. Therefore, the ability of appointed officials to 'dictate policy' priorities to elected politicians goes a long way towards, explaining how state growth has occurred under governments of very different ideological complexions, that, public service is not disciplined by profit motive. And if costs exceed revenue, the taxpayer is always there to pick up the bills. Similarly, public service is usually a monopoly and is in no way forced to respond to market pressures. The results are that public sectors are inherently wasteful and inefficient. Moreover, the service they provide is invariably of poor quality and does not meet consumer needs or wishes. This consequently led to the philosophy not only that public services are scaled down but also that when possible, private sector management techniques should be introduced.

4.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, discussions on the conceptual and theoretical framework of public administration as well as its evolution carried out in this unit sees public administration as a field of study and as a profession. As a field of study it emanates from political science and nurtured by management. As a profession it entails activities in running public organizations such as planning, organization, staffing, directing, co-coordinating, reporting and budgeting, In terms of theoretical underpinning of public administration, three theories were identified,

namely; rational-administrative machine, conservative power bloc model and source of government oversupply.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to conceptualise public administration, its evolution, the influence of political science and management on it and its theoretical underpinning.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Define public administration.
2. Trace the evolution of public administration.
3. Enumerate three influences each of political science and management on public administration.
4. Mention and explain three theoretical underpinnings of public administration.

7.0 References/Further Readings

- Bradbury, J. (1996), *"Public administration" in Mclean, I. (ed.), Oxford Course Dictionary of Politic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnham. J. (1987), *The Management Revolution*. Hannondsworth: Penguin.
- Burrell, G. and G. Morgan (1979), *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*, London: Heinemann.
- Denhardt, R.B. (1992), "Public Administration theory: The State of the Discipline" in Lynn, N.B. and A. Wildavsky (eds.) *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers. PP. 43-72.
- Downs, B. (1982), *"Undergraduate Public Administration Education: An empirical analysis with options for programme review by the undergraduate section of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration"*, Washington DC: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.
- Gaus, J. (1950), "Trends in the Theory of Public Administration" in *Public Administration Review*. 10(3): 161-68.
- Henry, N. (1992), *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Heywood, A. (2003), *Politics*. New York: Palgrave.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.
- Morgan, G. (1983), *Beyond Method*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Niskanen, W.A. (1971), *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*, Chicago: Aldine Atherton.
- Weiss.C.H. (1972), *Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Programmes*, Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall.
- Welch, S. and I. C. Comer (1983), *Quantitative Methods for Public Administration: Technique and Applications*, Home wood: Dorsey.
- White, J. (1985), "Much Ado About Everything: Making sense of Federal Budgeting", *Public Administration Review*. 45: 623-30.

MODULE 2: POLITICS/POLICY/ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY

Unit 1: Administration and Politics

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to identify and discuss the relationships between administration and politics as well as the various debates on the relationships. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the relationships between administration and politics arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Discuss the relationships between administration and politics, and
2. Understand the trends in the debates on administration and politics,

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Relationships between Administration and Politics

The relationship between politics and administration is often viewed from two perspectives. One viewpoint sees the relationship as dichotomous; the other perspective argues that both areas are not clearly distinct but interconnected. Perhaps the most notable exponent of the dichotomy thesis was Woodrow Wilson. In an article written in 1887, he argued that: “The policy of government will have no taint of officialdom about it. It will not be the creation of permanent officials but of statesmen whose responsibility to public opinion will be direct and inevitable”. Wilson’s position has been reiterated by other scholars such as Goodnow and White.

According to White, whose book is reputed to be the first devoted entirely to public administration, the general thrust of the field of administration maintains that:

1. Politics should not intrude on administration;
2. Management lends itself to scientific study;
3. Public administration is capable of becoming a value - free science in its own right;
4. The mission of administration is economy and efficiency.

However, there are other scholars who hold the opposite viewpoint and have argued that there is no rigid distinction between politics and administration. One of the exponents of this position, Appleby has remarked that, “public

administration is policy making. Public administration is one of the numbers of basic political processes by which people achieve and control government”.

Since the beginning of the debate, some scholars have gone on to suggest that public administration is more part of “management science” than political science. Those scholars present strong theoretical reasons for choosing management with emphasis on organisation theory as the paradigm of public administration. Examples of scholars who advanced this viewpoint are Henderson, Marchand, Simon, and Thomson.

3.2 Debate on Administration/Politics Dichotomy

The entire trend of thought contained in the debate on administration/politics dichotomy has been well presented by categorising the viewpoints into four competing paradigms which began about 1900. The shifts began from about 1900 with the ' first phase of school of thought ending at about 1926, during which date the dichotomy between politics and administration was upheld.

The second paradigm 1927-1937 was the “high noon of orthodoxy” and prestige of public administration which was marked by the thoughts of Henri Fayol and Frederick Taylor. This was the high point of the “administrative management” school. The debate at this time insisted on the existence of certain scientific principle of administration which could be discovered, and administrators would be experts in their work if they learnt how to apply those principles. It was at this stage that POSDCORB was introduced and popularised. This period was followed closely by a third school of thought which produced scholars like Herbert Simon, Robert Dahl and Dwight Waldo. These scholars argued that it was not feasible to develop a universal principle of administration. For instance, Herbert Simon argued that instead of principle of administration, there should be a more human process of decision-making.

The third school of thought coincided with the behavioural period in political science, 1950-1970, when public administration focused on what became comparative and development administration. Another name for this approach was cross-cultural public administration According to Fred Riggs; one of the prominent authors at the time, the aim of comparative administration was to use that field to strengthen public administration theory.

Close to the same period as comparative public administration, another paradigm evolved, 1956-1970, which shifted attention toward “management science” or administrative science. This approach of looking at public administration offered techniques, at times highly sophisticated, requiring expertise and specialization. At this time it was argued that instead of being part of political science, public administration should remain in the area of

"management science. The thinking was entertained that "administration was administration" whether in public, business or institutional administration. Emphasis in the study was "organisational theory," bureaucracy, whether public, or private.

From public administration as management, the discipline moved to what may be considered the present state of the discipline; the new public administration from 1970 to present which emphasizes that public administration should be studied along with science and society. The new public administration reflects the new interesting the relationship between knowledge and power, bureaucracy and democracy, technology and management, and technology and bureaucracy. Also, the period is witnessing interdisciplinary programmes in science, technology and public policy. Emphasis has shifted away from the traditional concern for efficiency, effectiveness, budgeting and administrative techniques to a new public administration much aware of normative theory, philosophy and activism; thus the new questions it raises are on ethics, the development of the individual members in the organism, the relation of the client to the bureaucracy, and the broad problem of urban growth, technology and violence.

In sum, therefore, political science and management are the major influences on the present stage of development of public administration. The present stage pays extra attention to areas of organisation theory and information science, emphasizing areas like the state, local government, executive management, administrative law, and all those questions which seek to explain what the public interest is in a democracy and under a highly bureaucratic set up that is confronted by high technology. Accordingly, core areas of the present state of the study are:

- a. Environment of public administration (ecology);
- b. Quantitative methods, public budgeting and financial management;
- c. Personnel administration
- d. Public policy

Details of the several phases of the development of public administration among other things show that administration takes place in an organisation and also when administration takes place in a very large and complex organisation, bureaucracy necessarily comes into practice.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the relationship between administration and politics. The learner has been exposed to the basic facts on the debate on administration and politics dichotomy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to discuss the relationships between administration and politics. In addition, the debate by various scholars on administration and politics dichotomy were discussed.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignments

1. Mention three relationships between administration and politics.
2. mention three scholars involved in the debate on relationship between administration and politics.

7.0References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley International edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemuo (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (2001), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Unit 2: Inter play of Political Institutions and Administration

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concepts of administration and political institutions. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the concept of administration and political institutions arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. Included is the legal basis of political institutions, political institutions as forms of social domination, gender as a means of legitimating social institutions, relationship of Administration to political institutions and control of behavior in politics and administration. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves. It should be noted that the discussion in this unit draws extensively from experience of France as a main case study.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

- a. Understand the different definitions of administration and political institutions,
- b. Describe the legal basis of political institutions,
- c. Discuss how gender serves as a means of legislating political institution, and
- d. Explain how behavior is control in politics and administration.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Administration

Simply defined, administration is the organization and direction of persons in order to accomplish a specified end. Perhaps the simplest and shortest definition of administration is the one which says; "when two men cooperate to roll a stone that neither could move alone the rudiments of administration have appeared" (Thompson, et. al. 1950). Generally, administration refers to the organization and management of man and materials to achieve the goal of any collectivity of people. Administration must exist in any organisation set-up for a defined purpose or objective. Whether you think of the Church, the army, a social welfare agency, a University, an industrial or business concern or a purely social organisation, there has to be administration because each one consists of human beings brought together in a hierarchical set-up making use of tools, equipment, human and material resources, all in the quest to attain the objective for which the organisation is established. Thus, the Bishop in the Church, the field Marshal in the army, the vice-chancellor in the University, the managing director or chairman of an industrial or business enterprise, each has under him a hierarchy of subordinates, each with functions and responsibilities assigned for the accomplishment of the objective or purpose of the organization.

This process requires planning, organization, command, coordination and control. All of these constitute administration (Adebayo, 1994; Murray, 1974).

3.2 Political Institutions

While studying institutions as a key aspect of the social sciences, analysis of the institutions must directly involved in exercising political power (the government, parliament, the presidency, etc.) which long failed to make it onto the research agenda. This lack of interest can largely be explained by the division of research topics between legal studies and political science. Political science set itself apart from law by addressing topics that were not pre-empted by legal specialists (electoral behaviour, political parties, etc.) leaving the latter to the monopoly on studying institutions. The renewal of studies in comparative politics in the 1970s and 1980s and later the spread of the neo-institutionalist trend in France in the 1990s, had little effect on this state of affairs. At most, political institutions were included as explanatory variables in analyses of public policy, international relations, or social movements. They did not, however, gain the status of a subject in and of themselves among social science researchers and this field of inquiry therefore remained a science of constitutional texts.

However, constitutional texts can in no way fully encompass the reality of political institutions. Parliament, for example, far exceeds the functions and rank conferred upon it by the 1958 Constitution. While today it only has a secondary position in the circuit of political decisions, it nonetheless remains crucial for anyone interested in politics as a profession and, more broadly, in political representation. First, since public funding for political parties was indexed on the legislative election results, it has been a major trophy in party competition. Second, it is also a necessary gateway for Ministers as well as a key locus for professionalisation where actors can build up indigenous capital on the ground.

It is therefore possible to produce knowledge about political institutions that goes beyond that afforded by the legal sciences. Since the early 1990s, certain researchers in political science have pursued this goal. While they could not be called a school as such, they do nonetheless all openly subscribe to the approach that Jacques Lagroye and Bernard Lacroix formally defined in a pioneering book entitled *Le Président de la République*, considered a seminal work in this field of inquiry in France.

In terms of hypotheses, key issues, and ways of conducting research, their approach differed from the English-language studies being conducted at the

same time under the banner of neo-institutionalism. It was first and foremost characterised by its empirical nature. This sociology of political institutions rejected disciplinary boundaries, choosing instead to use investigative protocols combining sociological, historical, and anthropological methods (archival research, ethnographic observation, interviews, prosopography). The researchers in question all refused to subscribe to any one theoretical trend, showing no hesitation in combining perspectives often considered mutually exclusive on the other side of the Atlantic (for example, rational choice, symbolic interactionism, and genetic structuralism).

However, this empirical stance did not mean that they eschewed theoretical ambitions. Quite the contrary, the latter were a central component in how they construed their subject. The key research issue they addressed in their studies was the way in how political institutions can objectify the social order. Put differently, their primary aim was to fully embed political institutions in the social world. French researchers are less interested in institutions than in processes of institutionalisation and their aim tends to understand the links between these processes and the social order. In doing so, they can be said to be pursuing an avenue opened up by Max Weber, according to whom domination, when exercised over a large number of individuals in a lasting fashion, requires political and administrative apparatuses tasked with maintaining belief in its legitimacy.

Broadly speaking, two main lines of research can be distinguished from this perspective. The first is macro-sociological and aims to understand the processes through which political institutions are invested with socially shared beliefs that legitimate the way political power is exercised in contemporary democracies. The second is more micro-sociological and examines the conditions under which relations of domination are reproduced or transformed within institutions. This second line of research sheds complementary light on the first: it deconstructs the relations of domination that tends to be objectified by the legitimating of institutions.

The power that institutions exercise over individuals is a key issue in this field of inquiry. For a long time, this question was addressed in two mutually exclusive ways: on the one hand, the likes of Emile Durkheim and Michel Foucault, to name the most renowned, showed that institutions had the power to discipline bodies and minds; on the other, people such as Erving Goffman and Anthony Giddens emphasised individual actors' margin of freedom and their ability to play with, and even subvert, institutional rules. However, as Jacques Lagroye and Michel Offerlé have noted, studies devoted to political institutions are strikingly different from their predecessors in this regard. Insofar as they pay careful attention to the heterogeneous nature of relationships to institutions, they

immediately reject this binary choice. Rather than judging the degree of constraint exercised over actors by objectivated bodies of rules and beliefs, they strive to show the various ways in which actors engage with these rules and beliefs.

3.3 Legitimizing Political Institutions

Of course, contemporary democracies are not only based on beliefs. Political regimes are held together in various ways: authorities that have the right to use physical violence have monopoly over that violence, but, additionally, the interdependent relations linking those who govern and those who are governed are based on a range of exchanges and interpersonal obligations. Nonetheless, short of demonstrating that the layperson's relationship to political institutions is only ever indifferent, submissive, and/or self-interested, the relatively robust nature of regimes cannot be fully understood without analysing the full range of beliefs that legitimate how political power is exercised and that increase the likelihood of people being willing to abide by its decisions. This research hypothesis raises at least two questions. What beliefs legitimate democratic political institutions? And how are they forged, that is to say by whom and through what processes?

Answers to these questions were first provided in the wake of Max Weber's work. According to Weber, the contemporary state is modern insofar as it is based on rational legal domination, which in turn rests on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands. Following on from this, some researchers have underscored the key role that the law plays in contemporary democracies: as the official language of institutions, it lends them legitimacy through the weight of its impersonal, general form; as a doctrine relating to how public authorities are organised, it tends to mask the arbitrary aspect to power by disembodiment. In other words, these studies shed light on the creation of a belief that is fundamental to the legitimation of democratic political institutions, namely the belief that they are neutral. This serves as a veritable front which, as James G. March and Johan P. Olsen explain, long prevented their scientific analysis. More specifically, by retracing the genesis of Republican constitutional doctrine, looking at how it became autonomous from political power, or examining how it is used in the government of international institutions, such research sheds novel light on the socio-professional conditions of political legitimation without slipping into a sociology of conspiracy. Due to both their professional ethos and the specificities of the legal field, legal specialists are in fact the first to subscribe to the justifications they produce. As for political leaders, the legal formatting of their positions constrains their actions just as much as it legitimates them.

Article 5 of the 1958 Constitution, as we know, justifies the exceptional powers of the President of the Republic given the role of *arbitre* (with its dual meaning of both arbitrator, in the legal sense, and umpire). However, as a consequence of this legal definition of the presidential role, those who take it on then find themselves distanced from party support, which can place them in somewhat of a double bind when it comes to re-election. In February 2016, for example, when a journalist from radio station France Inter asked President François Hollande whether he was “still left-wing”, he responded spontaneously, as if a prisoner of the legal definition of his role, “I’m the President of the Republic... I represent all French people”, drawing sarcasm and caustic comments from many editorialists and left-wing voters.

The fact remains that while these studies have considerably enriched our knowledge of rational legal domination, research on the legitimation of political institutions cannot stop there. First, nothing in Weber’s work allows us to think that this is the only kind of domination that subsists today, despite evolutionist readings of the different forms of domination he describes in *Economy and Society*. As Weber explains, they are only ideal-types, which are neither successive nor exclusive. Studies analysing charismatic phenomena in the most bureaucratised states of law have clearly demonstrated this and it is particularly true of the Fifth Republic. As Brigitte Gaiti has shown, its legitimation was first and foremost predicated on General de Gaulle as a figure and on his “prophetic” Bayeux speech. His charisma was routinised in such a way as to place the future of the regime in the balance and was a key issue in political competition during the early years of the Fifth Republic, which had a lasting impact on the presidential role. The case of French political institutions, while emblematic, is far from being exceptional. As other studies have shown, the construction of European institutions also owes much to the charismatic communities that formed around Jean Monnet and Pierre Henry Teitgen .

Second, certain observations relativise how important the law is in legitimating contemporary political institutions. First, voter abstention, radicalisation, and civil disobedience all indicate that a substantial number of citizens do not necessarily subscribe to this level of justification. It is also likely that many people, including those with high-level qualifications, do not have the necessary legal knowledge to think of political institutions in legal terms. Furthermore, while the legal framework of political life has developed considerably over the last thirty years, certain positions of power remain bound in a regime that is almost entirely exempt from the law. The Prime Minister and, more broadly, the government, offer a case in point as their scope of activity is largely undetermined by law. For all these reasons, and to avoid remaining confined to legal discourse about political institutions – which actually contributes to

rational legal domination – researchers have also examined the hypothesis that the legitimacy of democratic institutions is based on their capacity to be identified with certain social norms.

3.4 Political Institutions as Forms of Social Domination

Political institutions, as we know, are particularly elitist. On this point, the statistics are incontrovertible: the higher one looks in the hierarchy of political institutions, the stronger the social over-selection of its staff. For a long time, however, this specificity was explained by exogenous factors such as the aristocratic nature of recruitment procedures – elections, nomination, co-opting – and the fact that the sense of political competence was unevenly distributed within society. It is only with the development of studies on the “profession” of elected official and on the political profession in general that these explanations were supplemented with endogenous factors, specific to the institutions themselves. These new studies demonstrated empirically that institutions are not only defined legally, they are also socially constructed.

First, holding political office means taking on the role of elected official and this comes with certain social expectations. These may sometimes be weak or unclear in relatively recent institutions or those little known to the public. However, within the most established institutions, such as the Presidency, these expectations serve as prescriptions determining the behaviour of those post-holders. For example, socialist party mayors proved unable to subvert the mayoral office as they had originally hoped. Quite the contrary, in fact: the various interactions in which they were caught up as councillors (with the *Préfet*, the administration, the voters) progressively socialised them to the norms of their role as “notables”.

Second, whatever the expectations weighing on the roles of elected officials, advancing in *Conseils municipaux*, Parliament, etc. requires a certain political know-how, linked particularly to public speaking – eloquence, repartee, humour – that are not evenly distributed throughout society. It is therefore not enough to be elected in order to become a fully legitimate member of parliament, something that the first working-class parliamentarians discovered at their expense, as did both the Poujadist tradesmen who joined the *Assemblée nationale* in 1956 and the first elected officials from the Front National party. Whether in the ranks of the *Assemblée nationale* itself or in the press, these socially atypical parliamentarians faced stigmatising social judgments that discredited them as representatives.

What is true for class is also true for gender. As early as 1988, Mariette Sineau showed that political institutions, while theoretically universal, were in reality gendered and gendering. In other words, they forced female elected officials to

imitate the virile behaviour of their male counterparts. In this regard, while the parity law introduced in June 2000 offers an unprecedented way of promoting women in politics, it has not necessarily made the task any easier for the women wanting to pursue a career in the field. Elected due to their sex, they nonetheless still have to conform to the masculine norms of the role in order to avoid symbolic sanctions. Political institutions are therefore not just mirrors reflecting existing social inequalities: they also contribute actively to the unequal distribution of power in society between classes, sexes, and races.

3.5 Gender as a means of Legitimizing Political Institutions

Studies on women in politics do not, however, simply confirm that the universal is masculine here as it is elsewhere. Pursuing an avenue opened up by historian Joan W. Scott, they also show that “gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power”. In other words, it can be analysed as a political language that not only creates hierarchy and structure in the social world, but also makes the political organisation of societies objective by naturalising it. Elsa Dorlin’s work on plantocratic regimes is a prime example. She shows that, as a “matrix for race”, gender served to justify the domination of a minority of “whites” over a minority of “blacks”. However, these political uses of gender are far from remaining confined to obsolete regimes in faraway lands.

Of course, in the relatively closed circles of political activism in contemporary democracies, there is little scope for claiming a gendered political identity. Gender is nonetheless extremely present in public commentary of political life and particularly in journalistic portraits where specific features of this language make it particularly “efficient” in a field as differentiated and conflictual as politics. Above and beyond the fact it relates to the “nature” of things, i.e. to the things considered most self-evident and indisputable, it is also universally shared. In other words, unlike legal language, it can be understood by everyone including people who have little political awareness. Consequently, it can contribute to mobilising public opinion around political views and party loyalty. However, it also serves to naturalise hierarchical relationships between positions of power that are not framed objectively by the rule of law.

This is the case, for example, where the President/Prime Minister relationship is concerned. It is largely undetermined by law, in terms of both the boundaries of competence of each role and the hierarchy between the two. Significantly, the press talks about the “President/Prime Minister couple” and their “divorce” when certain heads of government leave the role. Similarly when, in 2005, the President made his Minister of the Interior (who was the leader of the majority at the time) second in the order of precedence instead of the Prime Minister, this unprecedented configuration within the executive was described as a “*ménage à trois*”. The rhetoric used to frame these situations is therefore neither legal nor

even political but domestic. Above all, in this language, the Prime Minister is positioned on the side of the dominated/feminine gender to the extent, in fact, that it can create gender trouble for those who take on the role.

In the Fifth Republic, the Prime Minister is the leader of the government but not of the executive. Periods of cohabitation aside, since 1962, the leader of the government has always played the “secondary” role and even more so when appointed during the president’s term. It is striking to note that, in the press, political actors who accept this role tend to be framed in feminine terms. In other words, the qualities ascribed to them are those usually associated with women in politics (listening, being discreet, being likable, etc.) and journalists’ attention focuses to an unusual degree on their families, bodies, and clothes. These feminine identity markers attached to political leaders can be analysed as a way of naturalising their subordinate position in the hierarchy of executive power, while symbolically preserving the gendered order of the social world.

Having underlined the role of law and legal specialists in producing the beliefs that legitimate how political power is organised, current research now highlights the role played by gender and journalists. In this regard, the rise in work on gender in communication and media studies – whether in information and communication technologies or in political science has contributed to furthering knowledge about the legitimation of political institutions. From this perspective, that legitimation appears less grounded in reason (legal, economic, etc.) than in nature. To use Mary Douglas’s terms, because they are linked by analogy to naturalised elementary classifications, such as the male/female divide, political institutions “are part of the order of the universe and so are ready to stand as the grounds of argument” . What remains to be understood is how, on a concrete level, they contribute to founding the social order.

3.6 Relationships of administration to Political Institutions

This particular stance can be explained in two ways. The first stems from the specificity of political institutions. They are part of a relatively autonomous universe of practices, which is also characterised by its extremely competitive nature. As evidenced by the way presidential candidates include constitutional reforms in their manifestos – and even more so by the way elected Presidents tend to enact regime reforms – defining political institutions is one of the major trophy in political competition, alongside gaining power. Moreover, in this universe of institutional practices, there is no formal socialisation when it comes to actors’ behaviour and, to some extent, the recruitment of the people who work in political institutions escapes the control of those who run them. Given the reality of the field, trying to understand the variable relationships between political institutions and their actors was therefore more a necessity than an epistemological break with the past. The second reason lies with

researchers' *libido sciendi*. As Bernard Lacroix and Jacques Lagroye explain in their introduction to *Président de la République*, the original aim here was to break away from the presuppositions inherent to legal analysis and particularly with any reified view of the research object at hand. In this context, Emile Durkheim's call to broach social facts as "things" seemed less of a priority than Max Weber's call to understand actors' motivations.

This stance was first expressed conceptually through redefinitions of the notion of "role". In a key interview with the journal *Politix*, published under the somewhat telling title "We are not subjected to our roles", Jacques Lagroye defined a "role" as a "set of behaviours linked to an institutional position which enable that position to exist, which make it perceptible to others". At first glance, this definition might seem vague. However, this is far from being a limitation; on the contrary, it is precisely where its value lies: as well as encouraging us to look as closely as possible at practices and collective representations of institutions, this definition offers a way of 'escaping the futile contrast between approaches framed in terms of how roles are learnt, emphasising a certain "institutional logic", and interactionist analysis, which, on the contrary, tends to present roles as behaviour resulting solely from the partners' expectations'.

On a methodological level, this stance mainly translated into qualitative approaches. More often than not, it generated ethnographic style monographs studying "the dynamic encounter between what is objectivated and how people engage with that" on a case-by-case basis. However, with the recent rise of legislative studies in France, quantitative methods are now also being used to create typologies of parliamentarians' behaviour and the different ways in which they perform the role of representative. However, whatever the protocols used and whatever the institutions studied, these studies all lead to the same conclusion: the relationship between the institution and its actors is a co-constructed, dialectic relationship. Political institutions appear to be continually shaped by the actors in a position to engage in the practical and symbolic struggles involved in their social construction. Moreover, and in relation to this, the power wielded by these institutions cannot simply be compared to that of a police force tasked with maintaining the existing social order. The *Conseil général* offers a good example in this regard. On the one hand, this institution plays an important role in socialising people to political careers by allowing some of its members to go beyond the locally-rooted nature of their office. On the other hand, it is torn between an "instrumental" rationale, which tends to reduce its role to that of a front-line desk dealing with social action, and a "politicisation" rationale, introduced by certain politicians who hold dual mandates as Councillors on this assembly but also as parliamentarians at the *Assemblée nationale*. In some cases, this co-construction can produce social

changes, even under authoritarian regimes. For example, far from consolidating the peshmaga's power, the progressive autonomy of the Iraqi-Kurdistan parliament underway since the mid-2000s has in fact weakened it. Within this institution, elected officials' social and political identity, as well as their allegiances, have shifted as partisan resources have given way to academic qualifications.

Non-collective political institutions, such as the Presidency, are no exception in this regard. The presidential role in France is commonly described as having been tailor-made by and for the General de Gaulle, who viewed the role as that of an arbiter – both an arbitrator, in the legal sense, and an umpire – detached from any party affiliation. However, it has in fact considerably evolved since election by direct universal suffrage was introduced.

From as early as the 1965 vote, the role became politicised under pressure from the left wing, to the extent that electing a candidate with little or no party capital seems impossible today. At the same time, defining the presidential role became the main prize in a symbolic struggle where the social value of economic capability was at stake, along with the social value of the groups who could take advantage of it. Although this struggle also went beyond this, it culminated in the 1965 presidential campaign when the General de Gaulle was forced to defend the economic results of his first seven-year term and to publicly acknowledge the importance he placed on economic issues in playing his role.

Of course, these counter-intuitive examples are in the minority. But they do remind us that, in political institutions more than anywhere else, relationships of domination are never fixed: they are constantly being (re)decided. Even when domination seems to be accepted and not particularly conflictual, for example among the communist intellectuals studied by Frédérique Matonti, this relationship can still entail ruse, double talk, or criticism. It therefore produces not only consensus but also tension and compromises. And when this domination is maintained despite legal measures aimed at reversing it, for example in the case of the French assemblies that are supposed to respect parity, this is not an iterative process that reproduces the existing situation identically – instead, it is a reconstructive process, in which the dominant only manage to keep their positions through various more or less costly investments.

3.7 Control of Behaviour in Politics and Administration

Broaching political institutions as a heterogeneous, conflictual, and shifting group of human beings logically means examining how behaviour is regulated within them. On this point, research has largely drawn on knowledge from the field of political sociology. Political parties are known for serving as “recruiting

offices” for political leaders. This is where actors are socialised to politics as a profession; it is also where those who want to exercise power are chosen, both through the processes selecting nominees for elections and, more recently, through the primary elections for presidential candidates. It has long been established that voting systems have an impact on the composition of deliberative assemblies. In this regard, the preference for a single-member plurality system in the legislative elections is not insignificant. As well as restricting political pluralism by creating parliamentary majorities, it also gives an advantage to outgoing parliamentarians and has discriminatory effects on outsiders to political competition. Nevertheless, this kind of control over the selection of politicians does not guarantee control over expected behaviour. This is apparent in the lack of discipline regularly shown by majority parliamentarians as well as by the many conflicts that have rocked the history of President/Prime Minister relations under the Fifth Republic outside periods of cohabitation and despite the fact the President has almost sole discretionary power in appointing a government leader who will not dispute presidential precedence within executive power.

As well as these processes aimed at controlling recruitment, there are also practices aimed at managing behaviour. Daily monitoring at *Matignon* allows Presidents to try – more or less successfully – to control their Prime Ministers. This is first and foremost done via members of the presidential offices that mirror the Prime Minister’s offices. They are constantly in contact with members of the other offices, attend all inter-ministerial meetings, and sometimes even bypass *Matignon*. Ministers are also a means of control over the Prime Minister given that the President signs the decrees appointing them. This prerogative allows Presidents to control the make-up of the government and also to keep Prime Ministers away from certain issues, which are then dealt with directly at the *Élysée* with the Minister in question. This can also be a way of marginalising Prime Ministers within the government, by surrounding them with Ministers whose loyalties lie more with the President. For example, following defeat in the 2014 municipal elections, President François Hollande replaced his friend Jean-Marc Ayrault with one of his main competitors for the *Élysée*, Manuel Valls; however, he only slightly reworked the government itself, thereby isolating the new Prime Minister from his most direct supporters. Parliamentary discipline is also based on both voluntary and forced submission on the part of majority parliamentarians. While it is in their interest for the government to succeed, observation of the majority parliamentary group shows that, in fact, a complex set of allegiances, self-controlled hopes, direct and indirect pressure, persuasion, and negotiations of all kinds, determine whether members follow voting instructions.

As Damien Lecomte has shown, the socialist parliamentary group – which had a majority in the *Assemblée nationale* under the fourteenth legislative term – was entirely focused on the quite tricky task of regulating/channelling parliamentarians’ behaviour. The key function of the group’s bureau is to ensure that members of parliament are present in plenary sessions, but it also manages its members’ activities very closely with a view to ensuring they follow the internal rules. According to these, bill proposals and amendments should only be submitted to the bureau of the *Assemblée nationale* after gaining approval from the parliamentary group. While it is possible to depart from this rule, amendments signed by the group are more likely to be adopted in plenary sessions, if only because one of the roles of the bureau (and the rapporteur) is to negotiate such amendments with the minister in charge of the bill. In cases of persistent disagreement, however, the group’s bureau has limited means through which to put pressure on its troupes. Sanctions do theoretically exist, but are rarely applied because they are relatively ineffective. It is therefore easier for the bureau to negotiate discipline in return for certain collective resources – requesting legislative reports, putting forward bills in the name of the group, asking questions at government “question time”, etc. The bureau can determine how such resources are distributed within the group and potentially restrict access to them to any “disloyal” members. However, this remains an imperfect means of control: first, these resources are relatively rare, and second, many members of parliament are quite happy to hold office without ever being a rapporteur, having a slot in question time, or putting forward any legislative proposals.

However, the power of political institutions can only be fully understood when we also take into account that behaviour is also controlled in unintentional ways. As several studies have shown, in order to understand how actors conform to the institution’s requirements, it is necessary to look at how their work is organised. For example, the system of different meetings involved in the deliberations of inter-municipal bodies operate as “a series of ‘sieves’ calibrating and filtering debates and decisions before they arrive in front of the *Conseil*”. This considerably reduces the possibility of conflicts arising in the *Conseil* itself and leads, de facto, to a “consensus regime” in which party resources and conduct are ineffective. Similarly, studies on women in politics have shown that the dual segregation – both vertical and horizontal – affecting female elected officials in parliaments worldwide is also linked to how work is organised through specialist committees in these sorts of assemblies. This bureaucratic organisation based on specialisation encourages female elected officials to turn to their field of socio-professional competence. Given current academic and professional career paths, this tends to lead to women being mainly present on committees devoted to “social” and/or “cultural” affairs, which are less strategic areas for building a career in politics.

Finally, in the same line as Michel Foucault's work, pragmatic sociology has shown that behaviour is also controlled through the most material aspects of institutions. As Jean-Philippe Heurtin has explained, the architectural apparatus of parliamentary assembly rooms used since 1789 – face-to-face, circles, hemicycles, etc. – contributes to ordering speech within the institution. More recently, Delphine Gardey has looked behind the scenes at the *Palais Bourbon* and highlighted how important administrative staff – stenographers, administrators, bailiffs, etc. – are in the way practices are institutionalised at the *Assemblée nationale*. By reminding us that institutions are above all made of bodies and things, these studies pave the way for new avenues that remain to be explored. They encourage the sociology of political institutions to stop focusing solely on professional politicians and to also address other aspects, including the everyday activities which have often been ignored (because they are considered marginal and not strictly political) and yet which contribute to perpetuating the institutional order.

Today, analysis stands to gain the most from pursuing research at the margins of political institutions. First, because administrative staff are often attached to political institutions on a more long-term basis than professional politicians and therefore carry with them an institutional memory that contributes to routinising practices. This is particularly true for the General Secretariat of the government, the General Secretariat of the *Élysée* and the administrators at the *Assemblée nationale* and the *Sénat*. It would also be reasonable to assume that because of how they are trained (often in legal studies) and selected (through competitive entrance exam) and because of their status (usually civil servants) and their missions (providing solely technical assistance), these actors tend to identify with the institution more than the politicians whom they serve. Their relationship to the institution certainly warrants analysing to the same extent as that of political actors.

Moreover, certain institutional actors are in a particular heuristic position, at the intersection of several social and institutional worlds. This is particularly true of members of Ministry offices and the staff of elected officials, but also presidents of Parliamentary groups, rapporteurs, etc. Focusing on these individuals could address two of the blind spots in current research. Until now, political institutions have been considered in isolation, resulting in segmented knowledge of the space they compose. Working on people who lie at the intersection of several political institutions would offer a way of understanding the impact of the vertical and horizontal interdependent relationships linking them together. Finally, certain actors also play a role as an interface with the public. For example, a team of sixty-three people sorts through the correspondence received by the President of the Republic and responds to the

requests, complaints, and comments sent to the *Élysée*. And when people appeal to their elected officials, in town halls or local constituencies, it is the representatives' staff who deals with their complaints. Studying these "marginal" actors and their activities would therefore afford an understanding of the relationship between ordinary citizens and political institutions, an issue that is all too often left to the remit of opinion polls and communications advisors.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the interplay of political institutions and administration. The learner has been exposed to the basic facts on the legitimation of political institutions and its powers.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to discuss the relationships between administration and political institutions. In addition, the legal basis of political institutions, political institutions as forms of social domination, and gender as a means for legitimating political institutions were discussed. Added is behavioural control in politics and administration.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Define Administration.
2. Describe political institutions.
3. How is gender used in legitimating political institutions?
4. What are the powers of political institutions?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Barbey, Aron K.; Colom, Roberto; Grafman, Jordan (March 2014). "Distributed neural system for emotional intelligence revealed by lesion mapping". *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. **9** (3): 265–272. doi:10.1093/scan/nss124. PMC 3980800. PMID 23171618.

Bertsch, G. R. Clarke and D. Wood *Comparing Political Systems: Power and Policy in 'Three Worlds* (4th ed.) (New York: Macmillan, 1992). A detailed analysis of the policy process in various parts of the world.

Brunton, Bingni W.; Botvinick, Matthew M.; Brody, Carlos D. (April 2013). "Rats and humans can optimally accumulate evidence for decision-making" (PDF). *Science*. **340**(6128): 95–98. doi:10.1126/science.1233912. PMID 23559254. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2016-03-05.

Chua, E. F.; Rand-Giovannetti, E.; Schacter, D. L.; Albert, M.; Sperling, R. A. (2004). "Dissociating confidence and accuracy: Functional magnetic resonance imaging shows origins of the subjective memory experience" (PDF). *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. **16** (7): 1131–1142. doi:10.1162/0898929041920568. PMID 15453969.

Davidson, Alice Ware; Bar-Yam, Yaneer (2006) [2000]. "Environmental complexity: information for human–environment well-being" (PDF). In Bar-Yam, Yaneer; Minai, Ali. *Unifying themes in complex systems*. Berlin; New York: Springer. pp. 157–168. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.33.7118. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-35866-4_16. ISBN 9783540358640.

Gold, Joshua I.; Shadlen, Michael N. (2007). "The neural basis of decision making". *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. **30**: 535–574. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.29.051605.113038. PMID 17600525.

Guo, Kristina L. (June 2008). "DECIDE: a decision-making model for more effective decision making by health care managers". *The Health Care Manager*. **27** (2): 118–127. doi:10.1097/01.HCM.0000285046.27290.90. PMID 18475113.

Hall, Crystal C.; Ariss, Lynn; Todorov, Alexander (July 2007). "The illusion of knowledge: when more information reduces accuracy and increases confidence" (PDF). *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. **103** (2): 277–290. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.01.003.

Heidenheimer, A. H. Hecllo and C. T Adams Comparative Public Policy (3rd ed.) (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1990). A good discussion of public policy and the performance of political systems.

Hogan, Robert (2007). Personality and the fate of organizations. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. p. 28. ISBN 978-0805841428. OCLC 65400436. Most personality psychologists regard the MBTI as little more than an elaborate Chinese fortune cookie...

Hogwood, B and L. Gunn Polzcy Analys1s for the Real World (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) A very useful introduction to the concepts used 1n policy analysis.

Kahneman, Daniel (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. ISBN 9780374275631. OCLC 706020998.

Kennerley, Steven W.; Walton, Mark E.; Behrens, Timothy E. J.; Buckley, Mark J.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (July 2006). "Optimal decision making and the anterior cingulate cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **9** (7): 940–947. doi:10.1038/nn1724. PMID 16783368.

Kiani, Roozbeh; Shadlen, Michael N. (May 2009). "Representation of confidence associated with a decision by neurons in the parietal cortex". *Science*. **324** (5928): 759–764. doi:10.1126/science.1169405. PMC 2738936. PMID 19423820.

Kutty, Ambalika D.; Kumar Shee, Himanshu; Pathak, R. D. (November 2007). "Decision-making: too much info!". *Monash Business Review*. **3** (3): 8–9. doi:10.2104/mbr07056 Monahan, George E. (2000). *Management decision making: spreadsheet modeling, analysis, and application*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 33–40. ISBN 978-0521781183. OCLC 42921287.

Maqsood, T.; A, Finegan; D, Walker (2004). "Biases and heuristics in judgment and decision making: The dark side of tacit knowledge". *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*. **1**. ISSN 1547-5840.

Moutsiana, Christina; Garrett, Neil; Clarke, Richard C.; Lotto, R. Beau; Blakemore, Sarah-Jayne; Sharot, Tali (October 2013). "Human development of the ability to learn from bad news". *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **110** (41): 16396–16401. doi:10.1073/pnas.1305631110. PMC 3799330. PMID 24019466.

Parsons, W. *Public Policy: Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1995) A wideranging and thorough analysis of policy and the policy making process.

Pierson, C. (ed.) *The New Politics of the Welfare State* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). An interesting examination of the political economy of welfare

Pijanowski, John (February 2009). "The role of learning theory in building effective college ethics curricula". *Journal of College and Character*. **10** (3): 1–13. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1088.

Pittenger, David J. (2005). "Cautionary comments regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator". *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. **57** (3): 210–221. doi:10.1037/1065-9293.57.3.210.

Reimann, Martin; Bechara, Antoine (October 2010). "The somatic marker framework as a neurological theory of decision-making: review, conceptual comparisons, and future neuroeconomics research". *Journal of Economic Psychology*. **31** (5): 767–776. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2010.03.002.

Reyna, Valerie F. (November 2013). "Psychology: Good and bad news on the adolescent brain". *Nature*. **503**(7474): 48–49. doi:10.1038/nature12704. PMID 24172899.

Schacter, Daniel L.; Gilbert, Daniel Todd; Wegner, Daniel M. (2011) [2009]. *Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. ISBN 9781429237192. OCLC 755079969.

Sharot, Tali (2011). *The optimism bias: a tour of the irrationally positive brain* (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon Books. ISBN 9780307378484. OCLC 667609433.

Sharot, Tali; Korn, Christoph W.; Dolan, Raymond J. (October 2011). "How unrealistic optimism is maintained in the face of reality". *Nature Neuroscience*. **14** (11): 1475–1479. doi:10.1038/nn.2949. PMC 3204264. PMID 21983684.

Sparks, Erin (2007). "Satisficing". In Baumeister, Roy F.; Vohs, Kathleen *Encyclopedia of social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 776–778. ISBN 9781412916707. OCLC 123119782.

Steinberg, Laurence (April 2007). "Risk taking in adolescence: new perspectives from brain and behavioral science". *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. **16** (2): 55–59. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.519.7099. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00475.x.

Ulea, Vera (2002). A concept of dramatic genre and the comedy of a new type: chess, literature, and film. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 17–18. ISBN 978-0809324521. OCLC 51301095.

Walton, Mark E.; Devlin, Joseph T.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (November 2004). "Interactions between decision making and performance monitoring within prefrontal cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **7** (11): 1259–1265. doi:10.1038/nn1339. PMID 15494729.

Unit 3: Institutional Setting and Administration

1.0 Introduction

Here, we shall discuss the orthodoxy in thinking concerning how the political system functions in relation to administration. This centres on the study of public policy as they constitute the dominant body of knowledge on the causes and consequences of governmental action.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

- a. Identify the different definitions of public policy and government,
- b. Describe the relationship between politics and policy,
- c. Discuss the theories of policy process, and
- d. Explain the problems and challenges of policy making.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Concept of public policy

What is public policy? Or what makes policy public? How are policy decisions made? What are the implications of policy decisions for the distribution of power in a society? These questions provide a broad cover for other issues pertaining to the nature and processes of policy making. These broad questions are central to the concern of politics with “who gets what” since ultimately the process of policy making is the process by which “values are authoritatively allocated” within a society. We shall seek to illustrate the problems of public policy making with specific allusions to the case histories of the policy process in developing countries.

Human conduct is generally governed by what is sometimes loosely referred to as ‘policy’. In this broad sense, everyone would seem to have one policy or another regulating one’s behaviour or action. Thus, it is conceivable to talk of private policies, policies which help to regulate the conduct of people in their private domains. Private policies are, however, restricted in terms of scope and expected impact. The decision of an individual ‘not to eat breakfast’ could be regarded as a private policy intended to regulate the nutritional behaviour of that individual. This behaviour is private to the extent that there are no demands made on other people to conform to such behaviour by denying them the pleasure and delight of a delicious breakfast.

But what makes a policy ‘public’? What, in other words, distinguishes public policy from, say, private policy? There are several ways of characterizing public policy. Hogwood and Gunn (1984) have attempted a scheme for categorizing the variety of different ways in which the word ‘policy’ is used. Many definitions of public policy abound "and it may simply be futile trying to

discover which is correct or proper. However, at a broad level, public policy will refer to the relationship of a government unit to its environment Thomas Dye, simply defined public policy as “whatever governments choose to do or not to do.” Other definitions associate public policy with purposive behaviour. In this regard, public policy is viewed as “a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of a concern.

What makes policies distinctively ‘public’ is that they are “developed by governmental bodies and officials.” The special character of public policies stems from the fact that they are formulated by what David Easton has called the “authorities”, that is, those persons who “engage in the daily affairs of a political system”, are “recognized by most members of the system as having responsibility for these matters” and take decisions that are “accepted as binding most of the time by most of the members so long as they act within the limits of their roles.

Following Anderson, it is possible to isolate some key elements which distinguish public policy from other types of policies. These elements are as follows:

1. Public policy is purposive or goal-oriented action rather than random or chance behaviour.
2. Public policy consists of courses or patterns of action by governmental officials
3. Public policy is what governments actually do, not what they intend to do or say they are going to do.
4. Public policy involves some form of overt government action to affect a particular problem; it also involves a decision by government officials not to take action, to do nothing, on some matter on which governmental involvement is sought.
5. Public policy is based on law and is authoritative. In other words, public policy has an authoritative, potentially legally coercive quality that the policies of private organisations do not have.

Public policy is directed towards a purpose, it is a goal-oriented action. It is not a random or chance behavior. Public policy does not just happen. ‘Public policy consists of courses or patterns of action by governmental officials. It is not their separate individual or discrete decisions. E. g. A policy will include not-only the decision to make a law about environment, but also subsequent decision relating to the enforcement of that environmental law.

Public policy is what governments actually do in regulating trade, controlling inflation, drugs, and promoting health and public housing etc. Public policy is not what governments intend to do or say they are going to do. Public policy

may be positive or negative. E. g. government may decide to do something or may decide to do nothing about a particular matter. Public policy is based on law, therefore it is authoritative. Accordingly, it must be obeyed. Failure to obey the law on that policy will attract sanctions like imprisonment or fine.

The study of "public, policy has developed to have various sections which include: public policy analysis, theories of the policy process, policy development and implementation; to these may be added programme development and implementation. So far as it is observed in practice, the commonest practitioners of bureaucratic method of administration, and the greatest formulators and implementers of public policies are members of the public service of any public organization. The public service is the next and final consideration of this work.

The public service represents the employees of government. They are those responsible for the functioning of government through the implementation of government policies. Such policies include welfare services rendered to the citizens. The public service is therefore made up of workers in government ministries, parastatals and agencies. Workers in the Ministry of Education, Central Bank-of Nigeria, etc. are all members of the public service. Within the public service, we have the civil service, which constitute the inner core, or the heart of the public service.

From the period of Nigerian independence in 1960 to 1967, there were five public services (the Federal Public Service, the Public service of Eastern Region, Northern Region, Mid-Western Region and Western Region). At the end of the Nigerian civil war in 1970 a Public Service Review Commission (the Udoji Commission) was set up to among other things, harmonise the structure and organisation of the public service of Nigeria.²⁸ In 1974 the Udoji Commission came out with a recommendation for results oriented and unified structure of public service for the whole country. This implies that recruitment/appointment, promotion, remuneration, retirement, discipline dismissal became governed by the same conditions all over the country.

In 1988, there was another review, the Phillips Civil Service Review Panel (The Nigerian Federal Civil Service in the mid 80s and Beyond) which according to the government was aimed at streamlining the public service along the lines of the presidential system of government, with the purpose of making the public service responsive to the Structural Adjustment Programme. One of the recommendations of the review was that heads of ministries be called Directors General instead of Permanent Secretaries. The review also recommended specialization in the ministry where the officer found himself. The appointment

of the Directors General became political and the Directors General were required to retire with the president who appointed them.

The latest review of the civil service was undertaken by the Allison Ayida Panel on Civil Service Reform which submitted its report in July, 1995. The panel examined the 1988 reform and suggested far-reaching changes. Based on the panel's recommendation, the Provisional Ruling Council, PRC, directed that the post of director-general should revert back to the status of permanent secretary and accounting officer of the ministry.

The relevance or importance and centrality of the public service to public administration cannot be over-emphasised. It is the public service that ensures the continuity of government, acts as Custodian and protector of the public interest and public treasury against violation by the ruling class. The public service, particularly their civil service is supposed to be politically neutral, and should faithfully serve any political master. They enjoy security of tenure of office and anonymity in the performance of their duties.

3.2 What is government?

As an activity, policy making is located squarely within the context of government. But what is government and what does it do? People's appreciation of government is as a set of institutions making and enforcing laws. Thus, we speak of institutions of government such as the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. These institutions are also assigned specific functions in furtherance of the purpose of government. There are also agencies of government such as the civil bureaucracy, the police, and prisons etc. which perform sundry functions that are contingent on the goal of government.

But to express government merely as a set of institutions performing specified functions is to simplify a complex phenomenon. A fundamental characteristic of government is that it creates and allocates values. Indeed, it is a fundamental concept of politics that any governmental action, be this the laws passed by legislatures or the rules made and applied by administrators or decisions made by the courts, have the intent or the effect of creating and allocating values.

The point, of course, is that governmental actions which seek to create or promote certain values also involve the allocation of values among the diverse groups composing the society and generally entail the unequal (although not necessarily unjust) distribution of values. In addition, governmental actions also entail uneven maximisation pattern among values. In other words, governments discriminate as to what values to create or promote among competing values and which societal groups benefit from what values. Significantly, the creation and allocation of values through governmental action entail costs to some

elements of society in that the maximisation of one or a set of values invariably requires some costs in terms of minimisation or deprivation of other values.

A related issue derives from the philosophical speculation concerning the end of government. Government, it is generally believed, ought to promote the public interest and all governments invariably justify their actions as being in the public interest. A venerable notion of politics held by political philosophers from Aristotle to the present is that government is a public activity that involves public purposes, or public interests, or a public good, or some distinctly 'public' aspect of human life. This concept of the public interest entails the ideas that governmental actions ought to create and promote values that are for the good of the general public and that are made with the welfare of most of society in mind.

Ascribing a public interest concern to governmental actions will no doubt generate much controversy. In any case, such an understanding of the purpose of government reflects poorly the popular perception of government as the Self-seeking and self-promoting activity of ambitious politicians. Neither common experience nor systematic research would seem to give much support to the postulation that government is motivated by a concern for the public good. At best the notion of public interest could only have been a normative expectation of what ought to be the end of government.

A key attribute of government is its authority, that is, its right to make, administer and enforce legally binding policies and rules on its citizens. The notion that governmental actions are under guarded by authority dates back to Aristotle. In *Politics*, Aristotle argued against those who say that all kinds of authority are identical and sought to distinguish the authority of those who occupy governmental roles from other forms of authority such as the master over the slave. "Government, by this argument, functions with respect to society as a whole and its rules are legally binding on all people within the government's legal jurisdiction. Indeed, Aristotle defines the *polis*, or political association as the 'most sovereign and inclusive association'. The German scholar, Max Weber has extended our understanding of the authoritative basis of governmental action by postulating that an association should be called political 'if and in so far as the enforcement of its order is carried out continually within a given territorial area by the application and threat of physical force on the part of the administrative staff.

Thus, a government policy is an authoritative plan of action for the promotion and allocation of selected values, which is deemed by governmental authority to be in the common interest of the people A policy consists of some general or

specific goal which policy makers hope to attain including the general course of action to be followed and the specific means by which the goal is to be pursued.

3.3 Politics and policy

The foregoing preliminary comments immediately suggest some form of relationship between politics and public policy. The concern of politics is with what Easton (1965) refers to as “the authoritative allocation of Values”. Easton’s definition of politics is very instructive because it points to the critical elements in the linkage between politics and public policy. First, is the issue of values. Values are the things that people desire and pursue with a fair amount of intensity. Values are not only many, but they vary with individuals. What is at issue here is the scarcity of resources relative to the many and varied values of individuals. Allocation therefore becomes an imperative function of politics because of the obvious lag between societal resources and the many and conflicting claims that people make. It bears emphasizing that the allocation function is reserved exclusively for what is called an authority, the reason being that were allocation to be left free for all, society will, in all probability, return to the anarchy of the state of nature.

The etymology of authority should not delay us here. It is only sufficient to note that it is authority which legitimizes the political process by which values are allocated. Significantly, authorities, properly so called, are responsible for resolving the conflict of interests which necessarily arises out of the competing demands which people make. There is a paradoxical aspect to politics which is evident from this discussion, namely, that the political process is at once a conflict generating and a conflict resolution process. As authorities seek to allocate values, they make judgmental decisions which are favourable to some and unfavourable to others. The cumulative decisions which authorities make are what we generally refer to as public policies. This is another way of saying that public policy is the output of the political process of value allocation.

The linkage between politics and public policy should by now be fairly obvious. Public policy is what authorities do when they are seized with the political process of sharing societal resources among competing values.

3.4 The policy cycle

Policy making is a complex activity involving a pattern of action, extending over time and involving many decisions. A policy is not synonymous with a single decision as a course of action; it is useful to conceive of policy making as a processual activity involving a series of distinct stages which constitute what we here refer to as the policy cycle.

All policies originate from demands or claims made upon public officials by other actors, private or official, in the political system for action or inaction on some perceived problems. A demand is a request that government should do something about a problem. Public policies are designed, almost invariably, to satisfy or meet the demands or claims made on public officials.

All policies involve decision making by public officials that authorize or give direction and content to public policy actions. Decision-making involves the choice of an alternative from a series of competing alternatives. Some decisions which affect public policy actions are fundamental while others are largely routine and are made by officials in the day-to-day application of public policy.

An important aspect of the policy cycle is the formal expression or articulation of public policy by public officials through statements and speeches they make indicating the intentions and goals of government and what will be done to realize them. Policy-statements are, of course, sometimes ambiguous. Sometimes public Officials pronounce on aspects of policy as a means of ‘testing the turf’ or gauging the public mood concerning actions that government intends to initiate.

The policy cycle comes to maturity with policy outputs, that is, the ‘tangible manifestations of public policies, the things actually done in pursuance of policy decisions and statements. The study of public policy as policy output clearly demonstrates the wide gulf that exists between policy pronouncements and the actual acts of government. Policy outcomes complete the policy cycle. Policy outcomes are the consequences for society, intended or unintended, that flow from action or inaction by government. Concern with policy outcomes directs our attention to the impact of public policies, namely, whether policies meet the original goals which led to their enactment.

The policy cycle corresponds to what in conventional usage is referred to as the policy process. The policy process is characterized by distinct stages which include; Agenda Setting, Formulation, Adoption, implementation and Evaluation. The policy agenda is the list of subjects or problems to which governmental officials, and people outside of government closely associated with those officials, are paying some serious attention at any given time. Agenda setting refers to the stage in the policy process when officials attempt to narrow the number of subjects which come to their attention to the set which will actually become the focus of their attention. The policy formulation stage is the stage at which the alternatives for dealing with a public problem are developed. This is the stage at which a set of alternatives for governmental action is seriously considered by governmental officials. The policy adoption stage is the stage when an authoritative choice among specified alternatives is

made by governmental officials. At the implementation stage, administrators carry out policies that have been adopted by formal political office-holders. Finally, during the evaluation stage of the policy process, the concern is with the estimation, assessment, or appraisal of policy, including its content, implementation, and effects.

The linkage among the stages in the policy process would appear obvious. After all, problems must receive the attention of policy makers who then must contemplate the list of potential alternatives for policy choices which are, in turn, legitimated through an adoption procedure. As policy makers contemplate the outcome of the decisions they make in terms of their impact on the relevant publics, new problems may be generated, and the cycle goes on.

Significantly, for each stage in the policy process, there are distinct sets of actors whose relevance is determined, largely, by the resources which they command. Actors in the policy process could be proximate or auxiliary, visible or hidden. With respect to agenda setting, for example, elected officials and their appointees are dominant actors, while alternatives, proposals and solutions are generated largely within communities of specialists. There is equally an agreement that bureaucrats are dominant at the implementation stage of the policy process.

What make the contribution of these actors significant are the resources which each command. Elected officials and their appointees command a set of institutional as well as organisational resources with which they dominate the public's attention. Through these enormous resources, these officials are well positioned to set the policy agenda. Professional staffers as well as academic researchers and consultants, on the other hand, dominate the alternative specification stage by invoking their reservoir of special skills and knowledge. The dominance of civil service bureaucrats at the implementation stage of the policy process owes largely to their acknowledged experience and power of administrative discretion.

The idea of a policy process gives the impression of a sequential, orderly process of policy making. This is rarely so. For example, the impression that demands are claims made on the political system by individuals and groups in the environment of the political system neglects the view that government through its own deliberate actions instigates and generates demands which form the basis of policy decisions. What cannot be controverted, however, is that the process of policy making involves quite a significant number of actors, some proximate, others auxiliary. As a result of the multitude of actors in the policy process, the question of who makes policy remains problematic. While it is accepted that individuals, societal groups and government institutions and

agencies are key actors in policy making, the specific mode of their impact on the policy process has been a matter for theoretical disputation.

3.5 Theories of the policy process

The linkage between the study of politics and the study of public policy comes into bold relief when we examine the theoretical approaches that have been adapted to the analysis of the policy making process. A preliminary point of observation is that none of these theories was developed for the study of public policy, “yet each offers a separate way of thinking about policy and even suggests some of the general causes and consequences of public policy. A more significant point, however, is the intended role of theory in policy analysis. First, theories of the policy process are intended as descriptive models for understanding the causes and consequences of governmental action. Second, these theories are also extendedly prescriptive, that is, they are normative specifications of what and how policies ought to be.

Finally, there is a need to distinguish between theories of policy-making and theories of decision making. This distinction is necessary in view of the conceptual confusion that comes from overlapping usage of the words; ‘policy’ and ‘decision’. Decision making is a component of policy making. While decision making involves the choice of an alternative from a series of competing alternatives, policy making typically involves a pattern of action; extending over time and involving many decisions, some routine, some not so routine. Theories of decision making are concerned with how choices among competing alternatives are made while theories of policy making help to clarify and simplify our thinking and suggest possible explanations for public policy.

From the foregoing distinction between decision making and policy making, we can make a further categorization of the theories of the policy process based on the level of analysis of policy making. We thus make a distinction between macro and micro theories of the policy process. At the micro level of analysis; the concern is with explaining the behaviour of individuals and groups engaged in the empirical activities involved in decision making Macro theorizing, on the other hand, is based on analytical frameworks which are, in the main, systemic and are concerned with the bigger and more fundamental questions relating to vested interests and the distribution of economic and political power within a society.

The role of theory in political analysis is to give direction to inquiry in the study of policy making theories provide needed guidelines for focusing our effort in weaving through the mass of data in the field. According to Thomas Dye, theoretical models of policy analysis are useful because they:

1. Simplify and clarify our thinking about politics and public policy;
2. Identify important aspects of policy problems;
3. Help us to communicate with each other by focusing on essential features of political life;
4. Direct our efforts to understand public policy better by suggesting what is important and what is unimportant; and
5. Suggest explanations for public policy and predict its consequences.

3.6 Problems of policy formulation and implementation

A compelling inference from the foregoing discussion is the divergence between theory and practice in choice making and the consequences of this divergence for governmental actions on the one hand and the difference that public policies make, on the other. Were public policies to flow from the prescriptions of rational theories, for example, it can be expected that government will make a whole lot of difference in the life of people.

The popular impression however, is that, public policies do not work. In general, people point to the failure of public policies to meet their elementary needs and they blame government for these lapses. The verdicts which people return on their governments in consequence of their negative experiences with public policies raise serious questions about the legitimacy of government and, hence, of its authority to make binding decisions. The difference between political systems could very well depend on the capacity of governments to make public policies which will work.

What, then, is the nature of the policy-making process and what factors account for the success or failure of governments in making and implementing policy choices? We shall seek answers to these questions drawing on the experiences of the so-called developing nations in policy formulation and implementation.

Those who have sought to analyze why developing nations frequently fall short of their goals speak in terms of a peculiar “failure-prone policy process.” According to economist Albert Hirschman, the fundamental problem of developing nations lies in the inability of their policy-makers to make decisions that will induce development due to certain psychological and social structural inadequacies that inhibit them from bringing to bear the needed amount of knowledge and commitment to make proper judgments about the allocation of resources.

Hirschman argues that it is fashionable for developing countries to opt for comprehensive or fundamental solutions to policy problems. The choice that these countries make, according to Hirschman, compounds the failure of policy

for two reasons. First, developing countries hardly possess governments with the policy-making apparatus adequate to the task of producing a comprehensive programme. Second, this inadequacy is met with the introduction of policy 'solutions -from 'elsewhere,' usually from advanced developed economies, solutions which are hardly suitable to local problems. The adoption of foreign solutions, in turn, undermines the capacity of local intellectual resources to act on local problems, deepens the underdevelopment of local talents and deprives them of the opportunity to master the problems on their own terms.

The evidence for the failure-prone thesis provided by the critical aspects of the policy formulation and implementation processes. A key activity in policy formulation is goal setting. Policy makers in developing countries engage in the elaborate exercise of goal setting by creating structures for planning. As policymakers make a fetish of planning as a basis for development, it would appear that the more they planned, the less development is achieved. Far from not trying, policy-makers in developing countries are, indeed, guilty of trying too much to plan and set goals and targets for national development. To what do we attribute the lag between the expectations and realisations of policy-makers in developing countries?

The failure prone policy process thesis argues that policy-makers in the developing nations are guilty of setting unrealistic goals. The thesis argues further that the policy formulation process engenders expectations among the people which can hardly be matched by the capacities of the system. Goals are unrealistic because they are set at very comprehensive levels, because decision makers lack reliable information on which to base their calculations and sometimes, because the possibility of expressing alternative policy options is either suppressed or non-existent.

The propensity for policy failure is pronounced at the implementation stage of the policy process in developing countries. The possibility of carrying through with policy programmes and implementing policy choices is circumscribed by administrative, economic and political constraints.

Administrative constraints include, among others, the lack of trained experts to administer the complex programmes and projects which comprehensive goals and plans demand and the negative consequences of the conflict of roles between elected political office holders and appointed officials in the civil service bureaucracy.

Public policies also fail in developing countries because of lack of funds to pay for the many projects and programmes tied to these policies. Governments of developing countries are unable to finance their projects and programmes on

account of the indebtedness of their countries and the reluctance of international financial institutions to sustain the profligacy and indiscipline which led to the indebtedness, in the first place. Funds from donor agencies are equally unavailable because of the severe conditionalities attached to these funds which developing nations are unable or unwilling to fulfill. In addition, the capacity of developing nations to source funds internally is severely limited.

Political considerations severely constrain successful policy implementation in developing countries. Many of these countries belong to the category of what Gunnar Myrdal (1990) referred to as “soft states.” These states suffer from severe/acute social indiscipline such as corruption, arbitrary enforcement of the law, lax or nonexistent enforcement of the law and abuse of power. These pathologies are without prejudice to regime types and the standards of morality in these states. A major source of these social pathologies could be located in the attempt to enforce an amazing array of official restrictions and regulations that amount to an open invitation to bribery and payoffs. The economics of many of these countries are choked to death by innumerable regulations administered by innumerable persons.

Perhaps the social indiscipline alluded to above could have been moderated but for the comparatively underdeveloped state of countervailing powers in developing countries. In other words, there are few checks on unrestrained and ‘abused power of a dominant executive and its representatives.

The ‘failure-prone’ thesis is a frightening characterization of the empirical world of policy-makers in developing countries. The implications of this thesis are doubly frightening especially in the inferable judgment that these countries are doomed to policy failures. Such a conclusion is, in our view, both uncharitable and defeatist. It is uncharitable because it denies altruism to policy makers in developing countries. It is defeatist because it signals a fatality by unwittingly denying the possibility of efficacious public policies in these countries.

In what follows, we shall account for the limited explanatory power of the failure-prone thesis in terms of the neglect of the analysis of the context of social action which defines the possibilities and limitations of policy-making. What are the peculiarities of the policy environment in the developing countries of the world and in what ways do these peculiarities affect the discharge of the policy-making function in these countries?

In emphasizing the criticality of the context for the analysis of the efficacy of public policies, we shall, following Claude Ake (1981), impress the theoretical point that human beings (including policy-makers) are largely products of their

environment; that they do not act in a vacuum; that whatever it is they do, they do so always in response to the necessities of the situation in which they find themselves; that the environment, in other words, shapes their values, preferences, attitudes and behaviour.

What, then, are the necessities of the conditions under which policy-makers operate in developing countries? This question calls for the stipulation of the objective realities which confront policy-makers as they seek to make policy choices.

A critical factor which conditions policy behaviour in the developing countries is economic dependence. Economic dependence is a feature of post-colonial societies because the colonial masters never really left their colonies, the fact of political independence notwithstanding. In the Nigerian case, for example, the successor policy-elite did not tight the colonial system to change it but merely to inherit it. The logic of colonialism did not allow the Nigerian policy class to be anything more than marginal economically being weak economically; this class relied on politics and mass mobilisation to come to power. Regardless of the long period of ascension to power, the policy class remains weak economically partly because of the dependent structure of the inherited economy. As a result of their weak material base the policy class continues to use political power for the accumulation of wealth.

But how is political power acquired? What, in other words, is the nature of politics or the form of struggle or competition to control the commanding heights of the state where the main decisions about public policy are made and enforced? Political competition of Nigeria is very intense largely because of the pervasiveness of state power. The state is everywhere and its might appears boundless. Control of state power assures the total dominance of the holders while all others remain losers. The state subserves the interests of those who control it, runs by rules of the dominant class and is, by implication, incapable of mediating political competition, as speculated in liberal political theory.

The linkage between the economy and policy behaviour is very instructive. A dependent economy coheres with a dependent state. Together they breed a category of policymakers who are materially weak and who crave political power in order to amass wealth.

The implication of this linkage is that public policies are made on the basis of political considerations. Major economic policies in Nigeria are replete with economic irrationalities and have, therefore, been limited in their developmental impacts. Political considerations govern the utilization of manpower so much so that critical positions where policy decisions are taken about the commanding

heights of the economy are filled with those who are politically safe, but who may have limited and/or inappropriate technical knowhow.

The political imperative of public policy decisions is nowhere demonstrated as in the expanding economic role of the state. State economic expansionism has been rationalized on altruistic grounds. But it would appear that as the state's role in the economy expands, so also does the opportunities for appropriation by those who control state power. Policy-makers have simply written themselves into the policy-decisions they formulate and implement. State economic expansion has led, not unexpectedly, to irrational and inefficient bureaucracies and parastatals whose burdens, especially with dwindling revenue, have become unduly heavy on the socio-economy.

3.7 The challenge of public policy making

What are the possibilities of a 'success-prone policy process' in countries with track records of policy failures? The subsisting solutions to the policy problems of developing countries have been short on success. It may very well be a case of too many easy solutions flying around. It is, for example, logical to blame government for policy failures. After all, government is assumed to have all the power to allocate and create values. Following upon this logic, we are inclined to want to change the personnel of government as though that in all that counts in instituting successful policies.

A lot of times, too, we blame our policy-makers for policy failures. This is also a logical thing to do. We psychologise the problem of policy failures by perceiving it as something arising from the defective character of our policy makers whom we judge as incapable of making the correct choices.

But we may very well be dead wrong. Our focus on government as the root of policy failures may be misplaced by bringing one government down and installing or supporting a new one we may not have thereby improved on policy fortunes. Ake's argument is premised on the useful distinction he made between the ruling class and government suggesting, in effect, that the ruling class is in power (always) while the government is only in office: The import of Ake's penetrating analysis is that we concentrate too much energy in reforming governments and its institutions believing that therein lies the key to a success-prone policy process and in so doing, we leave virtually untouched our inherited dependent economic structure and its corresponding state structure.

Given the nature of the policy environment in developing countries as sketched in the foregoing, what would amount to solutions to successful policy making are, indeed, no more than guideposts. For a start, it does not appear that we could get anywhere near stipulating the conditions for up turning the failure

prone policy process of these countries without addressing the problems of the political context of policymaking.

Public policies can be made to reflect the interests of the vast majority of the people in developing countries if politics in these countries is democratized. A crucial aspect of this process is the accommodation rather than the repression of the political expression of dissent. The capacity of the ruling class in developing nations to mobilize the vast majority of their people around national purposes and policies is contingent on this accommodation. That, the ruling class has not been sufficiently sensitive to this necessity is primarily responsible for the continuing failure of policy decisions in these countries.

Democracy engenders effective policy formulation and implementation in at least two ways. First, the institutions of government would be able to assume their constitutional role in the policy making process. Significantly, democratic rule is expected to engender the participation of the people in the policy making process through direct actions and indirectly through their representatives.

Second, policy implementation can also be expected to come under popular control. An absurd legacy of military rule in developing nations is the almost total appropriation of power by the military political authorities and the civil service bureaucracy. The culpability and scandalous philistinism of the civil service bureaucracy in the decadence of military rule deserves more attention than it has hitherto received. Suffice it to say that during the period of military rule, soldier-politicians and their civil service cohorts virtually ran away with the government. The promise of civil democratic rule in that government and its associated agencies and processes would be subjected to constitutional scrutiny especially through the legislative oversight of the executive branch.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the concepts of public policy and government, the relationships between the two concepts, the policy cycle, theories of policy process, and problems and challenges of public policy making.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to discuss the relationships between institutional settings and administration. In addition, the concepts of government and policy were discussed as well as policy cycle, theories of

policy process and problems and challenges of public policy making in developing countries.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is public policy?
2. What is government?
3. How are policy decisions made?
4. What are the implications of policy decisions for the distribution of power in a society?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Barbey, A. K.; Colom, Roberto; G. Jordan (March 2014). "Distributed neural system for emotional intelligence revealed by lesion mapping". *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. **9** (3): 265–272. doi:10.1093/scan/nss124. PMC 3980800. PMID 23171618.

Bertsch, G. R. Clarke and D. Wood *Comparing Political Systems: Power and Policy in 'Three Worlds* (4th ed.) (New York: Macmillan, 1992). A detailed analysis of the policy process in various parts of the world.

Brunton, Bingni W.; Botvinick, Matthew M.; Brody, Carlos D. (April 2013). "Rats and humans can optimally accumulate evidence for decision-making" (PDF). *Science*. **340**(6128): 95–98. doi:10.1126/science.1233912. PMID 23559254. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2016-03-05.

Chua, E. F.; Rand-Giovannetti, E.; Schacter, D. L.; Albert, M.; Sperling, R. A. (2004). "Dissociating confidence and accuracy: Functional magnetic resonance imaging shows origins of the subjective memory experience" (PDF). *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. **16** (7): 1131–1142. doi:10.1162/0898929041920568. PMID 15453969.

Davidson, Alice Ware; Bar-Yam, Yaneer (2006) [2000]. "Environmental complexity: information for human–environment well-being" (PDF). In Bar-Yam, Yaneer; Minai, Ali. *Unifying themes in complex systems*. Berlin; New York: Springer. pp. 157–168. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.33.7118. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-35866-4_16. ISBN 9783540358640.

Gold, Joshua I.; Shadlen, Michael N. (2007). "The neural basis of decision making". *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. **30**: 535–574. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.29.051605.113038. PMID 17600525.

Guo, Kristina L. (June 2008). "DECIDE: a decision-making model for more effective decision making by health care managers". *The Health Care Manager*. **27** (2): 118–127. doi:10.1097/01.HCM.0000285046.27290.90. PMID 18475113.

Hall, Crystal C.; Ariss, Lynn; Todorov, Alexander (July 2007). "The illusion of knowledge: when more information reduces accuracy and increases confidence" (PDF). *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. **103** (2): 277–290. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.01.003.

Heidenheimer, A. H. Hecllo and C. T Adams Comparative Public Policy (3rd ed.) (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1990). A good discussion of public policy and the performance of political systems.

Hogan, R. (2007). Personality and the fate of organizations. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. p. 28. ISBN 978-0805841428. OCLC 65400436. Most personality psychologists regard the MBTI as little more than an elaborate Chinese fortune cookie...

Hogwood, B and L. Gunn Polzcy Analys1s for the Real World (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) A very useful introduction to the concepts used 1n policy analysis.

Daniel, K. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. ISBN 9780374275631. OCLC 706020998.

Kennerley, S. W.; Walton, M. E.; Behrens, Timothy E. J.; Buckley, M. J.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (July 2006). "Optimal decision making and the anterior cingulate cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **9** (7): 940–947. doi:10.1038/nn1724. PMID 16783368.

Kiani, Roozbeh; Shadlen, Michael N. (May 2009). "Representation of confidence associated with a decision by neurons in the parietal cortex". *Science*. **324** (5928): 759–764. doi:10.1126/science.1169405. PMC 2738936. PMID 19423820.

Kutty, Ambalika D.; Kumar Shee, Himanshu; Pathak, R. D. (November 2007). "Decision-making: too much info!". *Monash Business Review*. **3** (3): 8–9. doi:10.2104/mbr07056 Monahan, George E. (2000). *Management decision making: spreadsheet modeling, analysis, and application*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 33–40. ISBN 978-0521781183. OCLC 42921287.

Maqsood, T.; A, Finegan; D, Walker (2004). "Biases and heuristics in judgment and decision making: The dark side of tacit knowledge". *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*. **1**. ISSN 1547-5840.

Moutsiana, Christina; Garrett, Neil; Clarke, Richard C.; Lotto, R. Beau; Blakemore, Sarah-Jayne; Sharot, Tali (October 2013). "Human development of the ability to learn from bad news". *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **110** (41): 16396–16401. doi:10.1073/pnas.1305631110. PMC 3799330. PMID 24019466.

Parsons, W. *Public Policy: Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1995) A wideranging and thorough analysis of policy and the policy making process.

Pierson, C. (ed.) *The New Politics of the Welfare State* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). An interesting examination of the political economy of welfare

Pijanowski, John (February 2009). "The role of learning theory in building effective college ethics curricula". *Journal of College and Character*. **10** (3): 1–13. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1088.

Pittenger, David J. (2005). "Cautionary comments regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator". *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. **57** (3): 210–221. doi:10.1037/1065-9293.57.3.210.

Reimann, Martin; Bechara, Antoine (October 2010). "The somatic marker framework as a neurological theory of decision-making: review, conceptual comparisons, and future neuroeconomics research". *Journal of Economic Psychology*. **31** (5): 767–776. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2010.03.002.

Reyna, Valerie F. (November 2013). "Psychology: Good and bad news on the adolescent brain". *Nature*. **503**(7474): 48–49. doi:10.1038/nature12704. PMID 24172899.

Schacter, Daniel L.; Gilbert, Daniel Todd; Wegner, Daniel M. (2011) [2009]. *Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. ISBN 9781429237192. OCLC 755079969.

Sharot, Tali (2011). *The optimism bias: a tour of the irrationally positive brain* (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon Books. ISBN 9780307378484. OCLC 667609433.

Sharot, Tali; Korn, Christoph W.; Dolan, Raymond J. (October 2011). "How unrealistic optimism is maintained in the face of reality". *Nature Neuroscience*. **14** (11): 1475–1479. doi:10.1038/nn.2949. PMC 3204264. PMID 21983684.

Sparks, Erin (2007). "Satisficing". In Baumeister, Roy F.; Vohs, Kathleen *Encyclopedia of social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 776–778. ISBN 9781412916707. OCLC 123119782.

Steinberg, Laurence (April 2007). "Risk taking in adolescence: new perspectives from brain and behavioral science". *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. **16** (2): 55–59. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.519.7099. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00475.x.

Ulea, Vera (2002). A concept of dramatic genre and the comedy of a new type: chess, literature, and film. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 17–18. ISBN 978-0809324521. OCLC 51301095.

Walton, Mark E.; Devlin, Joseph T.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (November 2004). "Interactions between decision making and performance monitoring within prefrontal cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **7** (11): 1259–1265. doi:10.1038/nn1339. PMID 15494729.

Unit 4: Decision Making in Administration

1.0 Introduction

The making of decisions, and specifically of bundles of decisions, is clearly central to any administrative activities in policy making. Although policy-making also relates to the acts of initiation and implementation, the making of decisions and reaching of conclusions is usually seen as its key feature. However, it may be difficult to establish how and why decisions are made. Decisions are undoubtedly made in different ways by individuals and by groups, within small bodies and within large organizations, and within democratic and authoritarian structures.

The focus of this unit is to identify and operationalise the concept decision making and its theoretical bases. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the concept of decision making arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Understand the different definitions of decision making, and
2. Discuss the theories of decision making.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Decision Making

Decision making is regarded as the cognitive process resulting in the selection of a belief or a course of action among several alternative possibilities. Every decision-making process produces a final choice, which may or may not prompt action. Decision-making is the process of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values, preferences and beliefs of the decision makers.

Decision-making can be regarded as a problem-solving activity terminated by a solution deemed to be optimal, or at least satisfactory. It is therefore a process which can be more or less rational or irrational and can be based on explicit or tacit knowledge and beliefs. Tacit knowledge can be obtained by experience or reflection, for instance. It might be something that you are not able to put in words, as opposed to explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is often used to fill the gaps in complex decision making processes. Usually both of these types of knowledge, tacit and explicit, are used in decision-making process together. Explicit knowledge is less likely to result in major decisions than tacit knowledge, which means that the decision-making process usually relies on knowledge acquired through experience.

Human performance has been the subject of active research from several perspectives: Psychological: examining individual decisions in the context of a set of needs, preferences and values the individual has or seeks. Cognitive: the decision-making process regarded as a continuous process integrated in the interaction with the environment. Normative: the analysis of individual decisions concerned with the logic of decision-making, or communicative rationality, and the invariant choice it leads to. A major part of decision-making involves the analysis of a finite set of alternatives described in terms of evaluative criteria. Then the task might be to rank these alternatives in terms of how attractive they are to the decision-maker(s) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Another task might be to find the best alternative or to determine the relative total priority of each alternative (for instance, if alternatives represent projects competing for funds) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Solving such problems is the focus of multiple-criteria decision analysis (MCDA). This area of decision-making, although very old, has attracted the interest of many researchers and practitioners and is still highly debated as there are many MCDA methods which may yield very different results when they are applied on exactly the same data. This leads to the formulation of a decision-making paradox.

Logical decision-making is an important part of all science-based professions, where specialists apply their knowledge in a given area to make informed decisions. For example, medical decision-making often involves a diagnosis and the selection of appropriate treatment. But naturalistic decision-making research shows that in situations with higher time pressure, higher stakes, or increased ambiguities, experts may use intuitive decision-making rather than structured approaches. They may follow a recognition primed decision that fits their experience and arrive at a course of action without weighing alternatives.

The decision-makers environment can play a part in the decision-making process. For example, environmental complexity is a factor that influences cognitive function. A complex environment is an environment with a large number of different possible states which come and go over time. Studies done at the University of Colorado have shown that more complex environments correlate with higher cognitive function, which means that a decision can be influenced by the location. One experiment measured complexity in a room by the number of small objects and appliances present; a simple room had less of those things. Cognitive function was greatly affected by the higher measure of environmental complexity making it easier to think about the situation and make a better decision.

3.2 Decision Making Theories

This body of theories is concerned with how decision makers go about choosing the alternative(s) for achieving defined goals. There are two polar theories of decision making. This polarity is reflected in “the debate between writers who analyse decision making by reference to rational models and writers who portray decision making as an incremental process”. Somehow, the point of contrast between the two theoretical poles is established by reference to rational theories as the ideal which could only have been intended to be prescriptive, while incremental theories are paraded as descriptive of how decisions makers act in the real world. As polar views of the same phenomenon, rational and incremental theories harbour other theoretical approaches to decision making which attempt to overcome the unrealism of the ideal type rational model as well as the ‘incompleteness’ of incremental approaches. We shall examine the two polar theories in some detail below. In addition, we shall highlight the contributions of the middle way theories especially in overcoming the deficiencies of rational and incremental theories of decision making.

Nevertheless, a number of general theories of decision-making have been advanced. The most important of these are the following: rational actor models; incremental models; bureaucratic organization models and belief system models.

Rational actor models

Decision-making models that emphasize human rationality have generally been constructed on the basis of economic theories that have themselves been derived from utilitarianism. Such ideas provide the basis for public-choice theories, developed by thinkers such as Downs (1957), and enthusiastically taken up by the New Right. At the heart of such theories lies the notion of so-called ‘economic man’, a model of human nature that stresses the self-interested pursuit of material satisfaction, calculated in terms of utility. In this light, decisions can be seen to be reached using the following procedures:

1. The nature of the problem is identified.
2. An objective or goal is selected on the basis of an ordering of individual preferences.
3. The available means of achieving this objective are evaluated in terms of their effectiveness, reliability, costs and so on, and
4. A decision is made through the selection of the means most likely to secure the desired end.

This type of process assumes that clear-cut objectives exist, and that human beings are able to pursue them in a rational and consistent manner. For this to be true, utility must be homogeneous: it must be possible to compare the amount of

action (pleasure or happiness) that each action would bring with that which results from any other action. The best example of such an approach to decision is found in the use of cost-benefit analysis in the making of business decisions.

The rational actor model is attractive, in part, because it reflects how most people believe decisions should be made. Certainly, politicians and others are inclined to portray their actions as both goal-orientated and the product of thought and deliberation. When examined more closely, however, rational action may not appear to be a particularly convincing model of decision making. First place, the model is more easily applied to individuals, who may have and or set of preferences, than it is to groups, within which there are likely to be of conflicting objectives. Organizations may therefore be said to make rational decisions only if they are highly centralized and possess a strict command structure.

A second problem is that, in practice, decisions are often made on the basis of inadequate and sometimes inaccurate information and the benefits of such actions may in any case not be comparable. Is it possible, for instance, to know the 'costs' of raising taxes with those of reducing healthcare provision? Such difficulty encouraged Simon (1983) to develop the notion of 'bounded rational' acknowledges that, as it is impossible to analyse and select all possible action. Decision-making is essentially an act of compromising between different valued and imprecisely calculated outcomes. Simon described this process as rational. The final drawback of rational actor models is that they ignore the perception: that is, the degree to which actions are shaped by belief and assumed about reality, rather than by reality itself. Little or no importance is thus attractive to the values and ideological leanings of decision-makers

Herbert Simon is closely associated with articulating the rational model of decision-making beginning with his work titled *Administrative Behaviour* (1945). A decision-maker operating according to the rational, comprehensive model would follow the under listed procedure in arriving at a rational choice:

- a. The decision maker defines his goals rather clearly and sets the levels of achievement of those goals that would satisfy him.
- b. The various alternatives that might achieve the goals would be canvassed.
- c. The consequences that would follow from the selection of each alternative would be investigated.
- d. Each alternative and its attendant consequences would be compared with the other alternatives.
- e. The decision maker would choose that alternative which achieves his goals at the least cost.

From the foregoing, it is clear that rational decision making involves the selection of alternatives which will maximize the decision maker's values, the selection being made following a comprehensive analysis of alternatives and their consequences.

The rational-comprehensive model raises a number of significant issues for the analysis of decision making. The general impression is that the model does not accurately describe the reality of decision making. In the first place, it is hardly the case that decision-makers are faced with any concrete, clearly defined problems. Defining a problem can, indeed, be a problem for the decision maker. People do not set about to solve problems; rather solutions search for problems (Kingdom). It is, perhaps, more to the point to argue, as Lindblom (1959, pp. 79-88) did, that people act in the absence of clearly defined goals and that it might, in fact, be counterproductive, so to do.

A second basis of criticism of the rational model is over the issue of values. The question is often raised as to whose values are used as a basis for making decisions. There are two issues here: first, a decision situation is a situation of value conflict rather than value consensus and "conflicting values, do not permit comparison or weighing." Second, there is the problem of the decision-maker confusing his personal values with the larger organisational value. There is, of course, the larger issue of separating facts from values, a problem that comes to the fore in a means-end model such as the rational model of decision making. The rational model stipulates the prior specification of means of reaching ends, but the means a decision maker chooses for achieving specified ends (goals) are hardly devoid of values.

A significant criticism of the rational comprehensive model is that the ability of human beings to process information is more limited than what the model prescribes. In practice, decision makers rarely proceed in a logical, comprehensive and purposive manner prescribed by the theory. It is humanly impossible for decision makers to canvass all possible alternatives, be informed about the consequences of each of these alternatives and choose the one best option for attaining organisationally specified goals. Considerations of sunk costs, that is, investments in existing programmes and policies may preclude the canvassing of some alternatives by the decision maker. There are, in other words, significant limitations to human rationality which are reflected in administrative behaviour.

Rational-comprehensive theory is presented as an idealised view of decision making in organisations. But as March and Simon have indicated, actual decisions are made under conditions of bounded rationality, a condition which involves the decision-maker choosing an alternative intended not to maximise

his values but to be satisfactory or good enough. A significant implication of the concept of bounded rationality is that decision makers use the most convenient and least expensive information, not necessarily the information that will result in the maximum amount of knowledge about the outcomes, alternatives, values and probabilities involved in the decision. Put differently, decision-makers rarely maximise goal attainment in their decisions. Rather, they sacrifice, that is, they tend to evaluate decision alternatives against standards that set minimally acceptable levels of attainment on each objective rather than maximum standards. By so doing, decision-makers are able to overcome the rigorous demands imposed by the ideal rational-comprehensive model.

Does the rational-comprehensive theory describe the way decisions are made in the real world? Obviously, not as we noted earlier, decision making rarely proceeds in the manner prescribed by the theory. There is a paradox, however. This is that because rationality is taken as a virtue, decision-makers talk and behave as though they conform to the dictates of the rational-comprehensive theory in the decisions they make. They, in other words, imply that the rational comprehensive theory is descriptive of how they act. This observation, notwithstanding, it is safe to conclude that rational comprehensive theory is a prescriptive theory which points in the direction of how perfect decisions can be made.

Incremental models

Incrementalism is usually portrayed as the principal alternative to rational decision making. David Braybrooke and Charles Lindblom (1963) termed this 'disjointed incrementalism, neatly summed up by Lindblom (1959) as the 'theory of muddling through'. This position holds that, in practice, decisions are made on the basis of inadequate information and low levels of understanding this discourages decision-makers from pursuing bold and innovative courses of Policy-making is therefore a continuous, exploratory process: lacking over goals and clear-cut ends, policy-makers tend to operate within an existing framework, adjusting their position in the light of feedback in the form of intention about the impact of earlier decisions. Indeed, incrementalism may sustain strategy of avoidance or evasion, policy-makers being inclined to move away from problems, rather than trying to solve them.

Lindblom's case for incrementalism is normative as well as descriptive. Its intention is to providing a more accurate account of how decisions are made in the world, he argued that this approach also has the merit of allowing for flexible the expression of divergent views. In this sense, it has a distinctly anti character and well suited to policymaking in pluralist democracies: through at least implies responsiveness and flexibility, consultation and compromise. However, the model has also been criticized as profoundly conservative that it

justifies a bias against innovation and in favour of inertia. Policy makers who embrace incrementalism are more likely to be concerned with day-to-day problems than with indulging in long term visionary thinking. Their energy is channeled into keeping the ship on course, not on reflecting on where that course is leading.

The incremental model was offered by Charles Lindblom as a reaction to “the literatures of decision-making, policy formulation, planning, and public administration” which formalize the rational comprehensive model leaving public administrators who handle complex decisions in the position of practicing what few preach Lindblom was, however, very critical of the assumptions of the rational comprehensive model and in its place he developed the notion of incrementalism as an approach to how decisions are actually made and a model for how decisions Should be made.

Lindblom indicted the rational comprehensive model of decision making on account of its failure to adapt to:

- i. Man’s limited problem-solving capacities;
- ii. Inadequacy of information;
- iii. The costliness of analysis;
- iv. Failures in constructing a satisfactory evaluative method;
- v. The closeness of observed relationships between fact and value in policy-making;
- vi. The openness of the system of variables with which it contends;
- vii. The analyst’s need for strategic sequences of analytical moves; and
- viii. The diverse forms in which policy problems actually arise.

What Lindblom proposed as an alternative to the rational comprehensive model was the method he described as successive limited comparisons. Lindblom drew a contrast between the method of successive limited comparisons which he referred to as the branch method and the rational comprehensive method which he called the root method. According to Lindblom, the root method which has been formalised as the best way of arriving at decisions “is in fact not workable for complex policy questions”, which is why most administrators use the method of successive limited comparisons.

Incrementalism approaches decision making as a conservative activity. It is assumed that new decisions are variations of past decisions; that decisions makers accept existing decisions as satisficing and legitimate, and only make small incremental, marginal adjustments in their current behaviour. By so doing, decision makers hardly bother to canvass formidable numbers of far reaching-changes, neither do they spend inordinate time defining their goals,

and that the comparisons they make between the current state of affairs and the small adjustments to be made in current behaviour are within manageable proportions. Decisions are, in other words, made “step-by-step” and by small degrees.

Incrementalism is offered as both a descriptive and prescriptive theory of decision making. Lindblom claims that the method of successive limited comparisons is descriptive of “how most administrators do in fact approach complex questions” in the real world understandably for reasons of limited knowledge, time and money to fashion truly different decisions. These limitations make it impossible to meet the rigorous conditionalities of the rational comprehensive model. Significantly, as Thomas Dye notes, “completely rational” policy may turn-out to be “inefficient” (despite the contradiction in terms) of the time and cost of developing a rational policy are excessive. In addition, decision makers are mindful of ‘sunk costs’ in existing programmes which preclude their abandoning existing decisions for radically new ones. Finally, the method of successive limited comparisons is politically more expedient because it involves incremental changes in existing decisions rather than the fundamental redistribution of social values. As Dye has concluded, incrementalism is important in reducing conflict, maintaining stability, and preserving the political system itself.

The prescriptive import of the incremental approach is that it helps to avoid the calamity of embarking on fundamental changes while leaving sufficient room for the decision maker to test the wisdom of the course of action he had chosen. It is also argued that incrementalism is a natural approach because it is consistent with the nature of decision makers as human beings who rarely act to maximise their values; who are hardly in search of the ‘one best way’ but who would rather be content with what works. In short, incrementalism is presented as a prescriptive model of how decision makers ought to act because it is the rational thing to do.

There is much in incrementalism to support its descriptive claims. Yet, questions arise especially over some of the assumptions inherent in the model. The conservative slant of the incremental approach has been a source of critical review of the model. It is argued, for example, that incrementalism is better suited as a descriptive model of decision making under conditions of social stability and continuity. But, many decision situations are hardly stable. For many societies, stability is a questionable proposition. To, therefore, insist that incrementalism is the preferred method for making decisions is to consign these societies to continuing instability as new decisions continue to be based on precedents that are themselves in need of overhaul. It is in this regard that incrementalism comes across, in the words of Yehezkel Dror “as an ideological

reinforcement of the pro-inertia and anti-innovation forces”. Incremental decisions tend to reflect the values and preferences of dominant interests in society while neglecting the interests of the underclass.

A further difficulty is that incrementalism sheds little light on those political decisions that are radical, even revolutionary, in character. For instance, Stalins' decision to launch the USSR's First Five Year Plan in 1928, Castro's decision to seize power in Cuba in 1959, and even Thatcher's decision to 'roll back the state' in the UK in the 1990s, can hardly be described as incremental adjustments. In view of such difficulties, Amitai Etzioni (1967) proposed the idea of 'mixed scanning', which attempts to bridge the gap between "the rational approach and incrementalism. Mixed scanning allows for decision-making being carried out in two distinct phases. First, decision-makers broadly evaluate, or scan, all the available policy options in terms of their effectiveness in meeting pre existing objectives. Then, a narrower and more incremental approach is adopted as the details of a selected policy option are reviewed. In this way, for example, a broad decision to cut public spending must be accompanied by a series of more narrowly focused decisions relating to the specific areas or programmes that may be affected.

Mixed scanning

Rational comprehensive model and incrementalism have been presented as polar views on decision behaviour. Although both theories would like to make descriptive and prescriptive claims, it is fairly obvious that the strength of the rational model lies in its prescriptive import. While the incremental approach is essentially descriptive, it is equally obvious that the rational model suffers from 'unrealism' while the incremental approach is incomplete in its neglect of fundamental decisions.

Mixed scanning was offered by sociologist Etzioni (1967) as a prescriptive model which attempts to overcome the limitations of the rational and incremental models by building on the strength of both. Mixed scanning takes into account both fundamental and incremental decisions by providing for "high-order, fundamental policy-making processes which set basic directions and...incremental processes which prepare for fundamental decisions and work them out after they have been reached". Etzioni attempted to drive home the efficacy of the mixed scanning strategy by using the following illustration:

Assuming we are about to set up a worldwide weather observation system using weather satellites. The rationalistic approach would seek an exhaustive survey of weather conditions by using cameras capable of detailed observations and by scheduling reviews of the entire sky as often as possible. This would yield an avalanche of details, costly to analyze and likely to overwhelm our action

capacities (e.g. “seeding” cloud formations that could develop into hurricanes or bring rain to arid areas). Incrementalism would focus on those areas in which similar patterns developed in the recent past and, perhaps, on a few nearby regions; it would thus ignore all formations which might deserve attention if they arose in unexpected areas.

A mixed-scanning strategy would include elements of both approaches by employing two cameras: a broad-angle camera that would cover all parts of the sky but not in great detail and a second one which would zero in on those areas revealed by the first camera to require a more in-depth examination. While mixed-scanning might miss areas in which, only a detailed camera could reveal trouble, it is less likely than incrementalism to miss obvious trouble spots in unfamiliar areas.

Etzioni provides the linkage between fundamental and incremental decisions. According to him, fundamental decisions set the tone and direction within which incremental decisions are made. Significantly, mixed scanning permits the consideration of fundamental decisions through the use of the wide-angled lenses without the obsession with detail and comprehensiveness as the radical model demands. Incremental decisions follow from fundamental decisions by permitting the detailed analysis of specific options through the use of the zoom lens.

By so doing, Etzioni (1967) reasons that, each of the two elements in mixed scanning helps to reduce the effects of the particular shortcomings of other; incrementalism reduces the unrealistic aspects of rationalism by limiting the details required in fundamental decisions, and contextuating rationalism helps to overcome the conservative slant of incrementalism by exploring longer-run alternative.

The mixed scanning model is a pointer to the fact that decisions come in varying magnitude thus necessitating the need for either comprehensive or incremental considerations. There are, however, no clear specifications as to the criteria for delimiting the boundary between fundamental and incremental decisions. It has, for example, been argued that the weight we assign to decisions is contextually defined suggesting, in effect, that what is fundamental rational in one context may be incremental in another.

Bureaucratic organization models

Both rational actor and incremental models are essentially black box theories of decision-making; neither pays attention to the impact that the structure of the policymaking process has on the resulting decisions. Bureaucratic or organizational models, on the other hand, try to get inside the black box by

highlighting the degree to which process influences product. This approach was pioneered by Allison (1971) in his examination of US and USSR decision-making during the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Two contrasting, but related, models emerged from this study. The first, usually called the organizational process model, highlights the impact on decisions of the values, assumptions and regular patterns of behaviour that are found in any large organization. Rather than corresponding to rational analysis and objective evaluation, decisions are seen to reflect the entrenched culture of the government department or agency that makes them. The second theory, the 'bureaucratic politics' model, emphasizes the impact on decisions of bargaining between personnel and agencies each pursuing different perceived interests. This approach dismisses the idea of the state as a monolith united around a single view or a single interest, and suggests that decisions arise from an arena of contest in which the balance of advantage is constantly shifting.

Although these models undoubtedly draw attention to important aspects of decision-making, they also have their drawbacks. In the first place, the organizational process model allows little scope for political leadership to be imposed from above. It would be foolish, for example, to suggest that all decisions are shaped by organizational pressures and perceptions, for this would be to ignore the personal role played by F. D. Roosevelt in initiating the New Deal, nor Hitler's influence on Germany's decision to invade Poland. Second; it is simplistic to suggest, as the bureaucratic politics model does, that political actors simply hold views that are based on their own position and on the interests of the organizations in which they work. Although the aphorism 'where you stand depends on where you sit' may often be applicable, personal sympathies and individual goals cannot be altogether discounted. Finally, to explain decisions entirely in terms of black-box considerations is to fail to give any weight to the external pressures that emanate from the broader economic, political and ideological context.

Belief system models

Models of decision making that place an emphasize on the role of beliefs and ideologies highlight the degree to which behaviour structured by perception. When people see and understand to an extent, what their concepts and values all them, or encourage them, to see and understand. This tendency is particularly entrenched because, in most cases, it is largely unconscious. Although decision makers may believe that they are being rational, rigorous and strictly impartial, that social and political values may act as a powerful filter, defining for them what is thinkable, what is possible, and what is desirable. Certain information and particular options are therefore not appreciated or even considered, while

other pieces of information and other courses of action feature prominently in the calculus of decision-making. Indeed, Boulding (1956) underlined the vital importance of process by pointing out that, without a mechanism to filter information, decision makers would simply be overwhelmed by the sheer volume of data confronting them.

However, there are different views about the origin and nature of this filter process. Jervis (1968), for instance, drew attention to evidence of consistence perception on the part of decision –makers. In international affairs, this stemmed largely from ethnocentrism. The inclination of Anthony Eden and UK government to view General Nasser as a second Hitler during the 1956 crisis, and the tendency of the USA in 1959 to regard Fidel Castro a Marxist revolutionary, may be examples of this phenomenon. Irving (1972), On the other hand, suggested that many decisions in the field of international relations could be explained in terms of what he called ‘groupthink’. This is the phenomenon in which psychological and professional pressures conspire to encourage a group of decision-makers to adopt a unified and coherent position, with contrary or inconvenient views being squeezed out of consideration.

An attempt to combine different approaches to decision-making that account of the impact of belief systems has been made by Paul Sabatier which his principal concern was to explain how policy changes occur. In particular he drew attention to the role of ‘policy subsystems’: that is, collections of people in some way contribute to influencing policy in a particular area. A policy may include not only interlocking groups of politicians, civil servants and interest groups, but also researchers, academics and journalists concerned with which Sabatier maintained that, within these subsystems, ‘advocacy coalitions’ emerge comprise collections of individuals who share broadly similar beliefs and values. These beliefs nevertheless operate on three different levels; deep core beliefs (fundamental moral or philosophical principles), near-core beliefs (policy preferences) and secondary beliefs (views about implementation or application).

The importance of such beliefs is that they provide what-Sabatier called the glue politics, binding people together on the basis of shared values and preferences. However, while core beliefs are highly resistant to change, a greater measure of disagreement and flexibility is usually found at the near-core and secondary levels. Using framework, Sabatier proposed that policy change could be understood in large terms of the shifting balance of forces within a policy subsystem, in particular through the dominance of one advocacy coalition over others. This process may nevertheless be seen to be rational insofar as debate within a belief system, and rivalry between belief systems, promotes ‘policy-orientated learning.

In the hands of Marxists and feminists, however, such ideas can be used to draw a very different conclusions (Hann, 1995). Marxists have argued that the core beliefs within any policy subsystem, or indeed amongst policymakers and opinion formers at large, are structured by ruling-class ideology and so favour the interests of dominant economic interests. Feminists, -for their part, may argue that a preponderance of men amongst policy-makers ensures that the 'glue' of politics is provided by patriarchal ideas and values. This results in policy biases that help to sustain a system of male power.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the concepts of decision making and theories of decision making.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to discuss the various definitions of decision making. In addition, the following theories of decision making were extensively perused; rational comprehensive, incremental, mixed scanning, bureaucratic organization and belief system.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Do people generally make decisions in a rational and calculating fashion?
2. What is the most important stage in the policy process, and why?
3. Is there a moral or economic case for greater social equality?
4. Can the 'politics of rights' threaten the 'politics of the common good'?

7.0 References/Further Reading

Barbey, Aron K.; Colom, Roberto; Grafman, Jordan (March 2014). "Distributed neural system for emotional intelligence revealed by lesion mapping". *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. **9** (3): 265–272. doi:10.1093/scan/nss124. PMC 3980800. PMID 23171618.

Bertsch, G. R. Clarke and D. Wood *Comparing Political Systems: Power and Policy in 'Three Worlds* (4th ed.) (New York: Macmillan, 1992). A detailed analysis of the policy process in various parts of the world.

Brunton, Bingni W.; Botvinick, Matthew M.; Brody, Carlos D. (April 2013). "Rats and humans can optimally accumulate evidence for decision-making" (PDF). *Science*. **340**(6128): 95–98. doi:10.1126/science.1233912. PMID 23559254. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2016-03-05.

Chua, E. F.; Rand-Giovannetti, E.; Schacter, D. L.; Albert, M.; Sperling, R. A. (2004). "Dissociating confidence and accuracy: Functional magnetic resonance imaging shows origins of the subjective memory experience" (PDF). *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. **16** (7): 1131–1142. doi:10.1162/0898929041920568. PMID 15453969.

Davidson, Alice Ware; Bar-Yam, Yaneer (2006) [2000]. "Environmental complexity: information for human–environment well-being" (PDF). In Bar-Yam, Yaneer; Minai, Ali. *Unifying themes in complex systems*. Berlin; New York: Springer. pp. 157–168. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.33.7118. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-35866-4_16. ISBN 9783540358640.

Gold, Joshua I.; Shadlen, Michael N. (2007). "The neural basis of decision making". *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. **30**: 535–574. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.29.051605.113038. PMID 17600525.

Guo, Kristina L. (June 2008). "DECIDE: a decision-making model for more effective decision making by health care managers". *The Health Care Manager*. **27** (2): 118–127. doi:10.1097/01.HCM.0000285046.27290.90. PMID 18475113.

Hall, Crystal C.; Ariss, Lynn; Todorov, Alexander (July 2007). "The illusion of knowledge: when more information reduces accuracy and increases confidence" (PDF). *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. **103** (2): 277–290. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.01.003.

Heidenheimer, A. H. Hecllo and C. T Adams Comparative Public Policy (3rd ed.) (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1990). A good discussion of public policy and the performance of political systems.

Hogan, Robert (2007). Personality and the fate of organizations. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. p. 28. ISBN 978-0805841428. OCLC 65400436. Most personality psychologists regard the MBTI as little more than an elaborate Chinese fortune cookie...

Hogwood, B and L. Gunn Polzcy Analys1s for the Real World (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) A very useful introduction to the concepts used 1n policy analysis.

Kahneman, Daniel (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. ISBN 9780374275631. OCLC 706020998.

Kennerley, Steven W.; Walton, Mark E.; Behrens, Timothy E. J.; Buckley, Mark J.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (July 2006). "Optimal decision making and the anterior cingulate cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **9** (7): 940–947. doi:10.1038/nn1724. PMID 16783368.

Kiani, Roozbeh; Shadlen, Michael N. (May 2009). "Representation of confidence associated with a decision by neurons in the parietal cortex". *Science*. **324** (5928): 759–764. doi:10.1126/science.1169405. PMC 2738936. PMID 19423820.

Kutty, Ambalika D.; Kumar Shee, Himanshu; Pathak, R. D. (November 2007). "Decision-making: too much info!". *Monash Business Review*. **3** (3): 8–9. doi:10.2104/mbr07056 Monahan, George E. (2000). *Management decision making: spreadsheet modeling, analysis, and application*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 33–40. ISBN 978-0521781183. OCLC 42921287.

Maqsood, T.; A, Finegan; D, Walker (2004). "Biases and heuristics in judgment and decision making: The dark side of tacit knowledge". *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*. **1**. ISSN 1547-5840.

Moutsiana, Christina; Garrett, Neil; Clarke, Richard C.; Lotto, R. Beau; Blakemore, Sarah-Jayne; Sharot, Tali (October 2013). "Human development of the ability to learn from bad news". *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **110** (41): 16396–16401. doi:10.1073/pnas.1305631110. PMC 3799330. PMID 24019466.

Parsons, W. *Public Policy: Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1995) A wideranging and thorough analysis of policy and the policy making process.

Pierson, C. (ed.) *The New Politics of the Welfare State* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). An interesting examination of the political economy of welfare

Pijanowski, John (February 2009). "The role of learning theory in building effective college ethics curricula". *Journal of College and Character*. **10** (3): 1–13. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1088.

Pittenger, David J. (2005). "Cautionary comments regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator". *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. **57** (3): 210–221. doi:10.1037/1065-9293.57.3.210.

Reimann, Martin; Bechara, Antoine (October 2010). "The somatic marker framework as a neurological theory of decision-making: review, conceptual comparisons, and future neuroeconomics research". *Journal of Economic Psychology*. **31** (5): 767–776. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2010.03.002.

Reyna, Valerie F. (November 2013). "Psychology: Good and bad news on the adolescent brain". *Nature*. **503**(7474): 48–49. doi:10.1038/nature12704. PMID 24172899.

Schacter, Daniel L.; Gilbert, Daniel Todd; Wegner, Daniel M. (2011) [2009]. *Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. ISBN 9781429237192. OCLC 755079969.

Sharot, Tali (2011). *The optimism bias: a tour of the irrationally positive brain* (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon Books. ISBN 9780307378484. OCLC 667609433.

Sharot, Tali; Korn, Christoph W.; Dolan, Raymond J. (October 2011). "How unrealistic optimism is maintained in the face of reality". *Nature Neuroscience*. **14** (11): 1475–1479. doi:10.1038/nn.2949. PMC 3204264. PMID 21983684.

Sparks, Erin (2007). "Satisficing". In Baumeister, Roy F.; Vohs, Kathleen *Encyclopedia of social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 776–778. ISBN 9781412916707. OCLC 123119782.

Steinberg, Laurence (April 2007). "Risk taking in adolescence: new perspectives from brain and behavioral science". *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. **16** (2): 55–59. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.519.7099. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00475.x.

Ulea, Vera (2002). A concept of dramatic genre and the comedy of a new type: chess, literature, and film. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 17–18. ISBN 978-0809324521. OCLC 51301095.

Walton, Mark E.; Devlin, Joseph T.; Rushworth, Matthew F. S. (November 2004). "Interactions between decision making and performance monitoring within prefrontal cortex". *Nature Neuroscience*. **7** (11): 1259–1265. doi:10.1038/nn1339. PMID 15494729.

Unit 5: Personnel Administration

1.0 Introduction

Managing human resources effectively has become vital to organization of the twenty-first century. The heightened level of global competitiveness has alerted all organizations to the fact that all their resources must be utilized well than ever before and that much more could be gained from a better handling of the personnel. Academics and human resources or personnel management professionals have identified several human resources activities that are critical for organizational survival. Survival of an organisation is enhanced by the ability to effectively manage human resources in order to attract, motivate and retain employees. Human resources activities need to be performed effectively, but also the human resources or personnel department of any organization need to play several roles and have a broader and deeper range of competencies in order to bring this about. Thus, Personnel management is the use of several activities to ensure that human resources are managed effectively for the benefit of the individual, society and the organization. It is based on this premise that this unit on personnel management treated the topic under the following headings;

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Understand the meaning of personnel management,
2. Explain recruitment, selection and placement of personnel,
3. Discuss compensation of personnel in terms of wages and salary,
4. Explain conditions of promotion, transfer, demotion and retirement of personnel, and
3. Understand the development of manpower.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of Personnel Administration

The term personnel administration encompasses those managerial actions concerned with the acquisition and utilization of labour services by any organization. Personnel management, like the management of any other resources, forms an element of all managerial activity because, by definition, all managers achieve their objectives by organizing, directing and controlling the activities of other people usually those of their subordinates in a hierarchy of roles. All managers must ensure therefore that the personnel needed are both procured from the labour market and used effectively in the services of the organizations.

Acquisition and utilization of labour may be broken down into the particular tasks of recruiting, selecting, deploying, using, assessing, developing and rewarding the labour services necessary to achieving the goals of the organization and its management.

3.2 Recruitment, Selection and Placement of Personnel

Recruitment

Recruitment can be defined as the first part of the process of filling a vacancy; it includes the examination of the vacancy, the consideration of sources of suitable candidates, making contact with those candidates and attracting applications from them. Another useful definition of recruitment is: searching for and obtaining potential job candidates in sufficient numbers and quantity so that the organization can select the most appropriate ones to fill its job needs. Selection on the other hand is the - assessing the candidates by various means, and making a choice followed by an offer of employment.

Vacancy occurred because of some new or increased activity, then, in all probability, there is the need for new employees to fill such vacancies. The majority of vacancies, however, occur as replacements for people who have left the organisation or as the final event in a chain of transfers and promotions following reorganization. In these cases, consideration may be given to the following points;

- a. It may be possible to fill the vacancy from within the company,
- b. It may be filled by a different kind of employee, e.g. a school-leaver or a part-time, and
- c. The job and personnel specifications may need to be revised.

The advantages of filling the vacancies internally rather than externally are:

1. Better motivation of employees, because their capabilities are considered and opportunities offered for promotion;
2. Better utilization of employees, because the company can often make better use of their abilities in a different job;
3. It is more reliable than external recruitment, because present employee is known to be more thorough than an external candidate;
4. Present employee is more likely to stay with the company than an external candidate; and
5. Internal recruitment is quicker and cheaper than external.

Many vacancies are filled from external sources; even when an internal candidate is transferred or promoted the final result is usually a vacancy elsewhere in the organization which has to be filled from outside. External

recruitment can be time- consuming, expensive and uncertain, though it is possible to reduce these disadvantages to some extent by fore thought and planning. External sources may be divided into two classes; those which are comparatively inexpensive but offer a limited choice (i.e. a-f below) and those which are comparatively expensive but give the employer access to a wider range of candidates (i.e. g and h below).

- i. Recommendations by present employees: This is sometimes encouraged by rewards to employees who introduce successful candidates. It gives a limited field of choice, but it costs very little and as a rule, the candidates are of good quality.
- ii. Unsolicited applications are sometimes received from candidates who either call personally at the place of work or write letter of enquiry. This is another inexpensive source, which provides a limited choice, but the candidates are of uncertain quality.
- iii. Direct links with educational establishments. Many employers maintain connections with universities, colleges and schools. Candidates are usually available from these sources only at one time of the year. This difficulty can often be overcome if companies begin their internal training courses to fill vacancies with temporary staff until school-leavers are available.
- iv. Trade unions: Some companies recruit certain kinds of employees through the appropriate trade unions. The choice is limited, but there is some certainty that the candidates have the skill or knowledge the job requires.
- v. Government agencies: The youth employment service and the various services of the Department of Employment provide means of recruitment, which is either free of charge or cost very little. The choice offered by these services is to seek jobs by other methods and do not register with the appropriate government agency.
- vi. Professional bodies: Many professional bodies have an employment services with which their members can register, supplying details of their experience and kind of job they are looking for. An employer who uses this service can be sure that all the candidates submitted to him are professionally qualified, and if the vacancy he wishes to fill requires a certain qualification the limited choice offered is not a disadvantage.
- vii. Private agencies: These are organizations that are run as commercial enterprises for supplying employers with candidates for jobs.
- viii. Advertising: The most popular method of recruitment is to advertise the vacancy in the mass media and invite candidates to apply to the company.

Selection

The application form: Whatever method of recruitment is used, the candidate should be asked to fill up an application form and to ensure that no important details are omitted. According to Dale (1978: 259) the layout of application forms varies, but most of them contain the following headings, usually in this order:

1. Job applied for;
2. Name, Address, Telephone number, e-mail;
3. Date and place of birth, Marital status, Nationality;
4. Education;
5. Training and Qualifications;
6. Medical history (e.g. any serious illness, whether disabled);
7. Employment history (names of previous employees, description of jobs held, dates of employment, reasons for leaving);
8. Any other information the candidate wishes to provide;
9. A signature under the words "this information is correct to the best of my knowledge";
10. Date.

The application form is not the only basis of selection, but it is the fundamental document in an employee's personnel record and has legal importance in the contract of employment.

Selection methods: Choosing the right person for the job is critical to the organization's success and a poor or inappropriate choice cannot only be costly to the organization, but demoralizing to the employee (who finds him/himself in the wrong job) and not motivating to the rest of the work force.

The manager's next step is to compare the application form with the personnel specification, looking for attributes, which show the candidates to be apparently suitable for the job and shortcomings, which may either rule out the candidate from consideration or necessitate special training if he were engaged. The manager will have decided what type of interview should be given to individuals, successive or panel and what test should be used e.g. an intelligent test, or aptitude test.

Selection Techniques: These can be summarized as short-listing, test and exercise, presentations, the selection, interview, recording the outcomes, making a decision and securing the appointment.

Offer of the job: Assuming that a suitable candidate has emerged from the selection process, she/he would then receive an offer. It is usual for her/him to

be made an oral offer, and if he accepts it he is given a written offer. The initial offer of a job needs special care, particularly as regards the following points:

- i. The wage or salary offered must not only be appropriate to the job and attractive to the candidate but consistent with the earning of present employees;
- ii. The job must be named and any special conditions stated;
- iii. The candidate must know the essential conditions of employment;
- iv. Any provision must be clearly stated; and
- v. The next stage must be clearly defined: if the candidate asks for time for consideration, it must be agreed when he will get in touch.

References: This is an important addition to the information available to the employing organization in deciding whether or not to confirm an offer of appointment. The verbal offer of appointment following interview is normally made subject to satisfactory references, health checks and sometimes police checks and careful account should be taken of these references in determining whether or not to offer a post.

Induction: The process of receiving the employee when he begins work, introducing him to the organisation and his colleagues, and informing him of the activities, customs and traditions of the organisation is called Induction. It may be regarded as the beginning of training or the final stage of the selection process. It has also been shown to have a close relationship with labour turn over.

3.3 Compensation: Wages and Salary

Wages is defined as the need and in return of a piece of work done immediately. This is specifically for "blue collar labour" or as it is popularly called casual labour. Skillful "white collar labour" gets the reward or salary. Salary is defined as the reward paid to employees after weeks or a month in return for the skillful or un-routine labour. Wages/salaries are structured according to its various elements, and the extent that different organizations can cope. Collective bargaining applies to those arrangements in which wages/salaries and conditions of employment are settled by bargaining in form of an agreement made between employees or association of employers and workers organization. A compensation package is comprised of basic salary and one or more of the following allowances/premiums.

- 1) **Cost of living differential:** This takes into consideration the differences in cost in various parts of the world so that expatriates can enjoy the same, if not better standard of living they were accustomed to at home.

- 2) **Foreign Service premium:** Beside cost of living differential, multinationals pay a Foreign Service premium to induce an employee to a foreign assignment.
- 3) **Relocation allowances:** Some multinationals pay a lump sum outright to offset nonrecurring incidental cost necessitated by relocation.
- 4) **Hardship and danger premium:** Danger pay applies to specific emergency situations, such as war, or political unrest, and it is discontinued once the emergency situation ceases. Hardship premium on the hand represents an on going allowance for assignment to countries with hardship living conditions, such as climate, or inadequate amenities. Besides monetary incentives many multinationals adopt other measures to make assignments to hardship location more bearable, such as shorter durations of overseas assignment and more frequent relation to seaside resort or home leave.

Salary Structure

Salary is a fixed periodical payment to a manual employee. It is usually expressed in annual terms, implying a relatively permanent employment relationship, though normally paid at monthly intervals. In many ways it resembles a retaining fee. Salaried workers are usually termed staff. The total remuneration of employees often consists of many different payment elements. These elements include:

1. Basic rate;
2. Incentive bonuses;
3. "Dirty money";
4. Shift allowance;
5. Merit allowance, etc.

These elements can be categorized and seen as relating either to the job content itself, the individual, special circumstances surrounding the job or the organization's policy aimed at retaining employees. Wages/salaries have some components namely:

1. Job rate which relates to the importance of the job;
2. Payments associated with encouraging individuals or group by rewarding them according to their performance;
3. Special or personal allowances associated with such factors as scarcity of particular skills or categories of employees or long services; and
4. Fringe benefits such as holiday with pay, pensions, life insurance, car and so on.

Surely, salary structures differ to the extent in which they incorporate these components. Generally the job rate is used as a basis for calculating performance and other bonuses and for determining the job holidays entitlement to fringe benefits.

Wages/salaries are paid to employees on the following purposes:

- a. As reward for service rendered by labours;
- b. As motivation to employees;
- c. As determinants of the employees purchasing power;
- d. As a social status determinant rather than a mere remuneration package.

Wages/salaries are determined based on several factors like:

- i. The ability to pay;
- ii. Government policy; and
- iii. Collective bargaining agreements.

Characteristics of Salaries

A salary differs from a wage in many respects, reflecting the different attitudes traditionally held by an employer towards his non-manual employees compared with his manual employees:

- a) A salary is usually all-inclusive; there are no additional payments of danger money or productivity bonus, for example;
- b) A salary is progressive, in most cases increasing annually, whereas a wage earner reaches the standard rate for the job early in adult life and does not receive annual increment;
- c) A salary is often regarded as personal to the individual, but a wage is sum paid to all workers at a particular job;
- d) A salary is often confidential but there is no secret about a wage; and
- e) In the private sector of employment, salaries, unlike wages, are seldom the subject of trade union negotiations.

Salary Administration

There are three typical ways in which an organization can administer its salaries:

- a. Ad hoc, in which there is no attempt at any kind of job evaluation to assess a fair level of salary for a job. Increases in salary are given erratically, often at the demand of the employee rather than at the initiative of the company. In a small company this method is workable. But in a large company it can produce an illogical and unfair salary structure, which will cause discontent and jealousy. For obvious reasons salaries paid by this system are intended to be confidential.

- b. Merit review, usually found in medium and large companies in the private sector. After job evaluation, a salary range is attached to every staff job. Employees are appraised and given merit increases each year, which will move their salaries at varying speeds through the range. In this way individual effort and merit are rewarded. It is customary for salaries under this system to be kept confidential: in most cases the employees do not know the maximum salary it is possible to earn in their job.
- c. Incremental scale found above all in the public sector e.g. the civil service, local government and nationalized companies though its use appears to be increasing in private sector. All stall jobs are evaluated and graded, the salary range appearing as, most schemes permit a manager to award a double increment for exceptional merit or withhold an increment for unsatisfactory work or conduct, but as a rule the standard increment is given automatically. In this system long service and loyalty are encouraged by regular higher grade. It is customary for salaries in the incremental system to be non-confidential.

Wage Structure

A wage is the payment made to manual workers. It is nearly always expressed as a rate per hour. The foundation of a manual worker's earnings is his basic time wage, which is often fixed by job evaluation and is subject in most industries to minimum rates agreed in national collective bargaining or laid down by wages councils. He is paid the hourly rate for every hour he attends work, though he is frequently fined for lateness by quartering e.g. for being five minutes late, he will lose a quarter of an hour's pay. In addition to the basic rate he will often receive other payments, the most common examples of which are:

- i. **Overtime:** Pay for any work done beyond normal hours. It is usually paid at premium rates, i.e. at time and a quarter time and a half, double time, etc, the rate varying according to the time or the day on which the overtime is worked.
- ii. **Shift:** Pay for employees who work unusual or charging hours to compensate them for inconveniences and hardship. The amount of shift pay varies in different industries, but seems to range from about ten to twenty percent of the basic rate.
- iii. **Special additions:** E.g. danger money, dirty money or wet money that are paid to the employees during abnormal working conditions. Since the circumstances that justify these additions are hard to define, many employers find it preferable to allocate it as contingencies in job evaluation rather than give special extra payments that is often difficult to take away again.
- iv. **Merit or length of service:** Additions to employees either on the results of appraisal or on completion of a certain period of service. Merit

payments are not very popular with wage earners, who feel they are influenced by prejudice and subjective judgments. Length of service payments has an approximate relationship with merit, encourage employees to stay with the company, and can be precisely defined.

- v. **Cost of living allowances:** Are given quite commonly to employees who work in the Lagos, Abuja or Port Harcourt areas, but with that exception are now consolidated into the basic wage.
- vi. **Policy allowances:** They cover miscellaneous extra payments, like the addition to the job-evaluated rate for temporarily scarce employee.
- vii. **Payment by results bonus:** This is an extra payment based on the output of the worker or of the group to which he belongs.

In private industry, about seventy percent of a manual worker's total earnings are on the average accounted for by his basic wage and about thirty percent by a selection from the additional payments. Total earnings have increased at a faster rate than basic wages because the additional payments have become proportionately larger. It should be noted that they are decided entirely within the company, often at a fairly low level of management, and are not easily influenced by government's action.

3.4 Staff Training and Development

According to Johnson (1972), the knowledge required of a senior executive of an organization includes:

1. A thorough knowledge of his disciplines and some understanding of related discipline;
2. A thorough understanding of the logical and analytical techniques;
3. Knowledge or understanding of the community which he is serving in terms of what it is, what it wants etc; and
4. Understanding of the art and science of management.

The concept of training, education and staff development

Some authors use these three terms interchangeably. Here, we shall regard them as a continuum. Education may be defined as a generalizing process intended to prepare an individual to deal with unexpected and unpredicted situations in life. Training is concerned with a deliberate and systematic attempt to develop and or improve the capability profile in a pattern of skill, knowledge and attitude - required by an individual to accomplish a given task.

On the other hand, staff development relates to the systematic development of the individual career so that his interests, abilities, education, formal and informal training and work responsibilities are related to one another, with the intention of realizing his full potentials. Hence development is to cause to grow larger, fuller or more mature or advance to a higher status.

Organisation Training Needs

Training should not be undertaken for its own sake. It must be seen to relate to the objectives of the particular organization. This is necessary because organizations differ in culture and in order to work out a training programme, the Training Needs

Analysis of each organization will have to be assessed or ascertained.

The following questions are relevant at this juncture

(a) Present Position:

1. What manpower do we have?
2. What training has this manpower had?
3. What are the deficiencies viz what skills are lacking?

(b) Based on Organization Objectives:

1. Who needs to be trained?
2. What categories of employees need specific training programme - machine operator, Mechanics, supervisors or managers?
3. How many of each category needs to be trained?
4. How much time/cost is available for the training?

Types of Training

Training may be specialized or general, internal or external, adhoc or regular etc. The various types of training which can be used in an organization in various combinations for maximum impact and effectiveness include:

- a. Induction training - general or specialized;
- b. Career development;
- c. On the job training;
- d. Departmental training;
- e. Organization development (OD);
- f. Occupational training;
- g. Organizational training e.g. ASCON, CMD, ARMTI, etc;
- h. Learning new techniques and concepts;
- i. Remedial training;
- j. Aiding displaced employees;
- k. Training for advancement;
- l. Apprenticeship e.g. construction workers, printers, etc.; and
- m. Training the disadvantaged etc.

3.5 Techniques of managing Manpower Development

The following are some of the important on-the-job and off the job techniques of management development:

Coaching - Trainee is placed under a particular supervisor who act as an instructor and teaches the job knowledge, skills and attitude;

Counseling - involves a discussion between the boss and his subordinates on areas concerned with the man's hopes, fears, emotions and aspirations.

Job rotation - transferring of executives to job and from department to department in a systematic manner.

Off-the-job Techniques

These will include among others:

- i. The case study;
- ii. Incident study;
- iii. Role-playing;
- iv. Business games;
- v. Sensitivity training;
- vi. Simulation; and
- vii. Conferences and lectures.

Case Study

Cases are prepared on the basis of actual business situations that happened in various organizations. Here, the situation is generally described and the trainees have distinguish the significant facts from the insignificant once, analyze the facts, identify different alternative solutions, select and suggest the best solution.

Role Playing

A problem situation is simulated by asking the participants to assume the role of a particular person in the situation. The particular interacts with others assuming different role. Roles' playing gives the participants various experiences, which are of many uses to understand people better. This method teaches human relation skills through actual practice.

Business Game

Under this method, the trainees are divided into groups or teams. Each has to discuss and arrive at decisions concerning such subjects as producing, pricing, research expenditure, advertising etc. assuming itself to be the management of a stimulated firm. The other teams assume themselves as competitors and react to the discussions. Any immediate feedback helps to know the relative performance of each team. The team's co-operative decision promotes greater interactions among participants and gives them the experience in the co-operative group process.

Sensitivity Training (T - Groups)

This is an intervention technique that attempts to give the person more insight into his or her own behavior as how that behaviour affects others. The main objective of this is the development of awareness of sensitivity, to behavioural patterns of oneself and others. Comphell and Dunnete (1968) have listed the objectives below. This development results in the (i) increased openness with others, (ii) greater concern for others; (iii) increased tolerance for individual differences (iv) less prejudice (v) understanding of group progress (vi) enhanced listening skills and (vii) increased trust and support. Delbeeq (1972:411) has described the process by which these objectives are attained as follows;

1. There is an initial lack of directive leadership and formal agenda and participants fill the behavioural vacuum by engaging in traditional behaviours such as status cue sending, power play etc.,
2. Feedback, based on member behaviour within the anxiety - laden environment is prioritized to confirm individual impressions of role effectiveness and personality impact.
3. Interpersonal relationship begins to develop, and members serve as resources to one another, previously untied personal and interpersonal behaviours, particularly collaborative behaviours, are attempted.
4. Relevance of the T-Group experience to back home situations is explained and problems are introduced to maximize transferability of what has been learned beyond the training laboratory.

Under this technique, the situation is duplicated in such a way that it carries a close resemblance to the actual job situation. The trainee experiences a feeling that he is actually encountering all these conditions. Then, he is asked to assume a particular role in the circumstances and solve the problems by making management decision and later, he is given a feedback of his performance.

Selection of Techniques

The success of any management development programme largely depends on the selection of the technique. The objectives of the programmes should always form the basis in the selection of techniques. However, it should also be remembered that no single technique can prove to be sufficient, but sometimes a combination of the techniques can make any management development programme effective. This is because all managers at all levels require all kinds of skills but in varied proportions.

3.6 Promotion, Transfer, Demotion and Retirement

Promotion

A promotion is a move of an employee to a job within the organization, which has greater importance and usually, higher pays. Frequently the job has higher

status and carries improved fringe benefits and more privileges. Its purpose is to improve both the utilization and motivation of employee. There are two main ways in which an organisation may promote its employees:

- a. By management decision, in which an employee is selected for promotion on the basis of information already known to the management. This method is quick and expensive and obviously very suitable for a small company or for jobs for which the field of possible candidates is small and well known. In large organizations, it may cause discontent because the decision is arrived at in secret, possible candidates not having the opportunity to state their qualifications for the post. In all cases, this method depends for its success on complete and up-to date employee records, which can be used to identify all possible candidates for any job.
- b. By internal advertisement, employees are told by notices or circulars that a post is vacant and they are then invited to apply. Some or all of the candidates are interviewed and finally selected. It is a comparatively expensive and time-consuming method, but is particularly suitable to a large organization in which management cannot be expected to have personal knowledge of possible candidates. It does not rely on accurate employee records, and, being open rather than secret, appears fairer to the candidates than the management decision methods. In the public sector promotions are made almost entirely through internal advertisements.

Normally, employees derive satisfaction from an organisation policy of promotion from within but badly handled promotions can cause dissatisfaction. The important points to note are:

- i. The criteria for promotion must be fair - usually a combination of ability, relevant experience and length of service;
- ii. The method must be fair;
- iii. Selection for promotion must be based on appraisals by present and past managers;
- iv. The wage or salary offered to the promoted employee must be what the job deserves rather than what the management thinks he will accept; and
- v. Unsuccessful candidates must be sympathetically treated.

Transfer:

A transfer is a move to a job within the organization, which has approximately equal important status and pay. To manage human resources in a constructive way it is sometimes necessary to transfer employees to other jobs, sometimes because of changed work requirements and sometimes because an employee is unhappy or dissatisfied in the present job. In some organisations it is the custom for the least satisfactory employees to be transferred from one department to another with the result that a transfer is regarded as discreditable, particularly if it occurs at short notice and without explanation. An unhappy employee may

therefore prefer to leave the organisation rather than seek a transfer. In other organisations transfers are used as a means of developing promising employees by giving them experience in several departments. A few companies internally advertise all vacancies, and consider applicants for whom the new job would be a transfer rather than a promotion.

Transfers can increase job satisfaction and improve utilization under following circumstances:

1. A transfer is regarded as a re-selection;
2. The need for a transfer is explained;
3. Unsatisfactory employees are not dealt with by transferring them to other department;
4. Requests by employees for transfers are fully investigated; and
5. Employee transferred to another district is given financial assistance from the company to overcome removal costs, legal fees, re-furnishing etc.

Demotion

A demotion is a move to a job within the company, which is lower in importance. It is usually, though not always, accompanied by a reduction in pay. An employee may be demoted for these reasons:

- a. Her/his job may disappear or become less important through company reorganization.
- b. He may no longer be thought capable of carrying out his present responsibilities efficiently.

Unless the employees asked for it, demotion will probably have adverse effects as follows:

- i. There will be less satisfaction of esteem and self-actualization needs. The employee may show negative reactions to frustration.
- ii. He may become a center of discontents in the company.
- iii. Other employees may lose confidence in the company.

Retirement

Social security retirement pensions are at present paid at sixty years for men and women in Nigeria, providing retirement from work takes place. The retirement policies of employers are usually based on this age or length of service. An employer's pension scheme (if one exists) is designed to conform with retire age when the employee is expected to retire. There are two schools of thought about

the age of retirement; one maintains that the age should be minimal while suitable and fit employees could be allowed to work on after this age. The others believe in a fixed retirement age.

The advantages of flexible retirement policy are:

1. Many employees are fit and active well beyond the official retirement age. By working on, they benefit financially and the employer profits from their knowledge and experience; and
2. The financial burden on the pension scheme may be reduced.

The disadvantages of this policy are:

- a. Eventually the employer must decide that an employee is no longer fit to work; the decision may not be accepted by the employee, who may make accusations of favouritism if others that are older than him are still working;
- b. Promotion may be held up if a senior employee does not retire, causing promising employees to leave the company;
- c. The employee, not knowing when he will be asked to leave, cannot easily plan for retirement; and
- d. The organization cannot plan its manpower when retirement ages are uncertain.

Moreover, a company, which adopts a fixed retirement age policy, insists on all its employees retiring from their present jobs at a certain age, although sometimes they are offered re-employment in a junior capacity for a limited period.

The advantages of this policy are:

- i. Employees can plan for retirement more easily;
- ii. No individual judgments about efficiency have to be made;
- iii. The company can plan its manpower more precisely; and
- iv. Promotion is not held up.

3.7 Manpower Planning

According to Nwachukwu (1988, p.100), the process by which management attempts to provide for its human resources to accomplish planning as an attempt to forecast how many and what kind of employees will be required in the future, and to what extent this demand is likely to be met. Also, Boway (1974) defines it as an activity of management which is aimed at coordinating the requirement for, and availability of different types of employees. This entails ensuring that the organization has enough of the right kind of person. It may also involve adjusting the requirement to the available supply. Cole (1999)

defines manpower planning as a rational approach to the recruitment, retention, utilization, improvement and disposition of an organization's human resources. It is concerned with quality as it is with quantity.

In whichever way it is defined, the fact remains that manpower planning is a crucial task that must be faced by human resource managers in all organizations. One of the major problems confronting any organization is the most effective way of matching people with jobs. The perennial question that experts often ask is whether we should design the job to suit the individual or get the individual to fit into a job position.

Manpower planning is both dynamic and complex. Manpower planning is dynamic and it requires frequent readjustments because; goals of the organization and its environment are dynamic and unstable. Since manpower planning is done to fit me to jobs or vice versa, for the achievement of the organization's objectives, it is necessary to adjust manpower planning from time to time to the needs of the organization. Sometimes, manpower planning can even call for a review of organizational objectives. According to Graham (1989, p.149), a manpower planning must include feedback because if the plan cannot be fulfilled, the objectives of the company may have to be modified so that they are feasible in manpower terms.

Types of manpower planning

Generally, manpower is categorized into different types primarily on the basis of time spent on planning. Manpower planning can therefore be classified into short-term and long-term.

Short-term manpower planning is much more common than the long-term. It usually covers a period up to one year ahead. According to Graham (1989, p.152), many organizations do not have the quality of management to forecast long-term objectives or they feel that the nature of their business makes it possible to look ahead for more than one year. Invariably, short-term manpower planning is easier to make than long-term. A long-term manpower plan is normally regarded as one which attempts to forecast for about five years ahead. Human resources managers are much more concerned with long term manpower planning not only because it is relevant and quite difficult to make, but also because it is complex.

The general process identified above applies to manpower planning in virtually all organizations. However, certain steps are important and must be taken by resources managers in the process of manpower planning.

Steps in manpower planning

Specifically, manpower planning can be classified into four (4) steps namely:

Assessment of needs

At this step, relevant questions such as what are the predicted employment needs of the organization, how many and what type of employees will be required in the organization in the future. The answers to these questions will enable the organization to work out the need for manpower. One of the methods of arriving at correct prediction is through job analysis. The job analysis method helps the organization to clearly define staffing needs. Areas covered in the analysis include:

- a. Work activities – what needs to be done;
- b. What tools and technology – what machines, tools and technology people will use;
- c. Knowledge requirement – what people must do to perform the job;
- d. Personnel requirement – what skills and experience people must possess to perform well;
- e. Job context i.e. the work schedules, physical, conditions, social environment of the job; and
- f. Performance standard – expected results.

Evaluation of manpower resources

To ascertain the current position, these questions are relevant; what skill, interest and experience do current employees have? What jobs are being done? How many employees are doing particular jobs? Are current employees the most likely candidates to meet the future needs and should therefore be the first one to be considered for new positions? The answer to these questions will go a long way in helping to evaluate the quality and potentials of current manpower available to a company.

Analysis of future availability

This step determines the job that employees are to hold in future. But promotion, transfers and termination affect this. Here, some moves are easier to predict than others. Changes such as retirement and some termination are easily predictable, this is not so with other movements. This notwithstanding, analysis of future availability of manpower is an important aspect of the planning process. Prediction of who is to be promoted, transferred or fixed allows managers to predict what jobs will be vacant.

A long-term manpower plan according to Graham (1989, p.149) is complex because it involves so many independent variables – invention, population, changes, resistance to change, consumer demands, government intervention, foreign competition and above all, domestic competition.

The process and steps in manpower planning

Like other types of planning, manpower planning is made from organizational objectives. When an organization's objectives are clearly stated, including which products to be produced, the methods to be used in production and the possible markets for the products, the demand for labour can be derived. The demand for labour is then related to supply to produce the manpower plan. The manpower planning process can then be described as below:

Preparation of recruitment and development plans: After the job analysis, recruitment process may start by the human resources manpower-planning manager developing a job description i.e. a specific statement of tasks involved in the job and condition under which the holder will work; also, job description of the kind of person who will be suitable for the job – including skills, education qualification and previous working knowledge or experience the job demand.

Importance of Manpower Planning to Organisation

Manpower planning can assist management in decision-making in the following areas:

- i. Recruitment: The right number of staff is recruited at each level in the organization hierarchy;
- ii. Avoidance of redundancies: The staffing requirement can be better balanced, ensuring that not more than required is recruited;
- iii. Training: Which number and categories of staff requires training and in what areas;
- iv. Management development;
- v. Estimates of labour cost;
- vi. Productivity bargaining; and
- vii. Accommodation requirements.

These and other importance of manpower planning to organization, make manpower planning a vital task in human resources management.

Limitations in Manpower Planning

Despite the importance and crucial nature of manpower, human resources management has some limitations (Graham 1989, p.153). In practice, manpower planning can be difficult and often inaccurate. Graham identified the following limitations in manpower planning:

- i. Opposition or skeptics among members of management would be convinced of the value of manpower planning if it is to be a success;
- ii. Resistance to the changes expressed in the plans. The forecast of the labour structure, with their effect on skills and status may be regarded as a threat;

- iii. Difficulty in forecasting economic and social changes accurately, especially in an era of high employment.
- iv. The plan may indicate recruitment and training programmes which although desirable may be impossible to put into practice. A company's financial position may find long plans useless; and
- v. The rapid growth of new technology.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the concepts of personnel management and related issues in terms of recruitment of personnel and their development.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to discuss the various definitions of personnel management. In addition, issues surrounding personnel recruitment, selection and placement were discussed. Also personnel compensation in terms of salary and wages were discussed. Added was discussion on promotion, transfer, demotion and retirement of personnel. The unit concluded with discussion on manpower development.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is personnel administration?
2. What differentiate wages from salary?
3. Explain promotion, transfer, demotion and retirement of personnel.
4. Discuss four types of manpower development.

7.0 References/Further Readings

- Bluny P. and Popoola, O. (1990), *Personnel Management in Africa*, USA: Longman Group Inc.
- Chrudan, H.J. and Sherman, A.W. (1976), *Personnel Management*: Cincinnati: Southwestern Publishing Company.
- Compbell, J.P. and Dunnette, M.D. (1968), 'Effectiveness of T-Group Experiences in Managerial Training and Development', *Psychological Bulletin*, 70:73-144.
- Dale, E. (1978), *Management: Theory and Practice*, Auckland: McGraw –Hill International Book Company.
- Delbeeq, A.L. (1972), 'Sensitivity Training' in Luthans (ed.) *Contemporary Readings in Organizational Behaviour*, London McGraw-Hill.
- Drucker, P. (1962), *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices*, London: Harper and Row.
- Dyer, L. (1982), 'Human Resources Planning', in Rowland, K. and G. Ferris (ed.), *The Management of Personnel/Human Resources: New Perspectives*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Graham, H.T. (1989), *Human Resources Management*, London: Mac Donald and Evans Ltd.
- Herzberg, F. Mausner, B. and Synderman, D.B., *The Motivation to Work*, in Dessler, G. (1976), *Organization and Management: A Contingency Approach*, Eagle-wood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- McLelland, C.D. (1961), *The Achievement Society*, London: D Van Nostrane Company Inc.
- McHehee, H.W. (1979), 'Training and Development Theory, Policies and Practices', in *ASPA Handbook of Personnel and Industrial Relations*, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs.
- Mcmahon, A. and Yearger R. (1976), 'Manpower and Career Planning', in Craig, R. *Training and Development Handbook*, London: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Morrison, J.H. (1976), 'Determine Training Needs', in Craig R., *Training and Development Handbook*, McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Miles, R.E. (1965), 'Human Relations or Human Resources' *Harvard Business Review* 43, No.4, 148-263.
- Warltec, C.L. (1952), *Executive Performance and Leadership*, Columbus: Ohio State University Research Foundation.
- Stodgill, R.M. (1948), 'Personnel Factors Associated with Leaders: A Survey of the Literature', *Journal of Psychology*, 25,35-71.

MODULE 3: SELECTED THEORIES OF ADMINISTRATION I

Unit 1: Scientific Management Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the scientific management theory and trace its evolution, its philosophy and its relation with mechanization and automation as well its impact in planned economies. Included are its negative sides and the reaction of organized labour to it. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the scientific management theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe scientific management theory,
2. Narrate its evolution,
3. Explain its philosophy,
4. Its relationship with mechanization,
5. Its impact on planned economy, and
6. Its negative sides.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Scientific Management Theory

Scientific management is a theory of management that analyses and synthesizes workflows, improving labor productivity. Scientific Management as a modern management began in the late 19th century. Scientific management also is a philosophy that sought to increase productivity and makes the work easier by scientifically studying work method and establishing standards. It is about the relationships between people and work, not a technique or an efficiency device. Besides that, scientific management also is based on a concern not only for the proper design of the job but also for the workers. Scientific Management also is a theory of management that analyzed and synthesized workflows. It is a term coined in 1910 to describe the system of industrial management and came to mean any system of organization that clearly spelled out the functions of individuals and groups.

Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915), was one of the early scientific management theorists. He is an engineer known as “Father of Scientific management”, focused on analyzing and redesigning jobs more efficiently. He searched for the best way to maximize performance. As a result of his work, he developed several scientific management principles. He believed that many workers of his time performed below their true capacities. Taylor developed

these four principles of scientific management for managers to follow. It also known as “Taylorism”:

1. Develop a science for each element of an individual’s work, which will replace the old rule-of-thumb method.
2. Scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop the worker.
3. Heartily cooperate with the workers so as to ensure that all work is done in accordance with the principles of the science that has been developed.
4. Divide work and responsibility almost equally between management and workers. Management takes over all work for which it is better fitted than the workers.

According to Taylor, Scientific management was a complete mental revolution for both management and employees towards their respective duties and toward each other. It was a new philosophy and attitude toward the use of human effort. It emphasized maximum output with minimum effort through the elimination of waste and inefficiency at the operative level. In Taylor view, the scientific study of work also emphasized specialization and division of labor. Thus, the need for an organizational framework became more and more apparent. The concepts of line and staff were developed. In an effort to motivate workers, wage incentives were developed in most scientific management programs.

Scientific management fundamentally consists of certain broad general principles, a certain philosophy, which can be applied in many ways, and a description of what any one man or men believe to be the best mechanism for applying these general principles should in no way be confused with the principles themselves. Under the management of “initiative and incentive”, practically the whole problem is “up to the workman”, while under scientific management fully one-half of the problem is “up to the management”.

Scientific management principles can improve productivity and had a substantial impact on industry. It also increased the monotony of work. Hence, scientific management is a thoughtful, organized, dual approach towards the job of management against hit or miss or Rule of Thumb. Taylor believed that if they were truly dependent on each other, cooperation would naturally follow.

In summary, Taylor and other scientific management pioneers believed employees could be motivated by economic rewards, provided those rewards were related to individual performance.

3.2 Evolution of Scientific Theory

Taylor began the theory's development in the United States during the 1880s and '90s within manufacturing industries, especially steel. Its peak of influence came in the 1910s. Taylor died in 1915 and by the 1920s, scientific management was still influential but had entered into competition and syncretism with opposing or complementary ideas.

Although scientific management as a distinct theory or school of thought was obsolete by the 1930s, most of its themes are still important parts of industrial engineering and management today. These include: analysis; synthesis; logic; rationality; empiricism; work ethic; efficiency and elimination of waste; standardization of best practices; disdain for tradition preserved merely for its own sake or to protect the social status of particular workers with particular skill sets; the transformation of craft production into mass production; and knowledge transfer between workers and from workers into tools, processes, and documentation.

Taylor's own names for his approach initially included "shop management" and "process management". However, "scientific management" came to national attention in 1910 when crusading attorney Louis Brandeis (then not yet Supreme Court justice) popularized the term. Brandeis had sought a consensus term for the approach with the help of practitioners like Henry L. Gantt and Frank B. Gilbreth. Brandeis then used the consensus of "scientific management" when he argued before the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) that a proposed increase in railroad rates was unnecessary despite an increase in labor costs; he alleged scientific management would overcome railroad inefficiencies. The ICC ruled against the rate increase, but also dismissed as insufficiently substantiated that concept the railroads were necessarily inefficient. Taylor recognized the nationally-known term "scientific management" as another good name for the concept, and adopted it in the title of his influential 1911 monograph.

The Midvale Steel Company, "one of America's great armor plate making plants," was the birthplace of scientific management. In 1877, at age 22, Frederick W. Taylor started as a clerk in Midvale, but advanced to foreman in 1880. As foreman, Taylor was "constantly impressed by the failure of his [team members] to produce more than about one-third of what he deemed a good day's work." Taylor determined to discover, by scientific methods, how long it should take men to perform each given piece of work; and it was in the fall of 1882 that he started to put the first features of scientific management into operation.

Horace Bookwalter Drury, in his 1918 work, *Scientific management: A History and Criticism*, identified six other leaders in the movement, most of whom learned of and extended scientific management from Taylor's efforts:

1. Henry L. Gantt (1861–1919)
2. Carl G. Barth (1860–1939)
3. Horace K. Hathaway (1878–1944)
4. Morris L. Cooke (1872–1960)
5. Sanford E. Thompson (1867–1949)
6. Frank B. Gilbreth (1868–1924).

Gilbreth's independent work on "motion study" is on record as early as 1885. After meeting Taylor in 1906 and being introduced to scientific management, Gilbert devoted his efforts to introducing scientific management into factories. Gilbreth and his wife Dr Lillian Moller Gilbreth (1878–1972) performed micro-motion studies using stop-motion cameras as well as developing the profession of industrial/organizational psychology.

Harrington Emerson (1853–1931) began determining what industrial plants' products and costs were compared to what they ought to be in 1895. Emerson did not meet Taylor until December 1900, and the two never worked together. Emerson's testimony in late 1910 to the Interstate Commerce Commission brought the movement to national attention and instigated serious opposition. Emerson contended the railroads might save \$1,000,000 a day by paying greater attention to efficiency of operation. By January 1911, a leading railroad journal began a series of articles denying they were inefficiently managed.

When steps were taken to introduce scientific management at the government-owned Rock Island Arsenal in early 1911, it was opposed by Samuel Gompers, founder and President of the American Federation of Labor (an alliance of craft unions). When a subsequent attempt was made to introduce the bonus system into the government's Watertown Arsenal foundry during the summer of 1911, the entire force walked out for a few days. Congressional investigations followed, resulting in a ban on the use of time studies and pay premiums in Government service.

Taylor's death in 1915 at age 59 left the movement without its original leader. In management literature today, the term "scientific management" mostly refers to the work of Taylor and his disciples ("classical", implying "no longer current, but still respected for its seminal value") in contrast to newer, improved iterations of efficiency-seeking methods. Today, task-oriented optimization of work tasks is nearly ubiquitous in industry.

3.3 Scientific Management's Philosophy

Flourishing in the late 19th and early 20th century, scientific management built on earlier pursuits of economic efficiency. While it was prefigured in the folk wisdom of thrift, it favored empirical methods to determine efficient procedures

rather than perpetuating established traditions. Thus, it was followed by a profusion of successors in applied science, including time and motion study, the Efficiency Movement which was a broader cultural echo of scientific management's impact on business managers specifically. Fordism, operations management, operations research, industrial engineering, management science, manufacturing engineering, logistics, business process management, business process reengineering, lean manufacturing, and Six Sigma. There is a fluid continuum linking scientific management with the later fields, and the different approaches often display a high degree of compatibility.

Taylor rejected the notion, which was universal in his day and still held today, that the trades, including manufacturing, were resistant to analysis and could only be performed by craft production methods. In the course of his empirical studies, Taylor examined various kinds of manual labor. For example, most bulk materials handling was manual at the time; material handling equipment as we know it today was mostly not developed yet. He looked at shoveling in the unloading of railroad cars full of ore; lifting and carrying in the moving of iron pigs at steel mills; the manual inspection of bearing balls; and others. He discovered many concepts that were not widely accepted at the time. For example, by observing workers, he decided that labor should include rest breaks so that the worker has time to recover from fatigue, either physical (as in shoveling or lifting) or mental (as in the ball inspection case). Workers were allowed to take more rests during work, and productivity increased as a result.

Subsequent forms of scientific management were articulated by Taylor's disciples, such as Henry Gantt; other engineers and managers, such as Benjamin S. Graham; and other theorists, such as Max Weber. Taylor's work also contrasts with other efforts, including those of Henri Fayol and those of Frank Gilbreth, Sr. and Lillian Moller Gilbreth whose views originally shared much with Taylor's but later diverged in response to Taylorism's inadequate handling of human relations.

Scientific management requires a high level of managerial control over employee work practices and entails a higher ratio of managerial workers to laborers than previous management methods. Such detail-oriented management may cause friction between workers and managers. Taylor observed that some workers were more talented than others, and that even smart ones were often unmotivated. He observed that most workers who are forced to perform repetitive tasks tend to work at the slowest rate that goes unpunished. This slow rate of work has been observed in many industries and many countries¹ and has been called by various terms. Taylor used the term "soldiering", a term that reflects the way conscripts may approach following orders, and observed that, when paid the same amount, workers will tend to do the amount of work that

the slowest among them does. Taylor describes soldiering as "the greatest evil with which the working-people ... are now afflicted."

This reflects the idea that workers have a vested interest in their own well-being, and do not benefit from working above the defined rate of work when it will not increase their remuneration. He therefore proposed that the work practice that had been developed in most work environments was crafted, intentionally or unintentionally, to be very inefficient in its execution. He posited that time and motion studies combined with rational analysis and synthesis could uncover one best method for performing any particular task, and that prevailing methods were seldom equal to these best methods. Crucially, Taylor himself prominently acknowledged that if each employee's compensation was linked to their output, their productivity would go up. Thus, his compensation plans usually included piece rates. In contrast, some later adopters of time and motion studies ignored this aspect and tried to get large productivity gains while passing little or no compensation gains to the workforce, which contributed to resentment against the system.

3.4 Relationship of Scientific Management to Mechanization and Automation

Scientific management evolved in an era when mechanization and automation were still in their infancy. The ideas and methods of scientific management extended the American system of manufacturing in the transformation from craftwork with humans as the only possible agents to mechanization and automation, although proponents of scientific management did not predict the extensive removal of humans from the production process. Concerns over labor-displacing technologies rose with increasing mechanization and automation.

By factoring processes into discrete, unambiguous units, scientific management laid the groundwork for automation and offshoring, prefiguring industrial process control and numerical control in the absence of any machines that could carry it out. Taylor and his followers did not foresee this at the time; in their world, it was *humans* that would execute the optimized processes. For example, although in their era the instruction "open valve A whenever pressure gauge B reads over value X" would be carried out by a human, the fact that it had been reduced to an algorithmic component paved the way for a machine to be the agent. However, one of the common threads between their world and ours is that the agents of execution need not be "smart" to execute their tasks. In the case of computers, they are *not able* (yet) to be "smart" (in that sense of the word); in the case of human workers under scientific management, they were often *able* but were *not allowed*. Once the time-and-motion men had completed their studies of a particular task, the workers had very little opportunity for

further thinking, experimenting or suggestion-making. They were forced to "play dumb" most of the time, which occasionally led to revolts.

The middle ground between the craft production of skilled workers and full automation is occupied by systems of extensive mechanization and partial automation operated by semiskilled and unskilled workers. Such systems depend on algorithmic workflows and knowledge transfer, which require substantial engineering to succeed. Although Taylor's intention for scientific management was simply to optimize work methods, the process engineering that he pioneered also tends to build the skill into the equipment and processes, removing most need for skill in the workers. Such engineering has governed most industrial engineering since then. It is also the essence of successful offshoring. The common theme in all these cases is that businesses engineer their way out of their need for large concentrations of skilled workers, and the high-wage environments that sustain them. This creates competitive advantage on the local level of individual firms, although the pressure it exerts systemically on employment and employability is an externality.

3.5 Scientific theory and planned economies

Scientific management appealed to managers of planned economies because central economic planning relies on the idea that the expenses that go into economic production can be precisely predicted and can be optimized by design. The opposite theoretical pole would be laissez-faire thinking in which the invisible hand of free markets is the only possible "designer". In reality most economies today are somewhere in between. Another alternative for economic planning is workers' self-management.

Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union, Taylorism was advocated by Aleksei Gastev and *nauchnaia organizatsia truda* (*the movement for the scientific organisation of labor*). It found support in both Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky. Gastev continued to promote this system of labor management until his arrest and execution in 1939. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Soviet Union enthusiastically embraced Fordism and Taylorism, importing American experts in both fields as well as American engineering firms to build parts of its new industrial infrastructure. The concepts of the Five Year Plan and the centrally planned economy can be traced directly to the influence of Taylorism on Soviet thinking. As scientific management was believed to epitomize American efficiency, Joseph Stalin even claimed that "the combination of the Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency is the essence of Leninism."

Sorensen was one of the consultants who brought American know-how to the USSR during this era, before the Cold War made such exchanges unthinkable. As the Soviet Union developed and grew in power, both sides, the Soviets and the Americans, chose to ignore or deny the contribution that American ideas and expertise had made to the Soviets because they wished to portray themselves as creators of their own destiny and not indebted to a rival, and the Americans because they did not wish to acknowledge their part in creating a powerful communist rival. Anti-communism had always enjoyed widespread popularity in America, and anti-capitalism in Russia, but after World War II, they precluded any admission by either side that technologies or ideas might be either freely shared or clandestinely stolen.

East Germany

By the 1950s, scientific management had grown, but its goals and practices remained attractive and were also being adopted by the German Democratic Republic as it sought to increase efficiency in its industrial sectors. In the accompanying photograph from the German Federal Archives, workers discuss standards specifying how each task should be done and how long it should take. The workers are engaged in a state-planned instance of process improvement, but they are pursuing the same goals that were contemporaneously pursued in capitalist societies, as in the Toyota Production System.

3.6 The Legacy of Scientific Management

Scientific management was one of the first attempts to systematically treat management and process improvement as a scientific problem. It may have been the first to do so in a "bottom-up" way and found a lineage of successors that have many elements in common. With the advancement of statistical methods, quality assurance and quality control began in the 1920s and 1930s. During the 1940s and 1950s, the body of knowledge for doing scientific management evolved into operations management, operations research, and management cybernetics. In the 1980s total quality management became widely popular, and in the 1990s "re-engineering" went from a simple word to a mystique. Today's Six Sigma and lean manufacturing could be seen as new kinds of scientific management, although their evolutionary distance from the original is so great that the comparison might be misleading. In particular, Shigeo Shingo, one of the originators of the Toyota Production System, believed that this system and Japanese management culture in general should be seen as a kind of scientific management.

Peter Drucker saw Frederick Taylor as the creator of knowledge management, because the aim of scientific management was to produce knowledge about how to improve work processes. Although the typical application of scientific management was manufacturing, Taylor himself advocated scientific

management for all sorts of work, including the management of universities and government. For example, Taylor believed scientific management could be extended to "the work of our salesmen". Shortly after his death, his acolyte Harlow S. Person began to lecture corporate audiences on the possibility of using Taylorism for "sales engineering". Person was talking about what is now called sales process engineering—engineering the processes that salespeople use—not about what we call sales engineering today. This was a watershed insight in the history of corporate marketing.

Google's methods of increasing productivity and output can be seen to be influenced by Taylorism as well. The Silicon Valley Company is a forerunner in applying behavioral science to increase knowledge worker productivity. In classic scientific management as well as approaches like lean management or business process reengineering leaders and experts develop and define standard. Leading high-tech companies use the concept of nudge management to increase productivity of employees. More and more business leaders start to make use of this new scientific management.

Today's militaries employ all of the major goals and tactics of scientific management, if not under that name. Of the key points, all but wage incentives for increased output are used by modern military organizations. Wage incentives rather appear in the form of skill bonuses for enlistments.

Scientific management has had an important influence in sports, where stop watches and motion studies rule the day. Taylor himself enjoyed sports, especially tennis and golf. He and a partner won a national championship in doubles tennis. He invented improved tennis racquets and improved golf clubs, although other players liked to tease him for his unorthodox designs, and they did not catch on as replacements for the mainstream implements).

Modern human resources can be seen to have begun in the scientific management era, most notably in the writings of Katherine M. H. Blackford, who was also a proponent of eugenics. Practices descended from scientific management are currently used in offices and in medicine (e.g. managed care) as well.

In the 21st century the tendency to overcome Taylorism is very great. The trend is moving away from assembly line work, since people are increasingly being replaced by machines in production plants and sub-processes are automated, so that human labor is not necessary in these cases. The desire for automated workflow in companies is intended to reduce costs and support the company at the operational level.

Furthermore, it can be observed that many companies try to make the workplace as comfortable as possible for the employees. This is achieved by light flooded rooms, Feng Shui methods in the workplace or even by creative jobs. The efficiency and creativity of the employees is to be promoted by a

pleasant atmosphere at the workplace. Approaches of the Scientific Management, in which attempts are also made to make the work environment pleasant, are partly recognizable here.

In the works of Gouldner and Crozier, the recognition of the plurality of industrial forms is being discussed. In the 21st century, we have a modern corporate management, where managers are given the available positions in companies and are given the right to take legal action.

The working world of the 21st century is mainly based on Total Quality Management. This is derived from quality control. In contrast to Taylorism, by which products are produced in the shortest possible time without any form of quality control and delivered to the end customer, the focus in the 21st century is on quality control at TQM. In order to avoid error rates, it is necessary to hire specialists to check all the products which have been manufactured before they are delivered to the end customer. The quality controls have improved over time, and incorrect partial processes can be detected in time and removed from the production process.

Taylorism approaches are largely prevalent in companies where machines can not perform certain activities. Certain subprocesses are still to be carried out by humans, such as the sorting out of damaged fruit in the final process before the goods are packed by machines. It turns out that the quality control is ultimately to be verified by the individual man. Certain activities remain similar to the approach of Taylorism. There are no "zero error programs", employees have to be trained and thus reduce error rates.

Through the invention of the management one managed positions, which are equipped with disposition rights. The positions are occupied by paid employees and form the basis for the current, modern corporate management. In order to be able to perceive these positions, it was no longer necessary to bring in resources such as capital, but instead qualifications were necessary. Written rights are also passed on to employees, which means that the leaders of an organization tend to fall into the background and merely have a passive position.

The structure and size of a company must be distinguished. Depending on which dispositions are predominant, the size of the company, the sector, and the number of employees in an organization, one can examine whether approaches of Taylorism are prevalent. It is believed to be predominant in the automotive industry. In spite of the fact that a lot of activities have been replaced by machines during the production, it is ultimately the person who can check the quality of a product.

Taylorism led to a performance increase in companies. All superfluous working steps are avoided. The company benefits from the productivity of the workers and this in turn from higher wages. Unused productivity resources were effectively exploited by Taylorism.

Today's work environment in the 21st century benefits from the humanity of working conditions. Corporate strategies are increasingly focused on the flexibility of work. Flexible adaptation to demand should be possible. The qualifications of the employees, the work content as well as the work processes are determined by the competition situation on the market. The aim is to promote self-discipline and the motivation of employees in order to achieve their own tasks and at the same time to prevent monotonous work. Technical progress has led to more humane working conditions since inhumane work steps are done by the machines.

Taylorism's approach is called inhuman. The increased wage alone is not a permanent incentive for the workers to carry out the same monotonous work. Worker-friendly work structures are required. People no longer want to be perceived merely as executive organ. The complete separation from manual and headwork leads to a lack of pleasure in the execution of the work steps.

In the 21st century the rising level of education leads to better trained workers, but the competitive pressure also rises. The interplay of economic as well as the pressure to innovate also led to uncertainty among employees. The national diseases in the 21st century have become burn-out phenomena and depressions, often in conjunction with the stress and the increased performance pressure in the work.

3.7 The negative sides of Scientific Theory

Other thinkers soon offered more ideas on the roles that workers play in mature industrial systems. These included ideas on improvement of the individual worker with attention to the worker's needs, not just the needs of the whole. James Hartness published *The Human Factor in Works Management* in 1912, while Frank Gilbreth and Lillian Moller Gilbreth offered their own alternatives to Taylorism. The human relations school of management evolved in the 1930s to complement rather than replace scientific management, with Taylorism determining the organisation of the work process, and human relations helping to adapt the workers to the new procedures. Today's efficiency-seeking methods, such as lean manufacturing, include respect for workers and fulfillment of their needs as integral parts of the theory. Workers slogging their way through workdays in the business world do encounter flawed implementations of these methods that make jobs unpleasant, but these implementations generally lack managerial competence in matching theory to execution. Clearly, a syncretism has occurred since Taylor's day, although its implementation has been uneven, as lean management in capable hands has produced good results for both managers and workers, but in incompetent hands has damaged enterprises.

With the division of labor that became commonplace as Taylorism was implemented in manufacturing, workers lost their sense of connection to the production of goods. Workers began to feel disenfranchised with the monotonous and unfulfilling work they were doing in factories. Before scientific management, workers felt a sense of pride when completing their good, which went away when workers only completed one part of production. "The further 'progress' of industrial development... increased the anomic or forced division of labor," the opposite of what Taylor thought would be the effect. Partial adoption of Taylor's principles by management seeking to boost efficiency, while ignoring principles such as fair pay and direct engagement by managers, led to further tensions and the rise of unions to represent workers needs.

Taylor had a largely negative view of unions, and believed they only led to decreased productivity. Although he opposed them, his work with scientific management led disenfranchised workers to look to unions for support. Under scientific management, the demands of work intensified. Workers became dissatisfied with the work environment and became angry. During one of Taylor's own implementations at the Watertown Arsenal in Massachusetts, a strike led to an investigation of Taylor's methods by a U.S. House of Representatives committee. The committee reported in 1912, concluding that scientific management did provide some useful techniques and offered valuable organizational suggestions, but that it also gave production managers a dangerously high level of uncontrolled power. After an attitude survey of the workers revealed a high level of resentment and hostility towards scientific management, the Senate banned Taylor's methods at the arsenal.

Scientific management lowered worker morale and exacerbated existing conflicts between labor and management. As a consequence, the method inadvertently strengthened labor unions and their bargaining power in labor disputes, thereby neutralizing most or all of the benefit of any productivity gains it had achieved. Thus, its net benefit to owners and management ended up as small or negative. It took new efforts, borrowing some ideas from scientific management but mixing them with others, to produce more productive formula.

Scientific management may have exacerbated grievances among workers about oppressive or greedy management. It certainly strengthened developments that put workers at a disadvantage: the erosion of employment in developed economies via both offshoring and automation. Both were made possible by the deskilling of jobs, which was made possible by the knowledge transfer that scientific management achieved. Knowledge was transferred both to cheaper

workers and from workers into tools. Jobs that once would have required craft work first transformed to semiskilled work, then unskilled. At this point the labor had been commoditized, and thus the competition between workers and worker populations moved closer to pure than it had been, depressing wages and job security. Jobs could be offshored giving one human's tasks to others—which could be good for the new worker population but was bad for the old or they could be rendered nonexistent through automation giving a human's tasks to machines. Either way, the net result from the perspective of developed-economy workers was that jobs started to pay less, then disappear. The power of labor unions in the mid-twentieth century only led to a push on the part of management to accelerate the process of automation, hastening the onset of the later stages just described. In a central assumption of scientific management, "the worker was taken for granted as a cog in the machinery." While scientific management had made jobs unpleasant, its successors made them less remunerative, less secure, and finally nonexistent as a consequence of structural unemployment.

It is often assumed that Fordism derives from Taylor's work. Taylor apparently made this assumption himself when visiting the Ford Motor Company's Michigan plants not too long before he died, but it is likely that the methods at Ford were evolved independently, and that any influence from Taylor's work was indirect at best. Charles E. Sorensen, a principal of the company during its first four decades, disclaimed any connection at all. There was a belief at Ford, which remained dominant until Henry Ford II took over the company in 1945, that the world's experts were worthless, because if Ford had listened to them, it would have failed to attain its great successes. Henry Ford felt that he had succeeded *in spite of*, not *because of*, experts, who had tried to stop him in various ways disagreeing about price points, production methods, car features, business financing, and other issues. Sorensen thus was dismissive of Taylor and lumped him into the category of useless experts. Sorensen held the New England machine tool vendor Walter Flanders in high esteem and credits him for the efficient floor plan layout at Ford, claiming that Flanders knew nothing about Taylor. Flanders may have been exposed to the spirit of Taylorism elsewhere, and may have been influenced by it, but he did not cite it when developing his production technique. Regardless, the Ford team apparently did independently invent modern mass production techniques in the period of 1905-1915, and they themselves were not aware of any borrowing from Taylorism. Perhaps it is only possible with hindsight to see the zeitgeist that indirectly connected the budding Fordism to the rest of the efficiency movement during the decade of 1905-1915.

Criticism of Taylor's principles of effective workmanship and the productivity of the workers continues today. Often, his theories are

described as man-contemptuous and portrayed as now overhauled. In practice, however, the principles of Taylor are still being pursued by Kaizen and Six Sigma and similar methodologies, which are based on the development of working methods and courses based on systematic analysis rather than relying on tradition and rule of thumb.

Taylorism is, according to Stephen P. Waring, considered very controversial, despite its popularity. It is often criticized for turning the worker into an "automaton" or "machine". Due to techniques employed with scientific management, employees claim to have become overworked and were hostile to the process. Criticisms commonly came from workers who were subjected to an accelerated work pace, lower standards of workmanship, lower product-quality, and lagging wages. Workers defied being reduced to such machines, and objected to the practices of Taylorism. Many workers formed unions, demanded higher pay, and went on strike to be free of control issues. This ignited class conflict, which Taylorism was initially meant to prevent. Efforts to resolve the conflicts included methods of scientific collectivism, making agreements with unions, and the personnel management movement.

In the middle of 1960 some counter-movements to Taylorism arose. Representatives of the so-called Human Relations movement urged humanization and democratization of the working world. The criticism of Taylorism supports the unilateral approach of labor. Strictly speaking, Taylorism is not a scientific theory. All theories of F. W. Taylor are based on experiments. On the basis of samples, conclusions were made, which were then generalized. There is no representativeness of the selected sample.

Another reason for criticizing Taylor's methods stemmed from Taylor's belief that the scientific method included the calculations of exactly how much time it takes a man to do a particular task, or his rate of work. However, the opposition to this argument is that such a calculation relies on certain arbitrary, non-scientific decisions such as what constituted the job, which men were timed, and under which conditions. Any of these factors are subject to change, and therefore can produce inconsistencies. Some dismiss so-called "scientific management"/Taylorism as pseudoscience.

3.8 Organised Labour Reaction to Taylorism

In 1911, organized labor erupted with strong opposition to scientific management, spreading from Samuel Gompers, founder and President of the American Federal of Labor (AFL), in the US to far around the globe. By 1913 Vladimir Lenin wrote that the "most widely discussed topic today in Europe, and to some extent in Russia, is the 'system' of the American engineer,

Frederick Taylor"; Lenin decried it as merely a "'scientific' system of sweating" more work from laborers. Again in 1914, Lenin derided Taylorism as "man's enslavement by the machine." However, after the Russian Revolutions brought him to power, Lenin wrote in 1918 that the "Russian is a bad worker who must learn to work. The Taylor system... is a combination of the refined brutality of bourgeois exploitation and a number of the greatest scientific achievements in the field of analysing mechanical motions during work, the elimination of superfluous and awkward motions, the elaboration of correct methods of work, the introduction of the best system of accounting and control, etc. The Soviet Republic must at all costs adopt all that is valuable in the achievements of science and technology in this field."

The early US history of labor relations with scientific management was described by Dr Drury thusly: ...for a long time there was thus little or no direct conflict between scientific management and organized labor... However, one of the best known experts once spoke to us with satisfaction of the manner in which, in a certain factory where there had been a number of union men, the labor organization had, upon the introduction of scientific management, gradually disintegrated. From 1882 when the system was started until 1911, a period of approximately thirty years, there was not a single strike under it, and this in spite of the fact that it was carried on primarily in the steel industry, which was subject to a great many disturbances. For instance, in the general strike in Philadelphia, one man only went out at the Tabor plant managed by Taylor, while at the Locomotive shops across the street two thousand struck.

Serious opposition may be said to have been begun in 1911, immediately after certain testimony presented before the Interstate Commerce Commission by Harrington Emerson revealed to the country the strong movement setting towards scientific management. National labor leaders, wide-awake as to what might happen in the future, decided that the new movement was a menace to their organization, and at once inaugurated an attack... centered about the installation of scientific management in the government arsenal at Watertown.

It intensifies the modern tendency toward specialization of the work and the task displaces skilled workers and weakens the bargaining strength of the workers through specialization of the task and the destruction of craft skill which leads to over-production and the increase of unemployment. It looks upon the worker as a mere instrument of production and reduces him to a semi-automatic attachment to the machine or tool and tends to undermine the worker's health, shortens his period of industrial activity and earning power, and brings on premature old age.

Owing to application of "scientific management" in part in government arsenals, and a strike by the union molders against some of its features as they were introduced in the foundry at the Watertown Arsenal, "scientific management"

received much publicity. The House of Representatives appointed a committee, consisting of William B. Wilson, William C. Redfield and John Q. Tilson to investigate the system as it had been applied in the Watertown Arsenal. In its report to Congress this committee sustained Labor's contention that the system forced abnormally high speed upon workmen, that its disciplinary features were arbitrary and harsh, and that the use of a stop-watch and the payment of a bonus were injurious to the worker's manhood and welfare. At a succeeding session of Congress a measure was passed which prohibited the further use of the stop-watch and the payment of a premium or bonus to workmen in government establishments.

The Watertown Arsenal in Massachusetts provides an example of the application and repeal of the Taylor system in the workplace, due to worker opposition. In the early 1901, neglect in the Watertown shops included overcrowding, dim-lighting, lack of tools and equipment, and questionable management strategies in the eyes of the workers. Frederick W. Taylor and Carl G. Barth visited Watertown in April 1909 and reported on their observations at the shops. Their conclusion was to apply the Taylor system of management to the shops to produce better results. Efforts to install the Taylor system began in June 1909. Over the years of time study and trying to improve the efficiency of workers, criticisms began to evolve. Workers complained of having to compete with one another, feeling strained and resentful, and feeling excessively tired after work. There is, however, no evidence that the times enforced were unreasonable. In June 1913, employees of the Watertown Arsenal petitioned to abolish the practice of scientific management there. A number of magazine writers inquiring into the effects of scientific management found that the "conditions in shops investigated contrasted favorably with those in other plants".

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit effort has been made to establish the description of scientific management theory, its evolution, legacy, impact on planned economy and negative sides.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe scientific management theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution, its philosophy and legacy were treated. Also relationship of scientific management theory to mechanization and automation and its impact on planned economies were discussed. Added was discussion on the negative sides of scientific management theory and the reaction of organized labour to it.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is Taylorism?
2. Describe the evolution of scientific management theory.
3. What are the impacts of Taylorism on planned economies?
4. What are the legacies of scientific management theory?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Aitken, Hugh G. J. (1985) [1960], *Scientific Management in Action: Taylorism at Watertown Arsenal, 1908-1915*, Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press, ISBN 978-0-691-04241-1, LCCN 84026462, OCLC 1468387. First published in 1960 by Harvard University Press. Republished in 1985 by Princeton University Press, with a new foreword by Merritt Roe Smith.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (200 I), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Beissinger, Mark R. (1988), *Scientific Management, Socialist Discipline, and Soviet Power*, London, UK: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, ISBN 978-1-85043-108-4.

Bonazzi, G. (2014). *Geschichte des organisatorischen Denkens*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.

Braverman, Harry (1998) [1974], *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York, NY, USA: Republication by Monthly Review Press, ISBN 0-85345-940-1.

Dawson, Michael (2005), *The Consumer Trap: Big Business Marketing in American Life* (paper ed.), Urbana, IL, USA: University of Illinois Press, ISBN 0-252-07264-2.

Drury, Horace Bookwalter (1915), *Scientific management: a history and criticism*, New York, NY, USA: Columbia University.

Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Mendling, J. & Reijers, H. (2013). *Fundamentals of Business Process Management*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.

Freriks, R. (1996). *Theoretische Modelle der Betriebsgröße im Maschinenbau. Koordination und Kontrollmechanismen bei organisatorischem Wachstum*. Opladen: Leske+ Budrich.

Hartness, James (1912), *The human factor in works management*, New York and London: McGraw-Hill, OCLC 1065709. Republished by Hive Publishing Company as *Hive management history series no. 46*, ISBN 978-0-87960-047-1.

Head, Simon (2005), *The New Ruthless Economy: Work and Power in the Digital Age*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, ISBN 978-0-19-517983-5.

Hebeisen, W. (1999). *F.W. Taylor und der Taylorismus. Über das Wirken und die Lehre Taylors und die Kritik am Taylorismus*. Zürich: vdf Hochschulverlag AG.

Henke, J. (2004). *Infoblatt Taylorismus. Frederick Winslow Taylor stellte Theorien zur Optimierung der Arbeit bzw. Unternehmen auf*. Leipzig: Klett Verlag.

Hounshell, David A. (1984), *From the American System to Mass Production, 1800-1932: The Development of Manufacturing Technology in the United States*, Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, ISBN 978-0-8018-2975-8, LCCN 83016269

Hughes, Thomas P. (2004) [1989], *American Genesis: A Century of Invention and Technological Enthusiasm, 1870–1970* (2nd ed.), Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, ISBN 978-0-14-009741-2, archived from the original on 2010-06-17.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), Contemporary Management, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Kanigel, Robert (1997), *The One Best Way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Enigma of Efficiency*, New York, NY, USA: Penguin-Viking, ISBN 978-0-670-86402-7. A detailed biography of Taylor and a historian's look at his ideas.

Koch, S. (2011). *Einführung in das Management von Geschäftsprozessen*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.

Laube, H. (2014). *Arbeiten im Silicon Valley. Wann ist endlich wieder Montag?* In: *Der Spiegel*.

McGaughey, Ewan, 'Behavioural Economics and Labour Law' (2014) LSE Legal Studies Working Paper No. 20/2014

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Mitcham, Carl (2005), "Management", Encyclopedia of science, technology, and ethics, **3**, Macmillan Reference USA, ISBN 978-0-02-865834-6.

Mullins, Laurie J. (2004), *Management and Organisational Behaviour* (7th ed.), Financial Times–FT Press–Prentice-Hall–Pearson Education Ltd, ISBN 978-0-273-68876-1.

Noble, David F. (1984), *Forces of Production: A Social History of Industrial Automation*, New York, New York, USA: Knopf, ISBN 978-0-394-51262-4, LCCN 83048867.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Rosen, Ellen (1993), *Improving Public Sector Productivity: Concepts and Practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, ISBN 978-0-8039-4573-9

Sorensen, Charles E.; with Williamson, Samuel T. (1956), *My Forty Years with Ford*, New York, New York, USA: Norton, LCCN 56010854. Various republications, including ISBN 9780814332795.

Stalin, J.V. (1976), *Problems of Leninism: Lectures Delivered at the Sverdlov University, Beijing, China*: Foreign Languages Press.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow (1903), *Shop Management*, New York, NY, USA: American Society of Mechanical Engineers, OCLC 2365572. "Shop Management" began as an address by Taylor to a meeting of the ASME, which published it in pamphlet form. The link here takes the reader to a 1912 republication by Harper & Brothers. Also available from Project Gutenberg.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Von Berg, A. (2009). *Humanisierung der Arbeit. Neue Formen der Arbeitsgestaltung als Determinante von Arbeitszufriedenheit am Beispiel*

teilautonomer Arbeitsgruppen. Seminararbeit an der Georg-August Universität: Göttingen.

Waring, Stephen P. (1991), *Taylorism Transformed: Scientific Management Theory since 1945*, Chapel Hill, NC, USA: University of North Carolina Press, ISBN 0807819727.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Woodham, Jonathan (1997), *Twentieth-Century Design*, New York, NY, USA and London, UK: Oxford University Press, ISBN 0192842048, OCLC 35777427

Unit 2: Bureaucratic Management Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe bureaucratic management theory and trace its evolution, its philosophy and its criticisms. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding bureaucratic management theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

1.0 Objectives

The central issues examined in this chapter are as follows:

1. What is bureaucracy?
2. What are the major theories of bureaucracy?
3. What are the functions of bureaucracies?
4. How are bureaucracies organized? How should they be organized?
5. Why are bureaucrats so powerful, and why has bureaucratic power expanded?
6. How, and how successfully, are bureaucracies controlled?

2.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Bureaucratic Management Theory

The first writer to closely devote his time to inputs of bureaucracy to administration and management was Max Weber. A German sociologist who developed the principles of bureaucracy to help his country (Germany) manage its growing industrial enterprises at a time when it was striving to become a world power (Ashiru, 2001).

Weber thought bureaucratic organization to be the most rational means of carrying out imperative control over human beings. Although he recognizes the importance of personal (Charismatic) leadership, he concluded that bureaucratic leadership was indispensable for the mass administration required in a modern society (Albers, 1973). He, for instance was unequivocal when he asserts that bureaucratic organization is superior both in intensive efficiency and the scope of its operations, and is formally capable of application to all kinds of administrative tasks...bureaucratic administration is all things being equal, always, from a normal technical points of view, the most rational type. For the needs of mass administration today, it is completely indispensable. Weber, thus, advocated five basic principles upon which bureaucratic system of administration is based. These principles will be seen and discussed as follows:

1. In a bureaucracy, formal-authority is derived from positions held in organization. Authority is the power to hold people accountable for their actions and to make decisions concerning the use of organizational resources. Authority empowers the superiors to direct and control their subordinates' behaviours to achieve organisational goals. In a bureaucratic system of administration a manager compels obedience not by personal qualities she/he possesses, but because of the position she/he occupies which is associated with certain level of authority and responsibility.
2. That in bureaucracy, people should occupy positions based on performance and merit. But not based on cheap social advantage or personal contacts. Most organizations in today's Nigeria crumble because managers fail to take this point into cognizance. Appointments are based on personal contacts and relations and not on job related skill or merit.
3. The extent of each position's formal authority and task responsibilities and its relationship to other positions in an organization should be clearly specified.
4. A hierarchical arrangement of positions in an organization, so that employers will know whom to report to, and who reports to them. Managers must create an organizational hierarchy of authority that makes it clear who reports to whom and to whom managers should go if conflict arises. This principle is especially more useful in the armed forces.
5. A well-defined system of rules, standard, operating procedures and norms must be created, so that behaviours can effectively be controlled in an organization.

Today, we often think of bureaucracy as vast impersonal organizations that put impersonal efficiency ahead of human needs. Like the scientific management theorists, Weber, sought to improve the performance of socially important organizations by making their operations predictable and productive (Ashiru, 2001).

To many, the term bureaucracy suggests inefficiency and pointless and time-consuming formalities: in short, 'red tape'. In the field of politics, bureaucracy refers to the administrative machinery of the state: that is, the massed ranks of civil servants and public officials who are charged with the execution of government business. Others follow Max Weber in seeing bureaucracy as a distinctive form of organization found not just in government but in all spheres of modern society. What cannot be doubted, however, is that, as government has grown and the breadth of its responsibilities has expanded, bureaucracy has come to play an increasingly important role in political life. No longer can civil servants be dismissed as mere administrators or policy implementers; instead, they are key figures in the policy process, and even sometimes run their

countries. A reality of ‘rule by the officials’ may lie behind the façade of representation and democratic accountability. The organization and control of bureaucratic power is therefore one of the most pressing problems in modern politics, and one that no political system has found easy to solve.

3.2 Organization of bureaucracies

One of the limitations of Weber’s theory of bureaucracy is that it suggests that the drive for efficiency and rationality will lead to the adoption of essentially similar bureaucratic structures the world over. Weber’s ‘ideal type’ thus ignores the various ways in which bureaucracies can be organized, as well as differences that arise from the political, social and cultural contexts in which bureaucracies operate. The organization of bureaucracies is important for two reasons. It influences the administrative efficiency of government and affects the degree to which public accountability and political control can be achieved. The issue of organization has, however, assumed a deeper significance as pressure has built up, especially from the 1980s onwards, to reduce public spending. This partly reflects the Spread of New Right ideas but is also one of the consequences of economic globalization. Many states have therefore looked to rationalize their administrative machinery, a process that has sometimes been portrayed as ‘reinventing government’. This process nevertheless has major political, and even constitutional, implications.

All state bureaucracies are in some way organized on the basis of purpose or function. This is achieved through the construction of departments, ministries and agencies charged with responsibility for particular policy areas; education, housing, defence, drug control, taxation and so forth. Of course, the number of such departments and agencies varies over time and from state to state, as do the ways in which functional responsibilities are divided or combined. For example, the broadening responsibilities of the US government were reflected in the creation of the Department of Health and Human Services in 1953, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1965. In the UK, the changing concerns of government led to the creation of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in 1997, and the replacement of the Department of Employment by the Department for Work and Pensions in 2001.

The most significant feature of these functionally defined bureaucracies is the degree of centralization or decentralization within them. The systems found in the remaining communist regimes, such as China, which are subject to strict party control and supervision at every level, are amongst the most centralized bureaucratic systems in the world. Nevertheless, the sizes and complexity of communist bureaucracies have also provided considerable scope for bureau and departmental independence.

Despite the formal 'leadership' of the CPSU, the Soviet bureaucracy, for example, functioned as a labyrinthine mechanism for interest articulation and aggregation amounting to a form of institutional pluralism' (Hough, 1927). The UK civil service has traditionally been centralized. It has a common recruitment and promotion policy, and a single career and salary structure. In some ways, the Fulton Report of 1966 furthered the ideal of a unified civil service by abolishing the division between the clerical, executive and administrative grades, which had amounted to a form of class system. However, by shifting emphasis away from generalists in senior positions, it placed greater stress on subject expertise and specialist knowledge, so strengthening 'departmentalism'. Moreover, in establishing the Civil Service Department (subsequently abolished) to take responsibility for recruitment, promotions and conditions of work it also facilitated bureaucratic autonomy.

The most centralized liberal-democratic bureaucracy has traditionally been that in France. Whereas bureaucracies in states such as the UK and Germany have developed through a process of reform and adaptation, the French system was constructed on the basis of the Napoleonic model of administration. This emphasized the importance of a highly centralized and hierarchically structured body of technical experts, wedded to the long term interests of the French state. The Conseil d'Etat (Council of State) is the supreme administrative body in France; it advises on legislative and administrative matters and acts as the highest administrative court. The Ecole Nationale d'Administration and the Ecole Polytechnique function as training schools for civil servants, giving the so-called grands corps (senior administrators and technical experts) unrivalled prestige. To some extent, however, the Napoleonic model of strict discipline and uniformity has never been fully realized. Divisions tend to exist between generalists and specialists, between the grand corps and junior civil servants, and between rival bureaux and departments, particularly between the finance ministry and the major spending ministries.

The USA, in contrast, is an example of a decentralized bureaucracy. The federal bureaucracy operates under the formal authority of the president as chief administrator. However, it is so diffuse and unwieldy that all presidents struggle to coordinate and direct its activities. One reason for this fragmentation is that the responsibilities of the federal government overlap with those of state and local governments, whose cooperation is required to ensure effective implementation. A second reason is the impact of the separation of powers. While executive departments and agencies operate under presidential authority via their cabinet secretaries or directors, a bewildering array of independent regulatory commissions have been created, and are funded, by Congress. Although presidents appoint the members of these commissions, they cannot dismiss them or interfere with their responsibilities as laid down by Congress. A

third reason is that there is tension between permanent civil servants, who are appointed through competitive public examination and placed on one of the General Schedule grades, and the much smaller number of political appointees in so-called Schedule C posts. While the latter can be expected to make loyalty to the administration their priority, the former may be more committed to the growth of their bureaux or the continuance of their services and programmes.

The conventional structure of government bureaucracies has come under particular scrutiny and pressure since the 1970s. In extreme cases, this has led to attempts to restructure the administrative state. The Clinton administration, for instance, was deeply impressed by the ideas developed in Osborne and Gaebler's *Reinventing Government* (1992). This suggested that the job of government is to 'steer' not to-'row'. In other words, government works best when it concerns itself with policy-making and leaves the delivery of services or policy implementation to other bodies acting as agents of the state. In theory, such an approach need not necessarily be linked to the contraction of state responsibilities, but its most enthusiastic advocates have undoubtedly come from the New Right, which has embraced this analysis as part of its broader attack on big government

These ideas have been influential in the USA and a number of other western countries. The construction of an enabling state, even a 'skeletal state, has been taken furthest in New Zealand but they have also affected the UK, through the civil service reforms introduced by Thatcher and Major, and further developed by Blair. These ideas have provided the basis for the 'new public management'. A significant step down this road was taken in 1988 with the launching of the Next Steps initiative, which began dismantling a unified national administration by restricting ministries to their 'core' policy functions and handing over responsibility for implementation to executive agencies, as occurs in Sweden. By 1996, 70 per cent of the UK's civil servants were working in these Next Steps agencies, with a growing body of work being contracted out to private bodies.

Attempts to compensate for alleged inefficiency and unresponsiveness in public administration have also led to the wider use of performance targets and quality measurement. The Blair government, since 1997, has attempted to extend a culture of target setting and performance review across the UK public sector, linking target fulfillment to funding and being willing publicly to expose 'under-performance'. Such innovations have also been accompanied by a substantial increase in the role of quangos (i.e. quasi autonomous non-governmental organization) in the administration of services such as health, education, urban development and regulation. In 1996, there were an estimated 5207 quasigovernmental bodies in the UK, spending over £60 billion a year (35

per cent of total public Spending) and employing 60000 staff. However, the most radical attempt to 'roll back the state' in the UK has been made through the policy of privatisation, which, from the 1980s onwards, saw industries such as telecommunications, electricity, gas, water and local transport transferred from public to private ownership. Public private partnerships have also given private bodies a greater role in public-service funding and delivery.

As governments struggle to keep public spending under control, such developments, especially the divorce between policy advice and policy implementation, are likely to become more common. However, the drive to streamline administration, promote efficiency and cut costs carries political costs. The most obvious of these is the weakening of public accountability and the emergence of a 'democratic deficit'. One of the strengths of a unified civil service is that it supports the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, which ensures that appointed officials are ultimately answerable to elected politicians and, through them, to the public. The creation of semi-independent executive agencies and, above all, quangos tends to mean that ministers no longer take responsibility for day-to-day administrative or operational matters. Supporters of reorganization, on the other hand, argue that this can be counterbalanced by the improvement of delivery standards through the use of charters and other performance targets. A second problem is that the introduction of management techniques, structures and, increasingly, personnel from the private sector may weaken the public-service ethos that state bureaucracies have striven over the years to develop.

3.3 Functions of bureaucracies

On the face of it, bureaucracies fulfill a single, but vital, function. Their primary concern is with the execution and enforcement of the laws, made by the legislature and the policies decided by the political executive. Indeed, while other functions of government such as representation, policy-making and interest articulation are carried out by a variety of institutions, policy implementation is solely the responsibility of civil servants, albeit working under their political masters. Moreover, the Weberian model of bureaucracies as rational and objective machines appears to divorce the administrative world from the political world. In this view, bureaucrats are seen simply as cogs in a machine, as reliable and efficient administrators operating within a fixed hierarchy and according to clearly defined rules. The reality is very different. Despite their formal subordination and impartiality, bureaucrats exert considerable influence on the policy process, and thus fulfill a number of key functions in any political system. The most important of these functions are the following;

1. carrying out administration,
2. offering policy advice,

3. articulating and aggregating interests, and
4. maintaining political stability.

Administration

The core function of the bureaucracy is to implement or execute law and policy. It is thus charged with administering government business. This is why the bureaucracy is sometimes referred to as ‘the administration’, while the political executive is termed ‘the government’. This distinction implies that a clear line can be drawn between the policy-making role of politicians and the policy-implementing role of bureaucrats. Certainly, the vast majority of the world’s civil servants are engaged almost exclusively in administrative responsibilities that range from the implementation of welfare and social-security programmes to the regulation of the economy, the granting of licenses and the provision of information and advice to citizens at home and abroad. The sizes of bureaucracies are therefore closely linked to the broader responsibilities of government. Civil service employment in the UK expanded in proportion to the role of government throughout the twentieth century.

It reached a peak of 735 000 in the 1970s, but then contracted to 499 000 by 1996 owing to the pursuit of neoliberal policies from the 1980s onwards. The federal bureaucracy in the USA expanded significantly as a result of the New Deal and has now grown to over 2.5 million strong; and the USSR’s central planning system eventually required 20 million state officials to administer it.

Nevertheless, the image of bureaucrats as mere functionaries who apply rules and carry out orders issued by others can be misleading in the first place, since much administrative detail is of necessity left to officials, civil servants may be allowed significant discretion in deciding precisely how to implement policy. Second, the degree of political control exercised over the bureaucracy varies greatly from state to state whereas state officials in China are subject to strict and continuous party supervision, in France and Japan their high status and reputation for expertise guarantee them a considerable degree of autonomy. Third, in their capacity as policy advisers, senior civil servants at least have the ability to shape the policies that they are later required to administer.

Policy advice

The political significance of the bureaucracy stems largely from its role as the chief source of the policy information and advice available to government. This policy role helps to distinguish top-level civil servants, who have daily contact with politicians and are expected to act as policy advisers, from middle-ranking and junior-ranking civil servants, who deal with more routine administrative matters. Debate about the political significance of bureaucracies therefore tends to concentrate on this elite group of senior officials. In theory, a strict

distinction can be drawn between the policy responsibilities of bureaucrats and those of politicians. Policy is supposedly made by politicians; bureaucrats simply offer advice. The policy role of civil servants therefore boils down to two functions: outlining the policy options available to ministers, and reviewing policy proposals in terms of their likely impact and consequences. The policy influence of senior officials is further restricted by the fact that they are either required to be politically neutral, as in the UK, Japan and Australia, or are subject to a system of political appointment, as in the USA.

However, there are reasons to believe that the policy role of civil servants is politically more significant than is suggested above. For instance, there is no clear distinction between making policy and offering policy advice. Quite simply, decisions are made on the basis of the information available, and this means that the content of decisions is invariably structured by the advice offered. Moreover, as the principal source of the advice available to politicians, bureaucrats effectively control the flow of information. Information can thus be concealed or at least 'shaped' to reflect the preferences of the civil service. The principal source of bureaucratic power is nevertheless the expertise and specialist knowledge that accumulates within the bureaucracy. As the responsibilities of government expand and policy becomes more complex, 'amateur' politicians almost inevitably come to depend on their 'professional' bureaucratic advisers.

Articulating interests

Although by no means one of their formal functions, bureaucracies often help to articulate and sometimes aggregate interests. Bureaucracies are brought into contact with interest groups through their task of policy implementation and their involvement in policy formulation and advice. This has increased as a result of corporatist tendencies that have blurred the divisions between organized interests and government agencies. Groups such as doctors, teachers, farmers and business corporations thus become 'client groups', serviced by their respective agencies, and also serve as an invaluable source of information and advice. This **clientelism** may benefit the political system insofar as it helps to maintain consensus. By virtue of having access to policy formulation, it is more likely that organized interests will cooperate with government policy. On the other hand, clientelism may also interfere with the public responsibilities and duties of civil servants. This, for instance, occurs when US regulatory agencies end up being controlled by the industries they supposedly regulate. When group interests coincide with those of the bureaucracy, a policy nexus may develop that democratic politicians find impossible to break down.

Political stability

The final function of bureaucracies is to provide a focus of stability and continuity within political systems. This is sometimes seen as particularly important in developing states, where the existence of a body of trained career officials may provide the only guarantee that government is conducted in an orderly and reliable fashion. This stability depends very largely on the status of bureaucrats as permanent and professional public servants: while ministers and governments come and go, the bureaucracy is always there. The Northcote-Trevelyan reforms of 1870 that created the modern UK civil service were based on the principles of impartial selection political neutrality, permanence and anonymity. Even in the USA, where senior officials are appointed politically through a so-called 'spoils system', the mass of federal bureaucrats are career civil servants.

However, continuity can also have its disadvantages. In the absence, of effective public scrutiny and accountability, it can undoubtedly lead to corruption, a problem that is found in many developing states, where it is compounded by widespread poverty and other disadvantages. In other cases, permanence may breed in civil servants either a tendency towards arrogance and insularity, or a bias in favour of conservatism. Career civil servants can come to believe that they are more capable of defining the common good or general will than are elected politicians. They may therefore feel justified in resisting radical or reformist political tendencies, seeing themselves as custodians of the state's interest.

3.4 Theories of Bureaucracy

The question of bureaucracy engenders deep political passions. In the modern period these have invariably been negative. Liberals criticize bureaucracy for its lack of openness and accountability. Socialists, particularly Marxists, condemn it as an instrument of class subordination; and the New right, for its part, portrays bureaucrats as self-serving and inherently inefficient. Underlying these contrasting views is deeper disagreement about the very nature of bureaucracy. Quite simply, the term bureaucracy has been used in so many different ways that the attempt to develop an overall definition may have to be abandoned altogether. Albrow (1970:84-105) identified no fewer than seven modern concepts of bureaucracy:

- a. Bureaucracy as rational organization
- b. Bureaucracy as organizational inefficiency
- c. Bureaucracy as rule by officials
- d. Bureaucracy as public administration
- e. Bureaucracy as administration by officials
- f. Bureaucracy as organization

g. Bureaucracy as modern society.

To some extent, these contrasting concepts and usages reflect the fact that bureaucracy has been viewed differently by different academic disciplines. Students of government, for example, traditionally understood bureaucracy in a literal sense to mean ‘rule by the bureau’: that is, rule by appointed officials. In *Considerations on Representative Government* ([1861] 1951), J. S. Mill therefore contrasted bureaucracy with representative forms of government – in other words, rule by elected and accountable politicians. In the field of sociology, bureaucracy has typically been understood as a particular type of organization, as a system of administration rather than a system of government. Bureaucracy in this sense can be found not only in democratic and authoritarian states but also in business corporations, trade unions, political parties and so on. Economists, on the other hand, sometimes view bureaucracies as specifically ‘public’ organizations. They are thus characterized by the fact that being funded through the tax system they are neither discipline by neither profit motive nor responsive to market pressures. In order to make sense of these various usages, here contrasting theories of bureaucracy will be examined:

- i. Bureaucracy as a rational-administrative machine;
- ii. Bureaucracy as a conservative power bloc; and
- iii. Bureaucracy as a source of government oversupply.

Rational-administrative model

The academic study of bureaucracy has been dominated by the work of Max Weber. For Weber, bureaucracy was an ‘ideal type’ of rule based on a system of rational rules, as opposed to either tradition or charisma. He identified a set of principles that supposedly characterize bureaucratic organization. The most important of these are the following:

1. Jurisdictional areas are fixed and official, and ordered by laws or rules;
2. There is a firmly ordered hierarchy, which ensures that lower offices are supervised by specified higher ones within a chain of command;
3. Business is managed on the basis of written documents and a filing system;
4. The authority of officials is impersonal and stems entirely from the post they hold, not from personal status;
5. Bureaucratic rules are strict enough to minimize the scope of personal discretion; and
6. Appointment and advancement within a bureaucracy are based on professional criteria, such as training, expertise and administrative competence.

The central feature of bureaucracy from the Weberian perspective is its rationality, because bureaucratization reflects the advance of a reliable,

predictable and, above all, efficient means of social organization. For Weber, bureaucracy was nothing less than the characteristic form of organization found in modern society, and, in his view, its expansion was irreversible. Not only was this a result of the technical superiority of bureaucracy over other forms of administration, but it was also a consequence of significant economic, political and cultural developments. The development of bureaucratization was closely linked to the emergence of capitalist economies - in particular, to the greater pressure for economic efficiency and the emergence of larger-scale business units. The development of the modern state, and the extension of its responsibilities into the social and economic spheres, also led to the growth of powerful government bureaucracies.

In Weber's view, the growth of bureaucratization was further stimulated by the pressures of democratization, which weakened ideas such as tradition, privilege and duty, and replaced them with a belief in open competition and meritocracy. He believed that the process of 'rationalization' would ensure that all industrial societies, whether nominally capitalist or communist, would increasingly resemble each other as they adopted bureaucratic forms of administration. This version of what is called the **convergence thesis** was subsequently developed by James Burnham (1905-87) in the *Managerial Revolution* (1941). This seminal text of **managerialism** suggested that, regardless of their ideological differences, all industrial societies are governed by a class of managers, technocrats and state officials whose power is vested in their technical and administrative skills.

Weber was nevertheless aware that bureaucracy was a mixed blessing. In the first place, organizational efficiency would be purchased at the expense of democratic participation. Bureaucratization would strengthen hierarchical tendencies, albeit ones based on merit, meaning that command would be exercised from above by senior officials rather than from below by the masses. This would destroy the socialist dream of a dictatorship of the proletariat, which, Weber accurately, as it turned out predicted, would develop into a 'dictatorship of the official'. In this respect, Weber drew conclusions similar to those of his friend Robert Michels (1878-1936), who developed the iron law of oligarchy on the basis of his study of political parties.

However, Weber was less pessimistic than Michels about the prospects for liberal democracy. Although he recognized the tendency of bureaucrats to seek the perpetuation of bureaucracy and to exceed its administrative function, he believed that this could at least be resisted through the use of liberal devices such as electoral highlight which was that the domination of the bureaucratic ideal could bring about a 'pigeon-holing of the spirit' as the social environment became increasingly depersonalized and mechanical. Reason and bureaucracy

could therefore become an 'iron cage' confining human passions and individual freedom.

Power-bloc model

The view of bureaucracy as a power bloc stems largely from socialist analysis, and particularly from Marxism. Although Marx developed no systematic theory of bureaucracy in the manner of Weber, the outlines of a theory are discernible in his writings. Rather than seeing bureaucracy as a consequence of the emergence of a complex industrial society, Marx linked it to the specific requirements of capitalism. He was thus concerned less with bureaucratization as a broader social phenomenon, and more with the class role played by the state bureaucracy. In particular, he saw the bureaucracy as a mechanism through which bourgeois interests are upheld and the capitalist system defended.

The analysis of class biases running through the state bureaucracy has been extended by neo-Marxists such as Ralph Miliband (1969). Particular attention has been paid to the capacity of senior civil servants to act as a conservative veto group that dilutes, even blocks, the radical initiatives of socialist ministers and socialist governments. As Miliband put it, top civil servants' are conservative in the sense that they are, within their allotted spheres, the conscious or unconscious allies of existing economic and social elites'. This happens for a number of reasons. Most obviously, despite the formal requirements of political neutrality, top civil servants share the same educational and social background as industrialists and business managers, and are therefore likely to share their ideas, prejudices and general outlook. The possibility that rising civil servants may harbor radical or socialist sympathies is also countered by recruitment and promotion procedures designed to ensure their ideological 'soundness'.

Miliband believed that the most important factor reinforcing the conservative outlook of higher civil servants is their ever-increasing closeness to the world of corporate capitalism. This has been a consequence of growing state intervention in economic life, ensuring an ongoing relationship between business groups and civil servants, who invariably come to define the 'national interest' in terms of the long-term interests of private capitalism. In turn, this relationship is reinforced by the interchange of personnel between government and business, often seen as a 'revolving door', through which the state bureaucracy recruits from the private sector and civil servants are offered lucrative employment opportunities when they retire. The implication of this analysis is that, if senior bureaucrats are wedded to the interests of capitalism, a major obstacle stands in the way of any attempt to achieve socialism through constitutional means.

One of the flaws of the Marxist theory of bureaucracy is that it pays little attention to the problem of bureaucratization in socialist systems. For Marx and Engels, this problem was effectively discounted by the assumption that the bureaucracy, with the state, would wither away as a classless, communist society came into existence. This left Marxism open to criticism by social scientists such as Weber and Michels, who argued that bureaucracy is a broader social phenomenon, and one that the socialist emphasis on common ownership and planning could only strengthen. The experience of twentieth-century communism made it impossible for Marxist thinkers to continue ignoring this problem.

The most influential Marxist analysis of post capitalist bureaucracy was developed by Leon Trotsky. Russian Marxist, political thinker and revolutionary. An early critic of Lenin's theory of the party and leader of the 1905 St. Petersburg Soviet, Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks in 1917, becoming Commissar for War, isolated and out-manoevered after Lenin's death in 1924, he was banished from the USSR in 1929, and assassinated in Mexico in 1940 on the instructions of Stalin. Trotsky's theoretical contribution to Marxism consists of his theory of 'permanent revolution', his consistent support for internationalism, and his analysis of Stalinism as a form of 'bureaucratic degeneration'.

In *The Revolution Betrayed* (1937) Trotsky highlighted the problem of bureaucratic degeneration. In his view, a combination of Russian backwardness and the proletariat's lack of political sophistication had created conditions in which the state bureaucracy could expand and block further advances towards socialism. The Stalinist dictatorship was thus merely the political expression of these dominant bureaucratic interests, entirely cut off from those of the masses. While Trotsky saw the bureaucracy as a social stratum that could be removed by a political revolution, the Yugoslav dissident and former colleague of Marshal Tito Milovan Djilas (1911-95) portrayed it as a 'new class'. For Djilas (1957) the power of the bureaucracy in orthodox communist regimes stemmed from its control of productive wealth, and this meant that communist social systems increasingly resembled a form of state capitalism.

Bureaucratic oversupply model

The idea that critics of bureaucracy come exclusively from the left was overturned by the emergence of rational choice and public choice theories. These had a considerable impact on the New Right, and in particular helped to shape its views about the nature of the state and the emergence of big government. Central to this model of bureaucracy is a concern with the interests and motivations of bureaucrats themselves. Rational choice theory is based on

the same assumptions about human nature as those in neoclassical economics. That is, that individuals are rationally self-seeking creatures or utility maximizers. Public choice theory, particularly prominent in the USA and associated with the Virginia school of political analysis, applies this economic model of decision-making to the public sector.

In *Bureaucracy and Representative Government* (1971) William Niskanen argued that senior bureaucrats, regardless of their image as public servants, are primarily motivated by career self-interest and thus seek an expansion of the agency in which they work and an increase in its budget. This is because bureaucratic growth guarantees job security, expands promotion prospects, improves salaries and brings top officials greater power, patronage and prestige. Bureaucracies thus contain a powerful inner dynamic, leading to the growth of government itself and the expansion of public responsibilities. For the New Right, the ability of appointed officials to dictate policy priorities to elected politicians goes a long way towards explaining how state growth has occurred under governments of very different ideological complexions. Similarly, the image of bureaucrats as nature's social democrats has important implications for New Right government's intent on rolling back the frontiers of the state. They believe that, quite simply, unless bureaucratic power can be checked or circumvented any attempt to pursue free market policies doomed to failure.

This New Right critique also focuses attention on the non-market character of state bureaucracies, and draws an unflattering comparison between private sector and public sector bodies. In this view, private-sector bodies such as business corporations are structured by a combination of internal and external factors. The principal internal influence on a business is the quest for profit maximization, which impels the firm towards greater efficiency through the exertion of a constant downward pressure on costs. Externally, businesses operate in a competitive market environment, which forces them to respond to consumer pressures through product innovation and price adjustments.

In contrast, bureaucracies are not disciplined by the profit motive. If costs exceed revenue, the taxpayer is always there to pick up the bill. Similarly, state bureaucracies are usually monopolies, and are therefore in no way forced to respond to market pressures; the result is that bureaucracies in common with all public sector bodies are inherently wasteful and inefficient. Moreover, the service they provide are invariably of poor quality and does not meet consumer needs or wishes. This private good philosophy of the New Right dictates not only that state bureaucracies should be scaled down, but also that, when this is not possible, private-sector management techniques should be introduced

Critics of public choice theory usually argue that it is flawed because it abstracts the individual from his or her social environment. A conservative value bias, so the arguments go; is built into the theory by the assumption that human beings are always rationally self-interested. Others, however, have used a public choice approach but reached very different conclusions. Dunleavy (1991), for example, argued that, if individual bureaucrats are rational actors, they are more likely to favour bureau-shaping strategies than, as conventional public-choice theory suggests, budget maximizing ones.

Budget-maximizing priorities certainly go hand in hand with state growth, especially in the absence of market disciplines. However, it is difficult to undertake collective action to achieve this end, and senior officials tend to be more interested in work-related benefits than in narrowly financial benefits. Dunleavy suggested that bureaucrats are likely to assign their highest priority to providing themselves with congenial work and an amenable and attractive working environment. This is because senior civil servants are especially concerned with the interest and importance of their work tasks, and because public-sector employment provides them with relatively modest opportunities to improve their salaries, job security and promotion prospects. Clearly, top officials concerned about bureau shaping would operate in a very different way from the empire builders of New Right demonology.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe bureaucracy, its organization, function and theories.

5.0 Summary

The term bureaucracy has been used in a number of ways. Originally, it meant rule by officials as opposed to elected politicians. In the social sciences, it is usually understood as a mode of organization. Modern political analysts, however, use the term bureaucracy to mean the administrative machinery of the state, bureaucrats being nonelected state officials or civil servants, who may or may not be subject to political control.

Three major theories of bureaucracy have been advanced. The Weberian mode suggests that bureaucracy is a rational-administrative machine, the characteristic form of organization in modern society. The conservative power-bloc model emphasizes the degree to which the bureaucracy reflects broader class interests and can resist political control. The bureaucratic oversupply model emphasizes a tendency towards 'big' government caused by the pursuit of career self-interest on the part of civil servants.

The core function of the bureaucracy is to implement or execute law and policy through the administration of government business. However, civil servants also play a significant role in offering policy advice to ministers, in articulating and aggregating interests (especially through links to client groups), and in maintaining political stability and continuity when there is a change of government or administration.

Bureaucracies have traditionally been organized on the basis of purpose or function; hence their division into departments, ministries and agencies. The degree of centralization or decentralization within them varies considerably. Modern trends, however, are towards the divorce of policy-making from policy implementation, and the incorporation of private-sector management techniques, if not outright privatization.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Do bureaucrats really ‘run’ their countries?
2. Can a clear distinction be drawn between making policy and offering policy advice?
3. Can civil servants ever be politically neutral?
4. Are public bureaucracies inherently inefficient?
5. Do the benefits of a politically committed civil service outweigh the costs?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (200 I), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Beetham, D. *Bureaucracy* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1987).A clear and concise discussion of models of bureaucracy and theories of bureaucratic power.

Bekke, H., J. Perry and T. Toonen *Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective* (Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 1996).A wide-ranging and thorough study of civil services in different parts of the world.

Gy Peters, B. *the Politics of Bureaucracy* (White Plains, NY: Longman, 200). An encyclopaedic exploration of the political and policy-making role of bureaucracies.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), Contemporary Management, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Self, P. *Government by the Market? The Politics of Public Choice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1994) A perceptive discussion of the remodeling of government according to the principles of market competition and efficiency.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper

and Brothers.

Verheijes, T. and D. Coombes (eds) *Innovation in Public Management: Perspectives from East and West Europe* (Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 1998). A comparative analysis of the ideas and impact of the new public management.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Unit 3: Functional Management Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the functional management theory and trace its evolution, its philosophy and its criticisms. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the functional management theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe functional management theory,
2. Narrate its categories and
3. Explain its principles.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Functional Management Theory

During the 20th century a body of literature emerged which considered the problem of designing the structure of organization as a major managerial task. The objective of this literature was to define principles, which could guide managers in the performance of their tasks. Prominent among the architects of this literature was Henry Fayol, who proposed a number of principles found useful in the management of a large coal mining company in France. Henry Fayol, a French engineer, was the author of "Administration Industrielle et Generale" meaning "General and industrial administration". Although Fayol's work first appeared in 1916 in French it was not translated in English until 1929 by the International Institute of Management at Geneva.

3.2 Categories of functional management theory

Reflecting upon his managerial career Fayol found that all industrial activities could be divided into six categories: viz:

- a. Technical (production);
- b. Commercial (buying selling and exchange);
- c. Financial (search for, and optimum use of capital);
- d. Security (protection of property and persons);
- e. Accounting (including statistics); and
- f. Managerial (planning, organizing, command, coordination and control).

Fayol observed that the first five categories were relatively well known; consequently, he concentrated most of his work on the analysis of the managerial category. He devoted his attention to what a manager does, thereby giving rise to the "functional" management thought (Ashiru, 2001).

Functional management is the most common type of organizational management. The organization is grouped by areas of speciality within different functional areas (e.g., finance, marketing, and engineering). Some refer to a functional area as a "silo". Besides the heads of a firm's product and/or geographic units the company's top management team typically consists of several functional heads such as the chief financial officer, the chief operating officer, and the chief strategy officer. Communication generally occurs within a single department. If information or project work is needed from another department, a request is transmitted up to the department head, who communicates the request to the other department head. Otherwise, communication stays within the department. Team members complete project work in addition to normal department work.

The main advantage of this type of organization is that each employee has only one manager, thus simplifying the chain of command.

Henri Fayol's management theory is a simple model of how management interacts with personnel. Fayol's management theory covers concepts in a broad way, so almost any business can apply his theory of management. Today the business community considers Fayol's classical management theory as a relevant guide to productively managing staff.

3.3 The fourteen principles of functional management theory

The management theory of Henri Fayol includes 14 principles of management. From these principles, Fayol concluded that management should interact with personnel in five basic ways in order to control and plan production.

1. **Planning.** According to Fayol's theory, management must plan and schedule every part of industrial processes.
2. **Organizing.** Henri Fayol argued that in addition to planning a manufacturing process, management must also make certain all of the necessary resources (raw materials, personnel, etc.) came together at the appropriate time of production.
3. **Commanding.** Henri Fayol's management theory states that management must encourage and direct personnel activity.
4. **Coordinating.** According to the management theory of Henri Fayol, management must make certain that personnel works together in a cooperative

fashion.

5. Controlling. The final management activity, according to Henri Fayol, is for the manager to evaluate and ensure that personnel follow management's commands.

Fayol went further to suggest fourteen principles of management, which are;

1. Division of work,
2. Authority,
3. Discipline,
4. Unity of command,
5. Unity of Direction,
6. Subordination of individual interest,
7. Remuneration,
8. Centralization,
9. Scalar chain (line of Authority),
10. Order,
11. Equity,
12. Stability of tenure of office,
13. Initiative and
14. Esprit de corps.

Fayol however, caution that these principles on their own may not be exhaustive as there may be others which he did not either recognize or could not implement in his career.

Keep in mind the limitations of Fayol's management theory. Since its publication in the early 1900s, Fayol's theory of management has come under criticism. Fayol never conducted research; instead he based his theory on personal experience.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe functional management theory, its categories and principles.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe functional management theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution, its philosophy and criticisms were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe functional management theory.
2. What are the categories of functional management theory?
3. Enumerate the principles of functional management theory.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed.) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (2001), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Menz, M. 2012. Functional Top Management Team Members: A Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(1): 45-80.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Unit 4: Human Relations Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the human relations theory and trace its evolution, its philosophy and its criticisms. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the human relations theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe human relations theory, functional management theory,
2. Narrate its evolution, and
3. Discuss its criticism.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Human Relations Theory

Human Relations Theory is a management theory, included in the Behavioral School founded by Elton Mayo following the conclusions obtained in several studies performed in several North American companies.

From these studies stands out one, accomplished between 1924 and 1932, in a factory of the Western Electric Company in Hawthorne (near Chicago), place which came to give the name to the study: Hawthorne Experiments. The initial goal of these experiments was to determine how the changes in the payment and work conditions (illumination, temperature, rest times, work accidents, fatigue, personnel rotation, etc.) influence people and their work productivity. For that is performed the subdivision of a rewinding workshop in two parts: in one are made changes in the schedules, brightness level, rest times, etc., while the other is kept as control group.

Such as expected, the suppositions that productivity increased with the improvement of the work conditions were confirmed in these experiments, The great surprise occurred when the investigators observed that productivity also increased when the work conditions were deteriorated.

It was, so, concluded that the human relations and the work environment that results from there and the creation of bonds among the workers who felt observed by an administration worried with their wellbeing are much more important for the increase of productivity than simple physical conditions and work materials. It was, so, given an end to the assumption of “economic men” in which based the Classic School, giving place to the assumption of “social men”.

Human Relations Theory base principle that men have social needs desires rewarding relationships in the work place and answers more to the peer pressure than to the superiors' authority and administrative control forms its main contribution for management. It's from here that emerges a new type of management more concerned in knowing the workers individual and group needs and seek for efficiency and productivity through leadership, motivation and communication. On the other hand, it's also from the Human Relations Theory that emerges the informal organization concept.

Human relations theory refers to the researchers of organizational development who study the behaviour of people in groups, in particular workplace groups and other related concepts in fields such as industrial and organizational psychology. It originated in 1930s' Hawthorene studies, which examined the effects of social relations, motivation and employee satisfaction on factory productivity. The movement viewed workers in terms of their psychology and fit with companies, rather than as interchangeable parts, and it resulted in the creation of the discipline of human relations management. This theory is premised on the following;

1. The power of natural groups, in which social aspects take precedence over functional organizational structures.
2. The need for reciprocal communication, in which communication is two way, from worker to chief executive, as well as vice versa.
3. The development of high quality leadership to communicate goals and to ensure effective and coherent decision making.

It has become a concern of many companies to improve the job-oriented interpersonal skills of employees. The teaching of these skills to employees is referred to as "soft skills" training. Companies need their employees to be able to successfully communicate and convey information, to be able to interpret others' emotions, to be open to others' feelings, and to be able to solve conflicts and arrive at resolutions. By acquiring these skills, the employees, those in management positions and the customer can maintain more compatible relationships.

The human relations management theory is a researched belief that people desire to be part of a supportive team that facilitates development and growth. Therefore, if employees receive special attention and are encouraged to participate, they perceive their work as significant and they are motivated to be more productive, resulting in high quality work. The following human relations management theory basics became evident during human relations studies;

1. Individual attention and recognition aligns with the human relations theory,
2. Many theorists supported the motivational theory, and
3. Studies supported the importance of human relations in business.

3.2 Evolution of Human Relations Theory

The human relations theory is a reaction against "person as machine" concept of Taylor and his scientific management theory. It conceives administration and management a humanistic rather than mechanistic conception of the scientific managers.

A close look at the scientific management theory pictures workers as machines, not social beings with certain psychological needs. This short sightedness and incompleteness was what drew the attention of some observers to the need to design a more humane and people friendly theory. The most outstanding among the architects of Human Relations movement were George Elton Mayo and Fritz J. Roethlisberger. A leading classicist, Lillian M. Gilbreth in 1914, wrote one of the earliest treatises on industrial psychology. Using the techniques of her work and others, George Elton Mayo, a psychologist and Fritz J. Roethlisberger, sociologist, both professors of Industrial Research at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, undertook some significant experiment in the field of individual psychology between 1927 and 1932.

The Western Electric Company, through the cooperation of the National Academy of Sciences, arranged to have Mayo and his associates carry out major study in its Hawthorne works in Chicago. Although Western Electric Company was considered to be a progressive company, since it provided man, material benefits such as pension plans and recreational facilities, it had noted great deal of work dissatisfaction. Efficiency experts has attempted to reduce tension among the employees and to increase production by using methods of changing working hours, spacing rest periods, changing environment conditions, simplifying and reducing work methods, and so forth. However, the result had not been conclusively positive (Ashiru, 2001).

Using industrial Psychology set forth by Taylor, Mayo and Roethlisberger started the Hawthorn experiments. Initially, they assumed that each worker was an isolated unit, in essence, a "human machine" whose action and performance could be measured and factors governing a worker's low productivity were wrong physical environment, such as inadequate heating, excessive humidity, bad lighting, too much noise, fatigue caused by the incorrect proportions and timing of work periods and rest periods, wasted motions, resulting in lost times in doing the work; inadequate wage incentives caused by the method of

determining the incentive and other physical factors inherent in individual and his physical environment. As they made progress in the experiment, these researchers found that their basic assumptions were not producing result. Unforeseen and uncontrolled factors were interacting with the controlled environmental factors.

There were Psychological factors that turned out to be of far greater importance than physical working conditions, hours of work and wages. Thus, everything had not been controlled in the experiment; the human mind was free to do as it pleased. Mayo and associates followed up their experiments and investigated the myriads of informal groupings, informal relationships, social cliques, patterns of communication, and patterns of informal leadership. From these investigations, it was established that various group were operating in the work environment. Furthermore, these groups have evolved their own set of norms or codes of conduct. Most times, groups' norms were in conflict with management aims. In fact, many new factors were discovered and identified by Mayo and associates. About the same time Mayo and associates were making these discoveries other developments related to human relation movement were emerging in industrial organization among them were a strong trend toward Unionization and a high level of conflict between labour and management (Ashiru, 2001). While supervision in the 1920s, could be described as primarily authoritarian, during the 1930s, there was a new trend toward "being nice to people", with resultant "keep them happy" philosophy. This trend was merged into Human Relation Movement. This later approach was first as ineffective as the former. Nevertheless, it can rightly be concluded that the findings of the Hawthorne studies has helped in bringing about a dramatic change in management and administrative studies.

The Human Relations function with its origin firmly rooted in the field of personnel administration was to attract strong negative responses from practicing administrators and managers in the middle of 1940s.

The results of Professor Elton Mayo's Hawthorne studies proved that the factor most influencing productivity is relationships. The researchers realized productivity increased due to relationships and being part of a supportive group where each employee's work had a significant effect on the team output. As a side result, the researchers noticed that the increased attention the workers received by the researchers increased motivation and productivity, which resulted in what is the Hawthorne Effect.

After the Hawthorne experiments, Abraham Maslow and Douglas McGregor revealed how the motivational theory ties into theories of human relations. Maslow suggested five basic needs (physiological, safety, love, esteem and self-

actualization) were motivating factors when viewing an employee's work values, because the employee is motivated to ensure the most important of these individual needs are met. McGregor supported motivation beliefs by realizing that employees contribute more to the organization if they feel responsible and valued.

The result of the studies regarding human relations in the workplace show that people want to have a sense of belonging and significance while being treated with value and respect. Treat an employee with respect and value, and their individual productivity and quality increases to support the organizational team.

3.3 Criticism of Elton Mayo's involvement in Human Relations

Mayo's work is considered by various academics to be the counterpoint of Taylorism and scientific management. Taylorism, founded by Frederick W. Taylor, sought to apply science to the management of employees in the workplace in order to gain economic efficiency through labour productivity. Elton Mayo's work has been widely attributed to the discovery of the 'social person', allowing for workers to be seen as individuals rather than merely robots designed to work for unethical and unrealistic productivity expectations. However, this theory has been contested, as Mayo's purported role in the human relations movement has been questioned. Nonetheless, although Taylorism attempted to justify scientific management as a holistic philosophy, rather than a set of principles, the human relations movement worked parallel to the notion of scientific management. Its aim was to address the social welfare needs of workers and therefore elicit their co-operation as a workforce.

The widely perceived view of human relations is said to be one that completely contradicts the traditional views of Taylorism. Whilst scientific management tries to apply science to the workforce, the accepted definition of human relations suggests that management should treat workers as individuals, with individual needs. In doing so, employees are supposed to gain an identity, stability within their job and job satisfaction, which in turn make them more willing to co-operate and contribute their efforts towards accomplishing organisational goals. The human relations movement supported the primacy of organizations to be attributed to natural human groupings, communication and leadership. However, the conventional depiction of the human relations school of management, rising out of the ashes of scientific management is argued to be a rhetorical distortion of events.

Firstly, it has been argued that Elton Mayo's actual role in the human relations movement is controversial and although he is attributed to be the founder of this movement, some academics believe that the concept of human relations was

used well before the Hawthorne investigations, which sparked the human relations movement. Bruce and Nyland (2011) suggest that many academics preceded Mayo in identifying a concept similar to that of the human relations movement even going as far to suggest that the output and information collected by the Hawthorne investigations was identified well before Mayo by Taylor. In addition, Wren and Greenwood (1998) argue that Taylor made important contributions to what inspires human motivation, even though his ultimate findings were somewhat different from the human relations movement.

Another name which has been attributed to pre-existing human relations ideas is that of Henry S. Dennison. The one time president of the Taylor Society has been linked to both Taylorist principles as well human relation ideals thus creating a nexus between Taylorism and human relation thought. Dennison demonstrated an activist concern both with the rationale and character of workers, and with the control and management undertaken by managers of the business enterprise.

In order to assess the validity of human relations as a benchmark for rights within the workplace, the contribution of Taylorism in comparison to human relations must be established. Taylorism and scientific management entailed to be a "complete mental revolution" and as Taylor explained, Taylorism sought to encourage managers and labourers to "take their eyes off of the division of the surplus as the important matter, and together turn their attention toward increasing the size of the surplus." This notion of management appealed to the employer as it addressed organisational problems, inefficiencies and adverse employer-employee relations. Scientific management aimed to use science and qualitative data in the selection of employees and facilitate the use of employee databases and performance reviews. First, scientific management aimed to reduce inefficiency through studying the time and motions in work tasks. The object of time studies was to determine how fast a job should and could be done. Second, Taylor purported to introduce specific quantitative goals to individual employees in order to provide challenging time restraints and thus increasing productivity. Most importantly, Taylor sought to increase productivity through organization of behaviour.

The theoretical goals of human relations were no different from those of Taylorism. In essence, both viewpoints sought to make the workplace a more efficient and worker-friendly place. Although some more specific goals and outcomes of each movement were different, each, broadly speaking, aimed to advance the workplace and create a coherent group of individuals, while still maintaining a hierarchical system with managers in control. The notion of Taylorism was supportive of improvement in pay and conditions in workplaces under the proviso that workers were paid in accordance to their output. However, human relations claimed to eliminate such calls entirely suggesting radical and maybe even unrealistic ideas.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe human relations theory, its evolution and criticism.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe human relations theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution, its philosophy and criticisms were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe human relations theory.
2. What are the criticisms of human relations theory?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (2001), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Bruce, Kyle. 2006, "Henry S. Dennison, Elton Mayo, and Human Relations historiography." *Management & Organizational History*, 1: 177–199.

Bruce, K & Nylan, C 2011, 'Elton Mayo and the Deification of Human Relations', *Organization Studies*, Vol 32, No 3, pp 383-405.

DuBrin, A J (2007). Human Relations Interpersonal Job-Oriented Skills (9 ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. p. 2.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), Contemporary Management, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Mcleod, M 1983, "'Architecture or Revolution": Taylorism, Technocracy, and Social Change', *Art Journal*, Vol. 43, No 2, pp 132-147.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Taneja, S, Pryor, M G & Toombs, L A 2011, 'Frederick W. Taylor's Scientific Management Principles: Relevance and Validity', *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, Vol 16, No 3, pp 60-78.

Taneja, S, Pryor, M G, Humpheries J H & Toombs, L A (2011). "Where Are the New Organization Theories? Evolution, Development and Theoretical Debate". International Journal of Management. 28 (3): 959–978.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Wilson & Rosenfield. *Managing Organizations*. London: McGraw Hill Book Company. p. 9.

Wren D & Greenwood R 1998, *Management innovators: The people and ideas that have shaped modern business*, Oxford University Press, New York.

MODULE 4: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES II

Unit 1: Administrative Management Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the administrative management theory and trace its evolution and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the administrative management theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe administrative management theory,
2. Narrate its evolution, and
3. Discuss its philosophy

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Administrative Management Theory

According to Julian Paul Sidin, administrative management examines an organization from the perspective of the managers and executives responsible for coordinating the activities of diverse groups and units across the entire organization. Administrative management focus on how and what managers should do in their jobs. Administrative management also seeks to create an organization that leads to both efficiency and effectiveness.

Administrative management is one of the functions, departments or sections existing in any organization. The aim of the administrative function is to manage the information needs of the organization so that timely, relevant and accurate information can be given to managers at all the different levels to enabling them take meaningful decisions. Without such information it is not possible to manage any organization, function or process. Administrative managers are middle and senior managers and leaders who make certain that information flows and resources are employed efficiently across the whole organization. They ensure that all operations and system run smoothly and in the most effective manner.

3.2 Philosophy of Administrative Management Theory

Administrative management theory is identified on the following:

1. Management Oriented Theory: The management oriented theory does not give many attentions to the problems of the workers.

2. Lack of Importance to Informal Organization: The administrative management theory gives importance only to the formal organization structure. It does not give any importance to informal organization or groups.
3. Concept Borrowed From Military Science: Administrative management theories were borrowed from military science. They tried to apply these concepts to the social and business organization.
4. Mechanical Approach: Administrative management theory has a mechanical approach. It does not deal to the important aspects of management such as motivation, communication and leading.
5. Henri Fayol identified five major functions of management: Planning, Organizing, Commanding (directing), Coordinating, Controlling.
6. Besides that, Fayol prefaced his famous definition of management by starting what he considered to be the key activities of any industrial undertaking. He outlines six such key activities: technical activities, commercial activities, financial activities, security activities, accounting activities, managerial activities. Example for technical activities is production, example for commercial activities is buying and selling, example of financial activities is securing capital, example of security activities is safeguarding property, example of accounting activities is providing financial information, and example of managerial activities is planning and organizing.
7. Furthermore, Henri Fayol also classified 14 principles of management: Division of work, Authority, Discipline, subordination of individual interest to General interest, Remuneration, Centralization, Equity, Initiative, Esprit De Corps, stability of Tenure of personnel, Unity of Direction, Scalar Chain, and Unity of command. According to Henri Fayol, a manager should require the following qualities and skills: Work experience, mental qualities, Moral qualities, General education, Special Knowledge, Physical Quality.

3.3 Evolution of Administrative Management Theory

The first expert of Administrative management theory was Henri Fayol (1841-1925). Fayol is called the “Father of modern management”. Henri Fayol was a French industrialist and a management consultant. He started the functional approach to management. In 1916, he wrote a book titled “Administration Industrielle et Generale” (Principles and Practices of Management) (Julian Paul Sidin, 2011). Administrative management also can be seen as managing information through people. The administrative function is that section in an organization that is responsible for the orderly collection, processing, storing, and distributing of information to decision makers and managers within the

organization to enable them to execute their tasks as well as other role players outside the organization.

This school of thought was initially popular among American writers. In 1937, Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick published papers on the Science of Administration in which they joined the acronym POSDCORB that stands for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting. These seven principles are fast becoming professional watchwords.

This line of thought is under the contention that the main functions of a public administrator are:

- a. Plan the direction of an organisation;
- b. Build up the appropriate structure of authority on which the work is to be done, (organizing);
- c. Staffing, that is, appointing suitable persons to every position in the organization;
- d. Coordinating all the various activities to achieve the desired goal;
- e. Reporting which involves establishing communication channel that can facilitate the process of keeping all informed of what is going on; and
- f. Budgeting, this involves all aspects of financial administration.

Gullick and Urwick were bent on devising administrative principle with a universal application. They contend that the principle of POSDCORB as highlighted above if properly developed can logically work in any kind of administrative institution with degree of success (Onuoha, et. al., 1999). This position has been criticized as having over simplified administrator's responsibilities and being logically inconsistent. These critics came up with two-fold conclusions, first, some of the principles were partially contradictory (e.g. The principle of Centralization and Decentralization) and second, that these principles gave no direction as to how to choose the one most appropriate for a particular situation for instance, one principle holds that, for the purpose of control, workers should be grouped either according to functions, work process, clientele or geographical location and yet, the principle is silent on which one to adopt at a given time or place (Aghayere, 1995).

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe administrative management theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe administrative management theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. What is administrative management theory?
2. What is the philosophy of administrative management theory?
3. Trace the evolution of administrative management theory.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

(Administrative Management, 2nd edition-2009, E.J Ferreira, A.W Erasmus, D. Groenewald)

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemuo, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (200 I), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), *Classics in Management*, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), *Management Theory and Practice*, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), *Organization Theory*, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Unit 2: Behavioural Science Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the behavioural science theory and trace its evolution and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the behavioural science theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe behavioural science theory,
2. Narrate the evolution of behavioural science
3. Discuss its philosophy

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Behavioural Science Theory

Behavioural sciences explore the cognitive processes within organisms and the behavioural interactions between organisms in the natural world. It involves the systematic analysis and investigation of human and animal behavior through the study of the past, controlled and naturalistic observation of the present, and disciplined scientific experimentation and modeling. It attempts to accomplish legitimate, objective conclusions through rigorous formulations and observation. Examples of behavioral sciences include psychology, psychobiology, anthropology, and cognitive science. Generally, behavioral science deals primarily with human action and often seeks to generalize about human behavior as it relates to society.

The term behavioural science is often confused with the term *social sciences*. Though these two broad areas are interrelated and study systematic processes of behaviour, they differ in their level of scientific analysis of various dimensions of behaviour. Behavioural science abstract empirical data to investigate the decision processes and communication strategies within and between organisms in a social system. This involves fields like psychology, social neuroscience ethology, and cognitive science. In contrast, social sciences provide a perceptive framework to study the processes of a social system through impacts of social organization on structural adjustment of the individual and of groups. They typically include fields like sociology, economics, public health, anthropology, demography and political science.

Many subfields of these disciplines cross the boundaries between behavioral and social sciences. For example, political psychology and behavioral

economics use behavioural approaches, despite the predominant focus on systemic and institutional factors in the broader fields of political science and economics.

This theory of administration is tailored toward developing a medium of research and practice which utilizes psychology, sociology, and anthropology as bases for describing administrative or management principles. It emphasizes individual and group behaviour, motivation and leadership in an organization.

3.2 Contributions of Maslow to Behavioural Science Theory

The behavioural science movement, started in 1940, and it was centered at understanding individual and their interpersonal relations. This theory owes its origin to the works of renowned psychologist, Abraham Maslow, who developed what he called the "Hierarchy of Needs". The crux of this theory is the contentions that needs are arranged in a hierarchical order. The lowest level needs are the physiological and the highest level is the self-actualization needs. These needs are classified in the following order:

1. The physiological needs which include food, drink, shelter, clothing, relief from pain etc.;
2. Safety or security needs which connotes freedom from threat, intimidation and harassment;
3. Belonging, love and affection needs. This is the need for friendship, affiliation, interacting and love;
4. Ego or esteem needs. This is the desire for self-esteem or appreciation from others; and
5. Self-actualization needs. This is the need to fulfill oneself by maximizing the use of abilities, skills and potentials.

What can be deduced from Maslow's contention is the assumption that a person attempts to satisfy basic needs (food, shelter, etc.) before directing behaviour towards satisfying upper-level needs. A crucial point in Maslow's thinking is that a satisfied need ceases to motivate. When a person decides that she/he is earning enough pay for contributing to the organization, money loses its ability to motivate. This theory is anchored on the belief that people have a desire for growth and development. This contention may be to the affirmative for some employees, but not exact for others.

The inherent problem with Maslow's hierarchy was that it was not subjected to scientific tests by its propounders. While Maslow recognizes that man is never completely satisfied on any need level, he contends that decreasing percentage of satisfaction are encountered as lower-level need is replaced in predominance

by a higher-level one. Maslow recommended a hypothetical example for an average citizen who is 85 percent satisfied in his basic physiological needs, 70 percent in his security needs, 50 percent in his social needs, 40 percent in the self-esteem category and 10 percent in his self-actualization needs. The implication of the high degree of need deficiency in the self-actualization need and esteem categories is that; managers should focus attention on strategies to correct these deficiencies.

This logic assumes that attempts to satisfy these deficiencies have a higher probability of succeeding than directing attention to the already fulfilled lower-order needs. In addition, the highly deficient needs are a potential danger for managers. An unsatisfied need can cause frustration, conflict and stress in an organisation. For example, a skilled Secretary in an organisation who is given a clerical responsibility instead of more appealing Secretarial assignment may feel being deprived of satisfying self-actualization need. This type of denial in the fulfillment of need can lead to frustration that may eventually amount to poor performance.

3.3Philosophy of Behavioural Science Theory

Behavioral science theories have greater potential to enhance the effectiveness of practice than is currently realized. Many have called for development of strategies to overcome current barriers to the use of theory in different fields. Such strategies should explicate the potential of commonly taught behavioral science theories to facilitate practice and assist practitioners in using such theories. This unit presents one of such strategies: a set of principles for practice, derived from multiple behavioral science theories and having many direct implications for practice.

Behavioral science theories provide much guidance in identifying steps in the behavior change process, in understanding inter and intra individual variation in the change process, and in developing support activities, such as guided practice, that facilitate progression from one step to the next. Some of the many implications for practice of this principle are as follows:

1. Expect individual differences in readiness to change;
2. Emphasize gradual change;
3. Develop program elements specific to each step in the behavior change process;
4. Teach the psychological and behavioral skills necessary for successful performance;
5. Use direct experience (e.g. guided practice; role playing) to activate performance and strengthen attitude-behavior consistency;
6. Teach goal setting to enable participants to set their own pace for change; and

7. Teach self-monitoring skills so participants can chart their own progress.

Psychological factors, notably beliefs and values, influence how people behave. A key contribution of behavioral science theories to practice is the specification of beliefs and values relevant to understanding or trying to change behaviors. An important corollary to the second principle is to know the conceptual and practical differences between beliefs and values. Beliefs involve consequential or probabilistic thinking about the relationships between objects or events. For example, individuals make attributions about the causes of specific events; they have expectations about the likelihood of certain outcomes. Values are evaluative judgments about outcomes or events. Individuals may perceive events as good or bad, as desirable or undesirable. These constructs, which constitute the cognitive and affective components of attitudes, are the principal explanatory variables of many behavioral science theories.

In the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 1985), for example, the attitudinal component is determined by beliefs that a behavior leads to certain outcomes, and evaluative judgments regarding the outcomes. Understanding the relationships between beliefs and values, as well as their relationships with behavioral variables, is key to understanding some of the important differences between behavioral science theories. Moreover, it is easier to develop programs to change relevant beliefs and values when one is clear on the distinctions between them. Implications for practice of this principle include;

- a. Develop program components that target beliefs such as perceived personal risk, self-efficacy, response efficacy and perceived social norms,
- b. Develop program components that target values, such as perceived personal benefits, perceived costs and perceived social relevance,
- c. Instilling new beliefs or values is but one of several strategies; programs may aim to modify existing beliefs or values, or they may aim to enhance the salience and perceived relevance of existing beliefs or values, and
- d. Recognize that multiple beliefs and values generally underlie each belief and value of primary interest; develop program elements to modify these underlying beliefs and values.

The more beneficial or rewarding an experience, the more likely it is to be repeated; the more punishing or unpleasant an experience, the less likely it is to be repeated. The positive or negative aspect of any experience, whether psychological or behavioral, is subjectively defined. Thus, application of the third principle requires practitioners to determine whether seemingly rewarding experiences are perceived as such by their constituents.

Conducting theory-informed practice often requires measuring such factors, and designing evaluations that will determine whether programs are effective in changing them. Practitioners therefore need to utilize research and evaluation methods to correctly apply behavioral science theory in practical situations. If, for example, a practitioner wants to assess the existing levels of self-efficacy and response-efficacy in a target population, research methods are needed to obtain reliable, valid assessments of these concepts. Similarly, if a program is intended to change social norms regarding use, a research design is needed that will determine whether any change in norms has occurred and whether such change can be attributed to the program. In brief, research and evaluation methods are critical tools for linking theory and practice. The general implications of Principles for practice are;

- i. Knowledge of the empirical literature underlying a theory is a useful foundation for determining whether and how theoretical concepts are relevant to specific practice situations.
- ii. To apply theory in needs assessments, formative evaluations for program planning and other practice activities, research methods should be used to define, operationalize and measure the theoretical concepts of interest.
- iii. To determine whether programs affect change in the psychological, and social and other theory based determinants of behavior, research designs are needed that eliminate rival explanations and provide evidence of a cause-effect relationship.

Conclusion and implications: Hochbaum et al. (1992) state that practitioners who doubt the usefulness of theories basically question the existence of a link between the abstract formulations that are theories and the realities of practice. Explicating principles for practice is a means of demonstrating such a link, of demonstrating the implications of theory for education. Most importantly, the principles may facilitate synthesis of theoretical knowledge, and, thus, application of an integrated body of knowledge rather than selection and application of single theories. It is widely acknowledged that no single theory is adequate for developing effective behavior change strategies. Practitioners need a framework for applying multiple theories. To the extent that these principles for practice are valid summaries of the behavioral tenets of the theories from which they are derived, they may constitute such a framework. Applying the principles in the framework does present certain challenges. First, as previously noted, the principles do not supplant the need to study behavioral science theories. Because the principles generalize across theories they do not specify in sufficient detail the theoretical constructs which practitioners could apply.

For example, the second principle describes the link between beliefs and behavior.

One would need knowledge of the Belief Model (Janz and Becker, 1984), the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1985) and other theories to determine what specific beliefs to address in a program or to determine how to measure beliefs in a program evaluation. Second, practitioners must determine which principles to apply in a given practical situation. Application of the first principle assumes, for example, that practitioners know where members of their target group are as regards the phases of behavior change and what behavioral skills might facilitate progress to the next phase. Similarly, practice situations vary with regard to the viability of using direct involvement as a change strategy or using normative influence factors to achieve behavior change. A third challenge is that resources are needed to collect information pertinent to the application of the principles. For example, application of the second principle requires information about participants' current beliefs and values; application of the third principle requires information on participants' perceptions of rewards and incentives, and application of the sixth principle requires information on social group members whom participants hold in high regard. Practitioners may use focus groups, small group surveys or other brief measures to obtain such information. In sum, the challenges of applying the principles are to link the principles with the set of theories one finds relevant to practice, determine which principles one can apply in a given practice situation and obtain the information necessary to take advantage of the relevant principles. The notion that behavioral science and other disciplines can inform education practice does not exclude or discount the equally important role of experience in informing practical decisions. Experience engenders knowledge of the people, knowledge of the problem, and knowledge of the social system in which the problem occurs. Experience engenders trust, familiarity, cultural sensitivity and political awareness—all essential to successful intervention.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe behavioural science theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe behavioural science theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe behavioural science theory?
2. Mention and describe the Hierarchy of Needs of Abraham Maslow.
3. Explain the philosophy of behavioural science theory.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Ademolekun, L. (ed.) (2002), *Public Administration in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum

Books.

Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1980) *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Ajzen, I. (1985) From intentions to actions: a theory of planned behavior. In Kuhl, J. and Beckman J. (eds.), *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior*. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 11-39.

Albers, H.U. (1973), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, Paris: Wiley international edition.

Anifowose, R. and F. Enemu, (eds.) (1999), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ashiru, A.T. (200 I), *Management Theory: An introductory Approach*, Ibadan: Rasmed Publications Ltd.

Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bandura, A. (1986) *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Becker, M. H. (ed.) (1974) Special issue: the health belief model and personal health behavior. *Health Education Monographs*, 2, 324—473.

Becker, M. H. and Maiman, L. A. (1983) Models of healthrelated behavior. In Mechanic, D. (ed.), *Handbook of Health, Health Care, and the Health Professions*. Free Press, New York, pp. 539-568.

Buchanan, R. (1994) Reflections on the relationship between theory and practice. *Health Education Research*, 9, 273-283. Burdine, J. N. and McLeroy, K. R. (1992) Practitioners' use of theory: examples from a workgroup. *Health Education Quarterly*, 19, 331-340.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (ed.) (1995), *Politics and Government: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Jones, G. R. et. al. (1998), Contemporary Management, Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Merril. A. F. (ed.) (1960), Classics in Management, New York: American Management Association.

Nwachukwu C. C. (1988), Management Theory and Practice, Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Limited.

Taylor. F. W. (1911), The Principles of Scientific Management, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Weber, M. (1984), "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy" in Pugh. D.S. (ed), Organization Theory, Harmsworth: Penguin Books.

Unit 3: Systems Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the systems theory and trace its evolution and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the systems theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe systems theory,
2. Narrate its evolution, and
3. Discuss its philosophy

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Systems theory

David Easton popularized the Systems paradigm for the analysis of political life. According to Easton, a political system is that system of interaction in any society through which binding and authoritative allocations are made. Easton analyzes political activity by employing the paradigm of the biological system “whose life processes interact with each other and with the environment to produce a changing but nonetheless stable bodily state.” Viewed this way, therefore, public policy is the response of the political system to forces brought to bear on it from the environment.

Systems theory portrays public policy as an output of the political system. But systems theory is also a process theory of public policy. Certain key concepts are central to the understanding of public policy from the systems theoretic framework. First, is the concept of system ‘which implies an identifiable set of institutions and activities in society that functions to transform demands into authoritative decisions requiring the support of the whole society. A crucial property of a system is the interrelatedness of its parts or elements. Furthermore, it is assumed that a system will respond to its environment and will seek to preserve itself. Second, is the concept of inputs which refer to the forces generated in the environment that affect the political system inputs can take the form of demand and support. Demands involve actions by individuals and groups seeking authoritative allocations of values from the authorities. Support comprises of actions rendered in favour of government such as obedience to the law and payment of taxes. Inputs are generated from the environment. “The environment is any condition or circumstance defined as external to the boundaries of the political system”. Inputs are fed into the black box of decision

making, otherwise called the conversion box, to produce outputs. Outputs are the decisions and policies of the authorities. Within the systems framework, allowance is made for feedback. This is the mechanism through which the outputs of the political system influence future inputs into the system. According to Anderson, the concept of feedback indicates that public policies (or outputs) may subsequently alter the environment and the demands generated therein, as well as the character of the political System itself.

Systems theory is a dominant paradigm in orthodox theorizing about public policy. Its prominence in the policy analysis literature lies more in its disaggregation of the stages of the policy process and the opportunity it offers for further studies of these stages. In general, systems theory provides a convenient umbrella for capturing the complexity of the policy making process and is to that extent a valuable tool for organizing our inquiry into the causes and consequences of governmental action. In addition, systems theory poses a number of questions on the relationship between the environment and the political system and how the characteristics of the political system, in turn, affect the content of public policy, inter alia.

There are, however, problems with the use of systems theory in policy analysis. Much of these problems derive from the processual assumptions of the theory. The impression that is conveyed to the effect that policy making proceeds in a systematic way, beginning with input through 'output' and on to output, can hardly be substantiated in the real world of policy making. While not denying the relevance of the environment for the generation of inputs, the fact remains that demands and support as basic raw materials of policy are sometimes initiated within the political system.

A fundamental assumption of systems theory is stability, an assumption that is implied in such notions as pattern maintenance, equilibrium etc. Much value is inevitably placed on the imperative of order and predictability. It is for this reason, that systems theory is, not without some justification, labeled an ideological, endorsement of the status quo. The implication of this characterisation is that stability becomes a goal which is pursued at all cost even if it means suppressing legitimate demands the utility of systems theory is even more worrisome in situations where stability is a problem and the policy making machinery is in dire need of change.

3.2 Philosophy of Systems Theory

Systems theory is the interdisciplinary study of systems. A system is a cohesive conglomeration of interrelated and interdependent parts that is either natural or man-made. Every system is delineated by its spatial and

temporal boundaries, surrounded and influenced by its environment, described by its structure and purpose or nature and expressed in its functioning. In terms of its effects, a system can be more than the sum of its parts if it expresses synergy or emergent behavior. Changing one part of the system usually affects other parts and the whole system, with predictable patterns of behavior. For systems that are self-learning and self-adapting, the positive growth and adaptation depend upon how well the system is adjusted with its environment. Some systems function mainly to support other systems by aiding in the maintenance of the other system to prevent failure. The goal of systems theory is systematically discovering a system's dynamics, constraints, conditions and elucidating principles (purpose, measure, methods, tools, etc.) that can be discerned and applied to systems at every level of nesting, and in every field for achieving optimized equifinality.

General systems theory is about broadly applicable concepts and principles, as opposed to concepts and principles applicable to one domain of knowledge. It distinguishes dynamic or active systems from static or passive systems. Active systems are activity structures or components that interact in behaviours and processes. Passive systems are structures and components that are being processed. E.g. a program is passive when it is a disc file and active when it runs in memory. The field is related to **systems thinking** and systems engineering.

3.3 Key Concepts in Systems Theory

1. System: An organized entity made up of interrelated and interdependent parts.
2. Boundaries: Barriers that define a system and distinguish it from other systems in the environment.
3. Homeostasis: The tendency of a system to be resilient towards external factors and maintain its key characteristics.
4. Adaptation: The tendency of a self-adapting system to make the internal changes needed to protect itself and keep fulfilling its purpose.
5. Reciprocal Transactions: Circular or cyclical interactions that systems engage in such that they influence one another.
6. Feedback Loop: The process by which systems self-correct based on reactions from other systems in the environment.
7. Throughput: Rate of energy transfer between the system and its environment during the time it is functioning.
8. Microsystem: The system closest to the client.
9. Mesosystem: Relationships among the systems in an environment.
10. Exosystem: A relationship between two systems that has an indirect effect on a third system.

11. Microsystem: A larger system that influences clients, such as policies, administration of entitlement programs, and culture.
12. Chronosystem: A system composed of significant life events that can affect adaptation.

3.4 Evolution of Systems Theory

The term "general systems theory" originates from Bertalanffy's general systems theory (GST). His ideas were adopted by others including Kenneth E. Boulding, William Ross Ashby and Anatol Rapoport working in mathematics, psychology, biology, game theory and social network analysis. Sociological systems thinking started earlier, in the 19th century. Stichweh states: "... Since its beginnings the social sciences were an important part of the establishment of systems theory... the two most influential suggestions were the comprehensive sociological versions of systems theory which were proposed by Talcott Parsons since the 1950s and by Niklas Luhmann since the 1970s.

Contemporary ideas from systems theory have grown with diverse areas, exemplified by the work of biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy, linguist Béla H. Bánáthy, sociologist Talcott Parsons, ecological systems with Howard T. Odum, Eugene Odum and Fritjof Capra, organizational theory and management with individuals such as Peter Senge, interdisciplinary study with areas like Human Resource Development from the work of Richard A. Swanson, and insights from educators such as Debora Hammond and Alfonso Montuori. As a trans disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multi-perspectival domain, the area brings together principles and concepts from ontology, philosophy of science, physics, computer science, biology and engineering as well as geography, sociology, political science, psychotherapy (within family systems therapy) and economics among others. Systems theory thus serves as a bridge for interdisciplinary dialogue between autonomous areas of study as well as within the area of systems science itself.

In this respect, with the possibility of misinterpretations, von Bertalanffy believed a general theory of systems "should be an important regulative device in science", to guard against superficial analogies that "are useless in science and harmful in their practical consequences". Others remain closer to the direct systems concepts developed by the original theorists. For example, Ilya Prigogine, of the Center for Complex Quantum Systems at the University of Texas, Austin, has studied emergent properties, suggesting that they offer analogues for living systems. The theories of autopoiesis of Francisco Varela and Humberto Maturana represent further developments in this field. Important names in contemporary systems science include Russell

Ackoff, Ruzena Bajcsy, Béla H. Bánáthy, Gregory Bateson, Anthony Stafford Beer, Peter Checkland, Barbara Grosz, Brian Wilson, Robert L. Flood, Allenna Leonard, Radhika Nagpal, Fritjof Capra, Warren McCulloch, Kathleen Carley, Michael C. Jackson, Katia Sycara, and Edgar Morin among others. With the modern foundations for a general theory of systems following World War I, Ervin Laszlo, in the preface for Bertalanffy's book: *Perspectives on General System Theory*, points out that the translation of "general system theory" from German into English has "wrought a certain amount of havoc".

General System Theory was criticized as pseudoscience and said to be nothing more than an admonishment to attend to things in a holistic way. Such criticisms would have lost their point had it been recognized that von Bertalanffy's general system theory is a perspective or paradigm, and that such basic conceptual frameworks play a key role in the development of exact scientific theory. Allgemeine Systemtheorie is not directly consistent with an interpretation often put on 'general system theory,' to wit, that it is a scientific "theory of general systems." To criticize it as such is to shoot at straw men. Von Bertalanffy opened up something much broader and of much greater significance than a single theory which, as we now know, can always be falsified and has usually an ephemeral existence. He created a new paradigm for the development of theories.

A system in this frame of reference can contain regularly interacting or interrelating groups of activities. For example, in noting the influence in organizational psychology as the field evolved from "an individually oriented industrial psychology to a systems and developmentally oriented organizational psychology", some theorists recognize that organizations have complex social systems; separating the parts from the whole reduces the overall effectiveness of organizations. This difference, from conventional models that center on individuals, structures, departments and units, separates in part from the whole, instead of recognizing the interdependence between groups of individuals, structures and processes that enable an organization to function. Laszlo explains that the new systems view of organized complexity went "one step beyond the Newtonian view of organized simplicity" which reduced the parts from the whole, or understood the whole without relation to the parts. The relationship between organisations and their environments can be seen as the foremost source of complexity and interdependence. In most cases, the whole has properties that cannot be known from analysis of the constituent elements in isolation. Béla H. Bánáthy, who argued—along with the founders of the systems society—that "the benefit of humankind" is the purpose of science, has made significant and far-reaching contributions to the area of systems theory.

The systems view is a world-view that is based on the discipline of SYSTEM INQUIRY. Central to systems inquiry is the concept of SYSTEM. In the most general sense, system means a configuration of parts connected and joined together by a web of relationships. The Primer Group defines system as a family of relationships among the members acting as a whole. Von Bertalanffy defined system as "elements in standing relationship." Similar ideas are found in learning theories that developed from the same fundamental concepts, emphasizing how understanding results from knowing concepts both in part and as a whole. In fact, Bertalanffy's organismic psychology paralleled the learning theory of Jean Piaget. Some consider interdisciplinary perspectives critical in breaking away from industrial age models and thinking, wherein history represents history and math represents math, while the arts and sciences specialization remain separate and many treat teaching as behaviorist conditioning. The contemporary work of Peter Senge provides detailed discussion of the commonplace critique of educational systems grounded in conventional assumptions about learning, including the problems with fragmented knowledge and lack of holistic learning from the "machine-age thinking" that became a "model of school separated from daily life". In this way some systems theorists attempt to provide alternatives to, and evolved ideation from orthodox theories which have grounds in classical assumptions, including individuals such as Max Weber and Émile Durkheim in sociology and Frederick Winslow Taylor in scientific management. The theorists sought holistic methods by developing systems concepts that could integrate with different areas.

Some may view the contradiction of reductionism in conventional theory which has as its subject a single part as simply an example of changing assumptions. The emphasis with systems theory shifts from parts to the organization of parts, recognizing interactions of the parts as not static and constant but dynamic processes. Some questioned the conventional closed systems with the development of open systems perspectives. The shift originated from absolute and universal authoritative principles and knowledge to relative and general conceptual and perceptual knowledge and still remains in the tradition of theorists that sought to provide means to organize human life. In other words, theorists rethought the preceding history of ideas; they did not lose them. Mechanistic thinking was particularly critiqued, especially the industrial-age mechanistic metaphor for the mind from interpretations of Newtonian mechanics by Enlightenment philosophers and later psychologists that laid the foundations of modern organizational theory and management by the late 19th century.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe systems theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe systems theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe systems theory
2. Mention and describe five key concepts in systems theory.
3. Explain the philosophy of systems theory.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Bertalanffy, Ludwig, (1974) *Perspectives on General System Theory* Edited by Edgar Taschdjian. George Braziller, New York

Beven, K. (2006). A manifesto for the equifinality thesis. *Journal of hydrology*, 320(1), 18-36.

Ivanov, K. (1993). Hypersystems: A base for specification of computer-supported self-learning social systems. In C. M. Reigeluth, B. H. Banathy, & J. R. Olson (Ed.), *Comprehensive systems design: A new educational technology* (pp. 381-407). New York: Springer-Verlag. (NATO ASI Series F: Computer and Systems Sciences, Vol 95.) Original research report.

Karl Ludwig von Bertalanffy: ... *aber vom Menschen wissen wir nichts*, (English title: *Robots, Men and Minds*), translated by Dr. Hans-Joachim Flechtner. page 115. Econ Verlag GmbH (1970), Düsseldorf, Wien. 1st edition.

Lester R. Bittel and Muriel Albers Bittel (1978), *Encyclopedia of Professional Management*, McGraw-Hill, ISBN 0-07-005478-9, p.498.

Luhmann, Niklas (1984). Soziale Systeme: Grundriß einer allgemeinen Theorie. Suhrkamp.

Michael M. Behrmann (1984), *Handbook of Microcomputers in Special Education*. College Hill Press. ISBN 0-933014-35-X. Page 212.

Shugart, Herman H., and Robert V. O'Neill. "Systems Ecology". Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross, 1979.

Thomé, Bernhard (1993). Systems Engineering: Principles and Practice of Computer-based Systems Engineering. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Van Dyne, George M. "Ecosystems, Systems Ecology, and Systems Ecologists". ORNL- 3975. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 1966.

Wilkinson, David M. (2006). Fundamental Processes in Ecology: An Earth Systems Approach. Oxford University Press.

Unit 4: Group Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the group theory and trace its evolution and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the group theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe systems theory,
2. Narrate its evolution, and
3. Discuss its philosophy

1.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Group theory

Group theory developed within the context of the pluralist paradigm of politics. Pluralism argues essentially that power in western industrialised societies is widely distributed among different groups. According to this paradigm, no group is without power to influence decision-making and equally no group is dominant. It is a major premise of pluralism that any group can ensure that its political preferences and wishes are adopted and reflected in governmental action with sufficient determination and the deployment of appropriate resources.

Pluralism is a theory of representation in a democracy. It gives a pride of place to pressure groups and the representation of specific interests by these groups as a hallmark of liberal democracy. In another sense, the theory legitimises the role which these groups play in the conduct of government business by emphasizing the mutuality of obligation which exists between these groups and government.'

3.2 Assumption of Group theory

What are the assumptions of group theory and how relevant are these assumptions for the understanding of policy making? Group theory begins with the proposition that interaction and struggle among groups is the central fact of political life. According to this theory, individuals are important in politics only when they act as part of, or on behalf of, group interests. A group is a collection of individuals that may, on the basis of shared attitudes or interests, make claims upon other groups in society. Groups assume political character when they make claims through or upon institutions of government.

According to group theory, politics is the struggle among groups to reflect their interests in public policy. Conflict often results from this interplay of group forces. Consequently, “The task of the political system” according to Dye, is to manage group conflict by;

1. Establishing the rules of the game in the group struggle,
2. Arranging compromises and balancing interests,
3. Enacting compromises in the form of public policy, and
4. Enforcing these compromises.

Public policy will reflect the equilibrium reached in the group struggle, that is, the “balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to tip in their favour.” Public policy will, however, reflect the interests of dominant groups defined as those groups gaining in influence, those, in other words who have the requisite resources such as size, money, information expertise etc.

3.3 Group theory and Policy process

How useful is group theory in unraveling the intricate process of policy making? By insisting that public policy is a product of group struggle, group theory introduces a dynamic element into the understanding of how policies are made. In its pluralist context, group theory views public policy as the negotiated settlement reached “between government agencies and pressure groups organised into policy” communities. There are nonetheless, basic and substantive defects in the analysis of the policy process offered by group theory.

First, is the obvious uni-causal explanation of politics and public policy from the perspective of group struggle alone. This is an exaggerated claim which overlooks the independent role of individual actors in the policy process. Second, it is an empirical question whether, indeed power is as widely distributed in society as group theory claims and more important, whether the voice of the least powerful ‘is ever audible as to make it significant in the decision making process. Third, the market place paradigm on which group theory is anchored raises the significant question about parity in the process of competition since we are told that the sources of power available to groups may not be equal. The advantage, which some groups enjoy on account of superior resource endowment, might be a factor in the dominance of their interests in public policy. This is more so as they are able to deploy their advantaged position to secure their interests through for example, the manipulation of the rules of competition. Fourth, the assumed neutrality of government in the clash of partisan groups in the value allocation process is questionable if not doubtful, a point to which we shall return shortly.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe group theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe group theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe group theory?
2. What are the assumptions of group theory?
3. Explain the nexus between group theory and policy process.

7.0References/Further Readings

Bottomore, T. (1993) *Elites and Society* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Burnham, J. (1960) *The Managerial Revolution*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Domhoff, G. William (1967–2009) *Who Rules America?* McGraw-Hill.

Dye, T. R. (2000) *Top Down Policymaking* New York: Chatham House Publishers.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2001) *Corporate Power and the Environment*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Gonzalez, G. A. (2006) *The Politics of Air Pollution: Urban Growth, Ecological Modernization, And Symbolic Inclusion*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2009) *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2012) *Energy and Empire: The Politics of Nuclear and Solar Power in the United States*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Hunter, Floyd (1953) *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*.

Lerner, R., A. K. Nagai, S. Rothman (1996) *American Elites*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press

Milch, Jan, (1992) . C.Wright Mills och hans sociologiska vision Om hans syn på makt och metod och vetenskap,. Sociologiska Institution Göteborgs Universitet-("C.Wright Mills and his sociological vision About his views on power and methodology and science. Department of Sociology Gothenburg University")

Neumann, Franz Leopold (1944). *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933 - 1944*. Harper.

Putnam, R. D. (1976) *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Putnam, R. D. (1977) 'Elite Transformation in Advance Industrial Societies: An Empirical Assessment of the Theory of Technocracy' in *Comparative Political Studies* Vol. 10, No. 3, pp383–411.

Schwartz, M. (ed.) (1987) *The Structure of Power in America: The Corporate Elite as a Ruling Class*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

MODULE 5: SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES III

Unit 1: Elite Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the elite theory and trace its evolution and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the elite theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe elite theory,
2. Narrate its evolution, and
3. Discuss its philosophy

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Elite Theory

In political science and sociology, **elite theory** is a theory of the state that seeks to describe and explain power relationships in contemporary society. The theory posits that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic elite and policy-planning networks, holds the most power—and this power is independent of democratic elections. Through positions in corporations or on corporate boards, and influence over policy-planning networks through financial support of foundations or positions with think tanks or policy-discussion groups, members of the "elite" exert significant power over corporate and government decisions. An example of this belief is in the *Forbes* magazine article (published in December 2009) entitled *The World's Most Powerful People*, in which *Forbes* purported to list the 67 most powerful people in the world (assigning one "slot" for each 100,000,000 of human population). The basic characteristics of this theory are that power is concentrated, the elites are unified, the non-elites are diverse and powerless, elites' interests are unified due to common backgrounds and positions and the defining characteristic of power is institutional position.

Even when entire groups are ostensibly completely excluded from the state's traditional networks of power historically, on the basis of arbitrary criteria such as nobility, race, gender, or religion, elite theory recognizes that "counter-elites" frequently develop within such excluded groups. Negotiations between such disenfranchised groups and the state can be analyzed as negotiations between

elites and counter-elites. A major problem, in turn, is the ability of elites to opt counter-elites.

Elite theory developed as an alternative paradigm to pluralism. Elite theory rejects the pluralist view concerning the distribution of power in society. In the alternative, elite theory points to the concentration of political power in the hands of a minority group which, according to Mosca, forms all political functions, monopolises power and enjoys the advantages that power brings. From the perspective of elite theory, public policy may be viewed as the values and preferences of governing elite. Elite theory opposes pluralism, a tradition that assumes that all individuals, or at least the multitude of social groups, have equal power and balance each other out in contributing to democratic political outcomes representing the emergent, aggregate will of society. Elite theory argues either that democracy is a utopian folly, as it is traditionally viewed in the conservative Italian tradition, or that democracy is not realizable within capitalism, as is the view of the more Marxist-compatible contemporary elite theory permutation.

3.2 Assumptions of Elite Theory

The assumptions of elite theory are captured by Thomas Dye and Harmon Zeigler as follows:

1. Society is divided into the few who have power and the many who do not. Only a small number of persons allocate values for society; the masses do not decide public policy.
2. The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic strata of society.
3. The movement of non-elites to elite positions must be slow and continuous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only non-elites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.
4. Elites share a consensus on the basic values of the social system and the preservation of the system.
5. Public policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the prevailing values of the elite. Changes in public policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary.
6. Active elites are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elite influence masses more than masses influence elites.

In its classical formulation, elite power could be acquired through military conquest, revolutionary overthrow, command of economic resources etc. In the modern state, however, elite status is associated with the development of large scale organisations and the resultant creation of different kinds of elites such as

political, military and economic elites whose sources of power include access to formal political office, wealth, technical expertise, knowledge etc. What is significant for our purpose here is that it is these elites who make policy; that when they do they tend to reflect their values and preferences and that it is only a matter of coincidence if the policy decisions of the elite reflect the interests of the masses, as they sometimes do.

Put this way, elite theory assumes a conspiratorial character and is to that extent a provocative theory of public policy. It is conspiratorial because of the underlying premise about elite consensus on fundamental norms of the social system which limits the choice of policy alternatives to only those which fall within the shared consensus. The theory is provocative because of the implied characterisation of the masses as passive, apathetic and ill-informed and the consequential relegation of their role in policy making.

There are two other issues that should be raised concerning the relevance of elite theory for policy analysis. Even if we concede the leadership role of elites in policy formulation, strategic placement in elite position as a source of power is hardly a scientific conclusion. In addition, we know little or nothing about the specific form which the participation of the masses in the policy process takes.

To recap, Systems, Group and Elite theories are orthodox theories which have dominated thinking concerning the way authorities make policy decisions. Central to the analysis which these theories offer is the role assigned to government in policy making. All three theories gave a pivotal role to government in the value allocation process. In systems theory, for example, government is located in the black box where inputs are converted into outputs. Group theory, on the other hand, assigns to government the role of an umpire in the struggle among societal groups to reflect their interests in public policy. Elite theory favours government with the crucial role of carrying into effect, through its officials and agencies, the values and preferences which the dominant few want reflected in public policy. The underlying assumption about government in these theories is that government is an impartial mediator of conflict in society and, impliedly, a preserver of the social order.

It is a moot question whether government is a neutral actor in policy making it suffices to say, however, that government is not necessarily a disinterested party in the conflict of interests of partisan groups in society. Indeed, government sometimes pursues its own preferences which may conflict with the interests of other groups in the society. The radical objection to orthodox theories of the policy process lies essentially in the uncritical acceptance of the role of government as a neutral arbiter of political values.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe elite theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe elite theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe elite theory
2. What are the assumptions of elite theory?
3. Explain the nexus between system, group and elite theories.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Bottomore, T. (1993) *Elites and Society* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Burnham, J. (1960) *The Managerial Revolution*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Domhoff, G. William (1967–2009) *Who Rules America?* McGraw-Hill.

Dye, T. R. (2000) *Top Down Policymaking* New York: Chatham House Publishers.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2001) *Corporate Power and the Environment*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Gonzalez, G. A. (2006) *The Politics of Air Pollution: Urban Growth, Ecological Modernization, And Symbolic Inclusion*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2009) *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gonzalez, G. A. (2012) *Energy and Empire: The Politics of Nuclear and Solar Power in the United States*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Hunter, Floyd (1953) *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*.

Lerner, R., A. K. Nagai, S. Rothman (1996) *American Elites*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press

Milch, Jan, (1992) . C.Wright Mills och hans sociologiska vision Om hans syn på makt och metod och vetenskap,. Sociologiska Institution Göteborgs Universitet-("C.Wright Mills and his sociological vision About his views on power and methodology and science. Department of Sociology Gothenburg University")

Neumann, Franz Leopold (1944). *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933 - 1944*. Harper.

Putnam, R. D. (1976) *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Putnam, R. D. (1977) 'Elite Transformation in Advance Industrial Societies: An Empirical Assessment of the Theory of Technocracy' in *Comparative Political Studies* Vol. 10, No. 3, pp383–411.

Schwartz, M. (ed.) (1987) *The Structure of Power in America: The Corporate Elite as a Ruling Class*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Unit 2: Radical Marxist Theory

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the radical Marxist theory and trace its evolution, impact and philosophy. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the radical Marxist theory arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe radical Marxist theory,
2. Narrate its evolution,
3. Discuss its philosophy, and
4. Explain its impact on social history

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Radical Marxist theory

Marxists ask a basic question about the relationship between politics and economics, namely, whether the way society's economic resources are distributed affect or determine the exercise of political power. The starting point in Marxist analysis is not the political process but the form of economic organisation or the mode of production which exists in a society. Central to Marx's analysis is the insistence that the mode of production is the determinant of the relations of power in society. Marxists argue that social classes are created on the basis of how people relate to the mode of production that is dominant in their society. People relate to the mode of production either as owners or non-owners of the means of production. In a capitalist society, Marxists argue, two classes exist, namely the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie as owners of means of production are not only economically dominant but also politically superior. This superiority is assured because the bourgeoisie also controls the state and its institutions. The state, in the Marxist thesis, is an instrument of domination by the bourgeoisie, "a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonism."

3.2 Philosophy of Marxist Theory

Marxist theory is too complex and rigorous than anything that can be sketched here. There are however, some important points inferable from the class analytic framework provided by Marxists which are of relevance for the understanding of policy making. First is the fact that a ruling class exists and that members of this class are the ultimate policy-makers. Second, Marxists assign a role to the state in policy making which is clearly different from that of orthodox theorists.

From the Marxist perspective, the state is viewed as an instrument which one class uses to dominate and exploit other classes. This view is encapsulated in Marx's oft-quoted saying that "the executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the bourgeoisie". Far from being the neutral actor which the orthodox theories promoted, the state, in Marxist analysis is viewed as partisan in favour of the interests of the dominant class. Miliband has offered three reasons why the state is an 'instrument of bourgeois domination in capitalist society:

1. The similarity in the social background of the bourgeoisie and the state officials located in government, the civil service bureaucracy, the military, the judiciary etc.
2. The power of the bourgeoisie to pressure for political action through a network of personal contacts and associations with those in business and industry;
3. The constraint placed on the state by the objective power of capital, that is to say, the limits placed on the freedom of state officials by their need to assist the process of capital accumulation, a need which stems from the requirements of a strong economy based for political survival.

Marxist theory is open to charges of determinism even though there are explicit indications in the work of Marx that the relationship between economic power and political power is hardly deterministic. As some Marxist scholars, such as Miliband have argued, the room for autonomous action by the state in capitalist society is not a remote possibility since the state sometimes carry out reforms favourable to the underclass. Marxist analysis provides a radically different approach to the understanding of the policy making process which comes across the orthodox theorising of that process. If, as Claude has pointed out 'politics' is the competition among groups to make public policy conducive to the realisation of their interests and ideologies" then the role of the ruling class is determinant in what the state does and what the state chooses not to do in the value allocation process.

3.3 Historical Background of Marxism

Marxism was born in European history. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels elaborated the materialist concept of history out of engagements with German philosophy, French socialism, and British political economy. In the mid-nineteenth century historical materialism—the radical contention that the production and exchange of things necessary to the support of human life, the process through which wealth was created and distributed, was the root cause of social change and the political revolutions of the eighteenth century—stood much of the interpretation of the European past, embedded in Hegelian idealism, on its head. For Marx and Engels the mode of production was the

motor of historical process. Its movement was impossible to understand outside of the necessary frictions and periodic clashes of a society divided into irreconcilable classes, primarily the new social strata, the bourgeois and the proletarian. From the time of its birth Marxism was inexplicable outside of the transformations associated with the rise of capitalism, a social formation defined by an accumulative regime driven forward by the extraction of surplus associated with the wage system and production for profit. Capitalism and its histories of class formation and struggle figured centrally in Marxist histories, although the materialist concept of history also was applied fruitfully to pre-capitalist modes of production.

The first Marxist histories accentuated different analytic features of historical materialism. In his historical writings on France, for instance, Marx presented scathing indictments of the personnel of bourgeois power, exposing the contradictory nature of capitalist "progress" and of those, such as Napoleon Bonaparte, who would be called upon to lead its march. Such social histories were conscious assaults on the hypocrisies of bourgeois rule and parodies of the democratic order. Fueled by a partisan analysis relentless in its use of oppositional language, Marx meant to convey to all concerned the powerful class divisions at work in historical process. Marx also commented on the failures of proletarian organization in the Paris Commune, while Engels reached back into the German experience to outline the social upheavals of the German peasant wars. In their later works of political economy, Marx and Engels were equally passionate but less attuned to the place of political rule or the mobilization of class resistance. These histories, such as Marx's *Capital* (volume 1, 1867), outlined capital's original accumulations by means of dispossessing a landed peasantry, divorcing small artisan producers from the means of production, and pillaging new colonial conquests and its relentless appetite for surplus manifested in extending the length of the working day, suppressing working-class collectivity, elaborating ever more intricate divisions of labor, and charting new technological innovation.

3.4 Theoretical Foundation of Marxism

These and many other writings formed the theoretical foundation on which Marxist histories rested for the next century and more. Within what might be called "the classical tradition," Marxist histories were produced by intellectuals whose primary commitment was to the revolutionary movement. Their historical writing, seldom far removed from theoretical questions, was often a direct attempt to explore historical themes originally addressed by Marx or Engels. Thus Karl Kautsky, one of a small contingent developing the materialist concept of history in the late nineteenth century, produced a study of religion, *The Origin of Christianity* (1923), a staple of Marxist critique in this period. Kautsky attempted to situate European and American agriculture in an

1899 publication, *The Agrarian Question*. His *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation* (1897) returned directly to Engels's concern with the German peasant uprisings of the sixteenth century, as did Belfort Bax's *The Peasants War in Germany, 1525–1526* (1899). Early writing on the Paris Commune included Lissagaray's *History of the Commune of 1871* (1886), translated from the French by Marx's daughter Eleanor Marx Aveling.

With the increasing importance of revolutionary activity, most especially in Russia and culminating in the October Revolution of 1917, Marxist histories intersected directly with the perceived needs and understood accomplishments of proletarian insurrection. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899) was a massive study of the rural economy. An investigation of the tsarist countryside, the book aimed to outline how varied modes of production coexisted to produce a specific historically contextualized social formation and to develop from this research strategic directions for a workers' revolution in a setting of combined and uneven capitalist development. This theme also set the stage for Leon Trotsky's magisterial three-volume narrative *The History of the Russian Revolution* (1932), probably historical materialism's most elegantly executed chronology of class revolt in the first fifty years of marxist historical production. Trotsky's text was preceded by Louise Bryant's memoir *Six Red Months in Russia* (1918) and John Reed's more chronologically focused and journalistically inclined *Ten Days That Shook the World* (1919).

The revolutionary movement stimulated Marxist research and bore rich fruit in the pre–World War I period. Subjects barely touched upon by the founders of historical materialism emerged out of the new global capitalism orchestrated by monopoly and threateningly powerful imperialist rivalries. Rudolf Hilferding's *Finance Capital* (1910) and Otto Bauer's *The Nationalities Question and Social Democracy* (1907) were both published, like Lenin's book, before their authors reached the age of thirty. They prefigured the concerns of Rosa Luxemburg, whose writings addressed the new regime of capital accumulation and accentuated the role of colonies. Luxemburg's politics breathed a vibrant internationalism and a particular resistance to national parochialism.

But troubling signs as well showed up on the Marxist horizon in 1914. The fracturing of the Second International, the working-class organization of marxism at the time of World War I, suggested the powerful challenges to orthodoxy that emerged in this period, detailed in the French marxist Georges Haupt's *Socialism and the Great War: The Collapse of the Second International* (1972) and in Carl Schorske's *German Social Democracy, 1905–1917: The Development of the Great Schism* (1955). The Russian

Revolution failed to spread to the advanced capitalist economies of the West, and the ground receptive to Stalinist containments was being tilled. One seed was the rise of the international Left Opposition, grouped around Trotsky and later organized in the Fourth International. The scant serious historical self-reflection on Marxist theory and history produced in these years, such as Trotsky's *The Revolution Betrayed: What Is the Soviet Union and Where Is It Going?* (1937), emanated from this dissident quarter. The Stalinist Comintern of the interwar years was notable for its mechanical practices and routinization of theory. As Perry Anderson argued in *Considerations on Western Marxism* (1976), the interwar years and beyond largely saw the relinquishment of historical, economic, and political themes in Marxist intellectual production and the replacement of Marxist activists at the writing center of historical materialism by university-based scholars of the left. The center of gravity of continental European Marxism, in Anderson's metaphor, turned toward philosophy. Certainly the major Marxist thought in this period was cultivated among a layer of what Luxemburg and Kautsky dubbed *Kathedersozialisten*, professorial socialists. From György Lukács to Jean-Paul Sartre, class consciousness was written about more as an aesthetic possibility than as a combative historical process.

Nevertheless, some Marxist histories produced in the post-1920 period continued to conjoin the social and the political within grounding in economic life. Much of this writing was produced by Communist Party (CP) intellectuals, among them the Russian émigré turned English journalist Theodore Rothstein, who wrote *From Chartism to Labourism* (1929), an important early account of the history of the British working-class movement. Something of a combination of Henry Mayhew, Charles Booth, and Engels, Jürgen Kuczynski authored a multivolume set of short histories of labor conditions in Germany, France, and Great Britain that prefigured, in its range of concerns and attention to periodization, the later approach of Eric J. Hobsbawm. But perhaps the most important Marxist history in these interwar years was sustained by two British CP figures, Maurice Dobb and Dona Torr. Dobb returned to the themes of *Capital* in his *Studies in the Development of Capitalism* (1947). Torr, in a series of largely party-circulated and often inaccessible publications, many of which were short educational or agitational pieces, stimulated interest and concern about the working class and its movements among a cohort of historians whose formative political years were spent in the struggles for colonial independence, the popular front organizations and cultural milieu of the late 1930s, the battle to defeat fascism both politically and militarily, and the postwar campaigns for peace and nuclear disarmament.

3.5 Impact of Marxism on Social History

Marxism's intersection with social history thus has been wide-ranging and highly influential, if at times constricting in what it seemed able to address. It has nevertheless actually charted particular spheres of study, such as important realms of the debate over the nature and meaning of the transition from feudalism to capitalism. In other areas, most obviously labor history but also particular chronological periods and topics, such as the English revolutions of the seventeenth century or the French Revolution of the late eighteenth century, Marxist histories achieved, for a time at least, interpretive hegemony. The concerns of Marxist histories always have been a fusion of the economic, the political, and the sociocultural. Hill, for example, believed that all history was intellectual history, but this did not prevent him from writing on matters that blurred distinctions between the material and the cultural, a crossover that produced or at least illuminated the social. It is inconceivable that European social history from the Renaissance to the modern period could have developed historiographically without the insights of Marxist perspectives.

Equally important, Marxist approaches highlighted for all historians—conservatives, radicals, feminists, and liberals—significant themes in the historical process. Those themes include the relationships of economic life and social being; the appreciation of large-scale socioeconomic transformation and the making of class, gender, and national-ethnic identities; and the importance of "totality" in historical process and the reciprocity of mercantile, landed, protoindustrial, and capitalist relations in the emergence of the modern world. Indeed Marxist histories stimulated and enlivened social history, assuring it a measure of intellectual tenacity by forcing reconsiderations and new appreciations of large issues. State formation, the subject of a stimulating synthetic statement by Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer that bridged the medieval and the modern, is one such area that Marxist approaches have reinvigorated. It is impossible to think of social history in the 1990s, for instance, without acknowledging the weight of Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*, not so much because of the persuasiveness of its research and argument, which have been contested, but rather because of its tone, vision, and sensibilities. This feel for a new kind of history, which became the enduring attraction of "the social," was not the monopoly of the Marxists, but they contributed mightily toward it. Consequently Marxist histories affected the changing balance of historical thought as much as they grew out of the material circumstances and internal debates, polemics, and ruptures of the Marxist movement itself.

The Marxist movement was never a monolith, and sociopolitical and intellectual histories of Marxism in the European past mark an evolution of uncommon

diversity. The major early political studies of the marxist First and Second Internationals, including A. Müller Lehning's *The International Association, 1855–1859: A Contribution to the Preliminary History of the First International* (1938) and James Joll's *The Second International, 1889–1914* (1974), were later complemented by national surveys and specific accounts of particular countries in restricted chronological periods, many written by nonmarxists. Among these Tony Judt's *Marxism and the French Left: Studies in Labour and Politics in France, 1830–1981* (1986) is notable for its breadth, and Gerald H. Meaker's *The Revolutionary Left in Spain, 1914–1923* (1974) sets the stage well for an appreciation of the momentous conflicts of the civil war of the 1930s. The Italian communist experience proved fertile ground for a Marxist engagement with the national question, especially acute in a country economically, socially, culturally, and politically fractured. The "southern question" preoccupied major Marxist thinkers, such as Antonio Labriola and Antonio Gramsci.

Germany's unique politics of Nazism stimulated significant Marxist engagements, such as those of Tim Mason, in which social histories of class intersect with the politics of a disturbing defeat of the left and open out into histories of class acquiescence and subterranean resistance. British communism's eclectic origins in religious dissent, the autodidact Labour Colleges, the meeting of Lib-Lab consciousness, Fabianism, trade unionism, and the mythological power of the Russian Revolution have been appreciated by Marxist historians, such as Raphael Samuel and Stuart Macintyre, while Marxist explorations of various aspects of the Labour Party have sustained important intellectual engagements. The peculiarities of Scandinavian socialism have generated equal interest. In the nation-states won to Marxism out of the dissolutions of World War II and through the contradictory "liberations" of Joseph Stalin's Red Army, Marxism as a social movement was suffocated at its potential birth, leaving it deformed and awaiting its overthrowers, the most illustrious of whom would appear, to Western eyes, to be Lech Walesa and Poland's labor movement *Solidarność* (Solidarity).

No unity congeals this ongoing relation of social change and the dissenting tradition, but it is impossible to consider European history without addressing the Marxist presence. No sooner had communism fallen in 1989, with Marxism proclaimed dead and history and ideology supposedly at their end, than Marxist ideas and movements began to reemerge out of the seeming wasteland of Stalinist decay. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Marxist thought and communist political organizations were down but certainly not out. The ills of capitalism—increasing economic inequality and its manifold oppressions and destabilizing violence—remained very much in evidence, especially in the new,

wildly erratic, and war torn frontier of acquisitive individualism's market economies, Russia and its former eastern European satellites.

Marxist histories, as the site of new understandings of the social and as the lived experience of mobilizations attempting to transform society and politics, have greatly influenced European history. Their intellectual, cultural, economic, and social meanings have been profound, and, although their future at the turn of the century was perhaps more clouded than at any time in the previous hundred years, they have remained a force to reckon with.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe radical Marxist theory, its evolution and philosophy.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe radical Marxist theory. In addition, issues surrounding its evolution and philosophy were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe radical Marxist theory
2. What is the philosophy of radical Marxist theory?
3. Explain the impact of radical Marxist theory on social history.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Alexander, Robert J. *International Trotskyism, 1929–1985: A Documented Analysis of the Movement*. Durham, N.C., 1991.

Aston, T. H., and C. H. E. Philpin, eds. *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe*. Cambridge, U.K., 1985.

Bolloten, Burnett. *The Spanish Civil War: Revolution and Counterrevolution*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991.

Brenner, Robert. *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653*. Princeton, N.J., 1993.

Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution*. Oxford, 1985.

De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. Ithaca, N.Y., 1981.

Dorpalen, Andreas. *German History in Marxist Perspective: The East German Approach*. Detroit, Mich., 1985.

Gruber, Helmut. *Red Vienna: Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919–1934*. New York, 1991.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London, 1994.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Workers: Worlds of Labor*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.

Judt, Tony. *Marxism and the French Left: Studies in Labour and Politics in France, 1830–1981*. Oxford, 1986.

Kaplan, Temma. *Red City, Blue Period: Social Movements in Picasso's Barcelona*. Berkeley, Calif., 1992.

Mason, Tim. *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*. Edited by Jane Caplan. Cambridge, U.K., 1995.

Merriman, John M. *The Red City: Limoges and the French Nineteenth Century*. New York, 1985.

Panitch, Leo. *Working-Class Politics in Crisis: Essays on Labour and the State*. London, 1986.

Perrot, Michelle. *Workers on Strike: France, 1871–1890*. Translated by Chris Turner. New York, 1987.

Rowbotham, Sheila. *A Century of Women: The History of Women in Britain and the United States in the Twentieth Century*. London, 1997.

Sassoon, Donald. *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The West European Left in the Twentieth Century*. New York, 1996.

Secombe, Wally. *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Northwestern Europe*. London, 1992.

Secombe, Wally. *Weathering the Storm: Working-Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline*. London, 1993.

Taylor, Barbara. *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*. London, 1983.

Thompson, Dorothy. *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution*. New York, 1984.

Thompson, E. P. *Customs in Common*. London: Merlin, 1991.

Thompson, E. P. *Witness against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law*. New York, 1993.

Unit 3: New Public Management

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the New Public Management and trace its history, theory and criticism. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the New Public Management arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe New Public Management,
2. Narrate its history,
3. Discuss its principles, and
4. Explain its theory.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of New Public Management

New Public Management (NPM) is an approach to running public service organizations that is used in government and public service institutions and agencies, at both sub-national and national levels. The term was first introduced by academics in the UK and Australia to describe approaches that were developed during the 1980s as part of an effort to make the public service more "businesslike" and to improve its efficiency by using private sector management models. As with the private sector, which focuses on "customer service", NPM reforms often focused on the "...centrality of citizens who were the recipient of the services or customers to the public sector." NPM reformers experimented with using decentralized service delivery models, to give local agencies more freedom in how they delivered programs or services. In some cases, NPM reforms that used e-government consolidated a program or service to a central location to reduce costs. Some governments tried using quasi-market structures, so that the public sector would have to compete against the private sector notably in the UK, in health care. Key themes in NPM are;

1. financial control,
2. value for money,
3. increasing efficiency,
4. identifying and setting targets,
5. continuance monitoring of performance, and
6. handing over power to the senior management executives.

Performance was assessed with audits, benchmarks and performance evaluations. Some NPM reforms used private sector companies to deliver what

were formerly public services. NPM advocates in some countries worked to remove collective agreements in favour of individual rewards packages at senior levels combined with short term contracts and introduce private sector-style corporate governance, including using a Board of Directors approach to strategic guidance for public organizations. While NPM approaches have been used in many countries around the world, NPM is particularly associated with the most industrialized OECD nations such as the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States of America. NPM advocates focus on using approaches from the private sector—the corporate or business world—which can be successfully applied in the public sector and in a public administration context. NPM approaches have been used to reform the public sector, its policies and its programs. NPM advocates claim that it is a more efficient and effective means of attaining the same outcome.

In NPM, citizens are viewed as "customers" and public servants are viewed as public managers. NPM tries to realign the relationship between public service managers and their political superiors by making a parallel relationship between the two. Under NPM, public managers have incentive-based motivation such as pay-for-performance, and clear performance targets are often set, which are assessed by using performance evaluations. As well, managers in an NPM paradigm may have greater discretion and freedom as to how they go about achieving the goals set for them. This NPM approach is contrasted with the traditional public administration model, in which institutional decision-making, policy-making and public service delivery is guided by regulations, legislation and administrative procedures.

NPM reforms use approaches such as disaggregation, customer satisfaction initiatives, customer service efforts, applying an entrepreneurial spirit to public service, and introducing innovations. The NPM system allows the expert manager to have a greater discretion. Public Managers under the New Public Management reforms can provide a range of choices from which customers can choose, including the right to opt out of the service delivery system completely.

New Public Management draws practices from the private sector and uses them in the public sector of management. NPM reforms use market forces to hold the public sector accountable and the satisfaction of preferences as the measures of accountability. In order for this system to proceed, certain conditions, such as the existence of competition, must exist and information about choices must be available. Reforms that promise to reinvent government by way of focusing on results and customer satisfaction as opposed to administrative and political processes fail to account for legislative self-interest. Institutions other than

federal government, the changes being trumpeted as reinvention would not even be announced, except perhaps on hallway bulletin boards.

3.2 Comparisons between New Public Management and New Public Administration

New Public Management is often mistakenly compared to New Public Administration. The ‘New Public Administration’ movement was one established in the USA during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Though there may be some common features, the central themes of the two movements are different. The main thrust of the New Public Administration movement was to bring academic public administration into line with a radical egalitarian agenda that was influential in US university campuses. By contrast the emphasis of the New Public Management movement a decade or so later was firmly managerial in the sense that it stressed the difference that management could and should make the quality and efficiency of public services. It focuses on public service production functions and operational issues contrasted with the focus on public accountability, ‘model employer’ public service values, ‘due process,’ and what happens inside public organizations in conventional public administration. That meant New Public Management doctrines tended to be opposed to egalitarian ideas of managing without managers, juridical doctrines of rigidly rule-bound administration and doctrines of self-government by public-service professionals like teachers and doctors.

The table below gives a side-by-side comparison of the two systems core aspects/characteristics

New Public Management	New Public Administration
Hands on approach	Hierarchy and rules
Explicit standards	Apolitical, non-partisan civil service
Emphasis on output control	Internal regulations
Disconnection of units	Equality (Equity?)
Importance of the private sector	Importance of public sector

Improve timing	Stability
Greater usage of money	

Source: Hood 1991 and Hood and Jackson 1991

3.3 History of New Public Management

The first practices of New Public Management emerged in the United Kingdom under the leadership of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Thatcher played the functional role of “policy entrepreneur” and the official role of prime minister. Thatcher drove changes in public management policy in such areas as organizational methods, civil service, labor relations, expenditure planning, financial management, audit, evaluation, and procurement. Thatcher's successor, John Major, kept public management policy on the agenda of the Conservative government, leading to the implementation of the Next Steps Initiative. Major also launched the programs of the Citizens Charter Initiative, Competing for Quality, Resource Accounting and Budgeting, and the Private Finance Initiative.

A term was coined in the late 1980s to denote a new (or renewed) focus on the importance of management and ‘production engineering’ in public service delivery, which often linked to doctrines of economic rationalism (Hood 1989, Pollitt 1993). During this timeframe public management became an active area of policy-making in numerous other countries, notably in New Zealand, Australia, and Sweden. At the same time, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) established its Public Management Committee and Secretariat (PUMA), conferring to public management the status normally accorded more conventional domains of policy. In the 1990s, public management was a major item on President Clinton’s agenda. Early policy actions of the Clinton administration included launching the National Partnership and signing into law the Government Performance and Results Act. Currently there are few indications that public management issues will vanish from governmental policy agendas. A recent study showed that in Italy, municipal directors are aware of a public administration now being oriented toward new public management where they are assessed according to the results they produce.

The term New Public Management (NPM) expresses the idea that the cumulative flow of policy decisions over the past twenty years has amounted to a substantial shift in the governance and management of the “state sector” in

the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, Scandinavia, and North America. A benign interpretation is that these decisions have been a defensible, if imperfect, response to policy problems. Those problems as well as their solutions were formulated within the policy-making process. The agenda-setting process has been heavily influenced by electoral commitments to improve macro- economic performance and to contain growth in the public sector, as well as by a growing perception of public bureaucracies as being inefficient. The alternative-generation process has been heavily influenced by ideas coming from economics and from various quarters within the field of management.

Although the origins of NPM came from Westernized countries it expanded to a variety of other countries in the 1990s. Before the 1990s, NPM was largely associated to an idea utilized by developed countries that are particularly Anglo-Saxon. However the 1990s have seen countries in Africa, Asia and other countries looking into using this method. In Africa, downsizing and decrease of user fees have been widely introduced. These autonomous agencies within the public sectors have been established in these areas. Performance contracting became a common policy in crisis states worldwide. Contracting out of this magnitude can be used to do things such as waste management, cleaning, laundry, catering and road maintenance.

NPM was accepted as the "gold standard for administrative reform" in the 1990s. The idea for using this method for government reform was that if the government guided private-sector principles were used rather than rigid hierarchical bureaucracy, it would work more efficiently. NPM promotes a shift from bureaucratic administration to business-like professional management. NPM was cited as the solution for management ills in various organizational context and policy making in education and health care reform.

3.4 The Principles of New Public Management

The basic principles of NPM are can best be described when split into seven different aspects elaborated by Christopher Hood in 1991. Hood also invented the term NPM itself. They are the following:

Management

Because of its belief in the importance and strength of privatizing government, it is critical to have an emphasis on management by engaging in hands-on methods. This theory allows leaders the freedom to manage freely and open up discretion.

Performance standards

It's important to maintain explicit standards and measures of performance in a workforce. Using this method promotes clarification of goals/intent, targets, and indicators for progression.

Output controls

The third point acknowledges the shift from the use of input controls and bureaucratic procedures to rules relying on output controls measured by quantitative performance indicators. This aspect requires using performance based assessments when looking to outsource work to private companies/groups.

Decentralization

NPM advocates often shifted from a unified management system to a decentralized system in which managers gain flexibility and are not limited to agency restrictions.

Competition

This characteristic focuses on how NPM can promote competition in the public sector which could in turn lower cost, eliminate debate and possibly achieve a higher quality of progress/work through the term contracts. Competition can also be found when the government offers contracts to the private sectors and the contract is given in terms of the ability to deliver the service effectively, quality of the goods provided, hence this will increase competition because the other private sector which did not get the contract will make strides to improve the quality and ability thereby facilitating competition.

Private-sector management

This aspect focuses on the necessity to establish short-term labor contracts, develop corporate plans or business plans, performance agreements and mission statements. It also focuses on establishing a workplace in which public employees or contractors are aware of the goals and intention that agencies are trying to reach.

Cost reduction

The most effective one which has led to its ascent into global popularity focuses on keeping cost low and efficiency high. Doing more with less moreover cost reduction stimulates efficiency and is one way which makes it different from the traditional approach of management.

3.5 Theoretical Basis New Public Management

The theoretical basis of New Public Management describes the characteristics of New Public Management (NPM) and gives a cursory overview of the

development of the behavioral-administrative sciences and their relation to NPM. A descriptive model of the behavioral-administrative sciences is developed that pits three internally consistent scientific worldviews that are incommensurable to each other. From this, the theoretical origins of NPM can be traced to a variety of theoretical perspectives. Although the special mix of characteristics of NPM is new, it does not represent a paradigm change. Indeed, it is improbable that there will ever be one paradigm for the behavioral-administrative sciences; and without an accepted paradigm, a paradigm change is not really possible.

The conventional wisdom holds that NPM has its origins in public-choice theory and managerialism (Aucoin, 1990, pp. 115; Dunsire, 1995, pp. 21–29; Lueder, 1996, pp. 93; Naschold et al., 1995, pp. 1–8; Reichard, 1996, p. 245f; Schedler, 1995, p. 155). Does this formula fit, and is it exhaustive? Moreover, is NPM really new? Finally, does NPM represent a paradigm change, as some writers claim (Aucoin, 1995, p. 3; Borins, 1994, p. 2; Kamensky, 1996, p. 250; OECD, 1995, pp. 8, 25; Osborne and Gaebler, 1993, p. 321; Reinermann, 1995, p. 6)? To answer these questions, describe the development of administrative thought in the U.S., the home of public-choice theory and managerialism, focus on the U.S. because it dominates theoretical developments in the behavioral-administrative sciences, owing in part to the sheer size of its academic establishment, its diversity, and the richness of its approaches. On the presumption that the attempts of practitioners, consultants, and scientists to reform administrative organizations and delivery systems are influenced by their disciplinary socialization and training, this survey will examine whether theoretical concepts other than public choice and managerialism have influenced NPM.

In the Progressive movement, the New York Bureau for Municipal Research was a key player. Influenced by Frederick Taylor's scientific management, the New York Bureau believed that efficiency was the best solution to the problem of corruption and incompetence. These progressive reformers imported techniques and studies from scientific management (e.g., on efficient street paving and snow removal). They were the first to use performance indicators to benchmark the efficiency of public organizations, one purpose of which was to identify corruption (Schachter, 1989). In the 1920s, some practitioners and academics created the science of public administration on the fundamentals of the progressive reform successes—particularly the presupposition of loyal bureaucrats, honest politicians, and the politics-administration dichotomy. These reformers—the new scientists of public administration—built a theory of organization that they supplemented with the concept of management. These principles were:

- a. The principle of division of work and specialization.
- b. The principle of homogeneity.
- c. The principle of unity of command.
- d. The principle of hierarchy with respect to the delegation of authority.
- e. The principle of accountability.
- f. The principle of span of control.
- g. The staff principle (Gulick, 1937; Urwick, 1937; Mooney, 1937; Graicunas, 1937).

3.6 Criticisms of New Public Management

There are blurred lines between policymaking and providing services in the New Public Management system. Questions have been raised about the potential politicization of the public service, when executives are hired on contract under pay-for-performance systems. There are concerns that public managers may move away from trying to meet citizens' needs. NPM brings to question integrity and compliance when dealing with incentives for public managers. Questions such as managers being more or less faithful arise. The public interest is at risk and could undermine the trust in government. Accountability can be a big issue.

Although NPM had a dramatic impact in the 1990s on managing and policymaking, many scholars believe that NPM has hit its prime. Scholars like Frank Dunleavy believe New Public Management is phasing out because of disconnect with “customers” and their institutions. Scholars cite the Digital Era and the new importance of technology that kills the necessity of NPM. In countries that are less industrialized, the NPM concept is still growing and spreading. This trend has much to do with a country's ability or inability to get their public sector in tune with the Digital Era. New Public Management was created in the Public Sector to create change based on: disaggregation, competition, and incentives. Using incentives to produce the maximum services from an organization is largely stalled in many countries and being reversed because of increased complexity.

In Post-NPM, many countries explored digital era governance (DEG). Dunleavy believes this new way of governance should be heavily centered upon information and technology. Technology will help re-integrate with digitalization changes. Digital Era Governance provides a unique opportunity for self- sustainability however; there are various factors that will determine whether or not DEG can be implemented successfully. When countries have proper technology, NPM simply can't compete very well with DEG. DEG does

an excellent job of making services more accurate, prompt and remove most barriers and conflicts. DEG also can improve the service quality and provide local access to outsourcers.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe New Public Management, its history, principles, theory and criticism.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe New Public Management. In addition, issues surrounding its history, principles, theory and criticisms were treated.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe New Public Management.
2. What are the principles of New Public Management?
3. Explain the theory of New Public Management.

7.0 References/Further Readings

Barzelay (2001). *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Dunleavy (2005). *New Public Management Is Dead--Long Live Digital-Era Governance*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Farazmand, Ali (Jan 2, 2006). "New Public Management: Theory, Ideology, and Practice". *Handbook of Globalization, Governance and Public Administration*. in "A Public Management for all seasons?", *Public Administration Review*, Vol 69, Spring 1991 (3-19)

Farazmand, Ali (Feb 2, 2006). "New Public Management". *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration*: 888.

Kaboolian, Linda (1998). *The New Public Management: Challenging the Boundaries of the Management vs. Administration Debate*. *Public Administration Review*.

Marozzi, Marco; Bolzan, Mario (2015). "Skills and training requirements of municipal directors: A statistical assessment". *Quality and Quantity*. **50** (3): 1093–1115. doi:10.1007/s11135-015-0192-2.

Unit 4: Chinese Developing Bureaucracy

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this unit is to describe the Chinese Developing Bureaucracy trace its history, theory and criticism. This is to enable the learner overcome some misconceptions and ambiguity surrounding the New Public Management arising from the multicultural and multidisciplinary approaches to it. You are therefore, expected to give the unit maximum attention it deserves.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit, students should be able to;

1. Describe Chinese Developing Bureaucracy,
2. Narrate Chinese central organization department, and
3. Explain communist bureaucracy and officials.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Description of Chinese Bureaucracy

Name chop mark is used instead of signature in China. The powerful State Council is China's highest administrative body. It makes proposals to the Standing Committee of the Politburo and takes care of the day-to-day operations of the country. It is a huge bureaucracy controlled by the Communist Party and headed by the Prime Minister. Through its hierarchy of ministries and agencies, the State Council carries out the directives of the Politburo. Among the agencies are the Ministry of Truth and a Department of Propaganda. The bureaucracy is led by the party elite. Participation is limited to members of the Communist Party. The Central Party School is the top training ground for Communist Party bureaucrats. All the top leaders attended it.

During the Tang Dynasty (A.D. 618--907), there was one official for every 2,927 people. During the more recent Qin Dynasty (1644--1911), there was one official for every 299 people. But in modern China, there are up to 50 million officials, amounting to about one official for every 27 people. Its bureaucracy certainly cannot complain about being understaffed.

John Lee wrote in Newsweek, while modern China is the most over governed land in Asia, it is also one of the worst governed. Even as China has decentralized and officials have multiplied, the country is not building the institutions needed for better transparency and accountability. CCP's influence over courts, bureaucracies, media, research institutions, and state-controlled enterprises are well known. It's difficult to make CCP's local officials accountable when Beijing relies on them to maintain the party's hold on power in far-flung places. There are roughly 300 million government employees in

China. In recent years the central government has vowed to shrink the bloated bureaucracy. They have laid off some people and reduced salaries yet many people continue drawing substantial salaries at the taxpayers' expense.

A great deal of time is taken up by sitting through lengthy meetings which accomplish little and sifting through lengthy documents and paperwork that are largely waste of time. In 2007, the State Council set limits on the lengths of official meetings, speeches and documents. The bureaucracy is slowly reforming and becoming more accountable. A health minister was fired for mistakes made during the SARS crisis in 2003. This was seen as a sign that leading bureaucrats were going to be held accountable for their actions.

3.2 Central Organization Department and the Communist Party Bureaucracy

The Chinese government elite, which includes about 2,800 people at or above director or vice minister level, in the government and military, is intensely loyal.

The Central Organization Department is the party's vast and opaque human resources agency. Andrew Higgins (2010): It has no public phone number, and there is no sign on the huge building it occupies near Tiananmen Square. Guardian of the party's personnel files, the department handles key personnel decisions not only in the government bureaucracy but also in business, media, the judiciary and even academia. Its deliberations are all secret.

If such a body existed in the United States, Richard McGregor (2010) wrote in his book *The Party* it would oversee the appointment of the entire US cabinet, state governors and their deputies, the mayors of major cities, the heads of all federal regulatory agencies, the chief executives of GE, Exxon-Mobil, Wal-Mart and about fifty of the remaining largest US companies, the justices of the Supreme Court, the editors of the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post, the bosses of the TV networks and cable stations, the presidents of Yale and Harvard and other big universities, and the heads of think-tanks like the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation.

Economic policy and other important policies are still largely shaped by the government's central planning agency, the National Development and Reform Commission. Many think that policy could be shaped more effectively and efficiently if the agency was stripped of some of its responsibilities. Foreign

policy is ultimately crafted not by the foreign ministry but the party's Central Leading Group on Foreign Affairs, and that military matters are decided not by the defense ministry but by the party's Central Military Commission. These and other party groups meet in secret.

In *The Party* McGregor described the existence of a network of special telephones known as "red machines," which sit on the desks of the party's most important members. Connected to a closed and encrypted communications system, they are China's version of the "vertushka" telephones that once formed an umbilical cord of party power across the vast expanse of the Soviet empire. All governments have their own secure communications systems. But China's network links not just ministers and senior party apparatchiks but also the chief executives of the biggest state-owned companies---businessmen who, to outside eyes, look like exemplars of China's post-communist capitalism.

At the National People's Congress in 2008, China announced plans to streamline its massive bureaucracy by merging some large ministries into "super-ministries" covering areas such as transportation, social services, environmental protection, housing and construction but not energy. The idea was that with increased power, streamlining, and separation of regulation and enforcement from policy the super ministries would make it harder for provincial governments to ignore rules set in Beijing.

3.3 Administration in China

Governmental institutions below the central level are regulated by the provisions of the State Constitution of 1982. These provisions are intended to streamline the local state institutions and make them more efficient and more responsive to grass-roots needs; to stimulate local initiative and creativity; to restore prestige to the local authorities that had been seriously diminished during the Cultural Revolution; and to aid local officials in their efforts to organize and mobilize the masses. As with other major reforms undertaken after 1978, the principal motivation for the provisions was to provide better support for the ongoing modernization program.

The state institutions below the national level were local people's congresses--the NPC's local counterparts--whose functions and powers were exercised by their standing committees at and above the county level when the congresses were not in session. The standing committee was composed of a chairman, vice chairmen, and members. The people's congresses also had permanent committees that became involved in governmental policy affecting their areas and their standing committees and the people's congresses held meetings every other month to supervise provincial-level government activities. Peng Zhen

described the relationship between the NPC Standing Committee and the standing committees at lower levels as "one of liaison, not of leadership." Further, he stressed that the institution of standing committees was aimed at transferring power to lower levels so as to tap the initiative of the localities for the modernization drive.

The administrative arm of these people's congresses was the local people's government. Its local organs were established at three levels: the provinces, autonomous regions, and special municipalities; autonomous prefectures, counties, autonomous counties (called banners in Nei Monggol Autonomous Region (Inner Mongolia)), cities, and municipal districts; and, at the base of the administrative hierarchy, administrative towns (*xiang*). The administrative towns replaced people's communes as the basic level of administration.

Reform programs have brought the devolution of considerable decision-making authority to the provincial and lower levels. Nevertheless, because of the continued predominance of the fundamental principle of democratic centralism, which is at the base of China's State Constitution, these lower levels are always vulnerable to changes in direction and decisions originated at the central level of government. In this respect, all local organs are essentially extensions of central government authorities and thus are responsible to the "unified leadership" of the central organs.

3.4 Chinese Communist Bureaucrats and Officials

The traditional Communist bureaucracy operates under a command system of specified ranks called *nomenklatura* in which everyone knew his place, his role, and what he was supposed to do, think and say. Bureaucrats have traditionally been resistant to changes because in many cases change would make them obsolete and unnecessary. Common terms used to describe Communist members included *appartchik*, a petty bureaucrat; *cadre*, a group or a member of a group of Communist loyalists; and *commissar*, a personnel officer responsible for morale and discipline.

On the bureaucratic elite is the Communist Party, George Yeo, Singapore's foreign minister, wrote in *Global Viewpoint*, when working properly the mandarin state is meritocratic and imbued with a deep sense of responsibility for the whole country. Yeo told *Global Viewpoint*, although politics in China will change radically as the country urbanizes the core principals of bureaucratic elite holding the entire country together is not likely to change. Too many state functions affecting the well-being of the country as a whole require central coordination. In its historical memory, a China divided always means chaos.

Describing a typical Communist official, Rudolph Cheleminski wrote in

Smithsonian, "Bright, confident, well-spoken but still bearing that indefinable air of defensiveness when...encountering Westerners. Milling, ironical, circumlocution with practiced rhetorical skill, prodding, rebutting when there was no call for rebuttal, answering questions with questions, he fenced more than he participated in an interview." The work load of some senior officials is quite high. They have a responsibility to keep friends, colleagues, and investors entertained in a punishing round of restaurants, karaoke bars and massage parlors. [Sexton, 2010]

Chinese Cadre System

Communist officials are known as cadres. A cadre is defined by the Oxford University Press Dictionary as "a small group of people trained for a particular purpose or profession." High-level officials are sometimes referred to as mandarins, a term used to describe elite bureaucrats in imperial times. Senior cadres remain overwhelmingly male, but there is now a compulsory retirement age and even (very low) quotas for women. The party and government cadre (ganbu) system is the rough equivalent of the civil service system in many other countries. The term cadre refers to a public official holding a responsible or managerial position, usually full time, in party and government. A cadre may or may not be a member of the CCP, although a person in a sensitive position would almost certainly be a party member.

Bureaucrat Behavior in China

The Communist bureaucracy functions under many of the same principals of the old imperial bureaucracy, namely operating under a rigid hierarchy and acting to serve its own self-interests and unresponsive to the needs of the people it supposed to serve. The bureaucracy in China has been described as a "multiplicity of competing ministries and bureaucratic levels" defined by "the constant distractions of interdepartmental buck-passing and turf wars." A meritocracy it isn't. Local officials are often promoted even though they have miserable records. They often advance using "framing, fawning, stealing and sneaking" and seeking their self-interest. Under ancient Chinese system of patronage, which is still followed to some degree today, officials received appointments from above in return for remuneration from below. And people who collected taxes and other payments kept some for themselves and passed on the rest to their superiors.

Bureaucrats have traditionally gone through great lengths to make sure they didn't make any mistake or anger a superior. High-level officials make the decisions behind the scenes and mid-level cadres carry out the decisions. Chinese government official, according to the Times of London, fear being sacked or jailed if they said anything deemed inappropriate to U.S.

officials. One civil servant told the Times, "The security people will study these documents word by word, After all, that's their job, They already make a record of anyone who meets with a U.S. diplomat and so they will be able to put together the date in the cable with the date of the meeting and from the content can easily identify anyone." One official was sent to jail for 10 years in 1992 for revealing in advance the text of a speech by President Jiang Zemin to Hong Kong reporters.

Many low-level Communist officials drive black Volkswagen Santanas. Often they are among the worst drivers on the roads, in some cases producing gridlock traffic jams with their impatience. High-level officials like to travel around China with an entourage. In 2009, state media warned that growing competition for government jobs appeared to have encouraged cheating in the civil service entrance exam, with about 1,000 cheaters caught over a four month period.

Wang Yang, a Communist Party leader of Guangdong Province and a member of the Politburo, is major proponent of what he calls "mind liberation"---the process of opening of the bureaucracy to new ways of thinking.

Red Tape and Bribes in China

For non-Chinese things do not happen so quickly. It can take two years to obtain permission from local authorities to buy the house and even then it can take skill and guanxi to navigate the process and keeps it from going at an even slower pace.

Some Chinese say that achieving success in China requires skill of navigating through the messy tangle of governmental bodies---national, provincial, city, county township, and even village and neighborhood---and dealing with a certain amount murkiness and not asking a lot of unnecessary questions such as where the money came from.

Opening a hotel in Shanghai requires the approval of 11 agencies, including the police, the fire department and various business licensing bureaus and foreign enterprise offices. Sometimes navigating through the bureaucracy requires proceeding in a step by step fashion from one agency to another but more often means being bounced back and forth between agencies. Foreign businessmen often have to hire dozen or more Chinese to help get through the maze.

Small companies can avoid a \$1,400 tax by paying a \$140 bribe Mark Magnier wrote in the Los Angeles Times, "Executive say government and party officials demand payments and abuse their power to award contracts and issue permits. Companies that lowball or otherwise anger officials learn quickly that the most routine inspection can turn into a nightmare...Though cash is straightforward, executives said gifts of department store and restaurant vouchers are more

difficult to trace, as are artwork and stock, paid “study” trips, prostitutes or paying overseas tuition of officials’ children.”

Once in Nanjing, a 1,000-ton shipment of steel passed through 83 different government work units and companies before it was delivered. The steel was bought and sold 232 times over several months, increasing the price by 300 percent.

Foreign companies are often restricted from hiring and firing who they want and often they are forced to hire Chinese employees on the basis of their connection not their skills. Simple things such as getting a land-line telephone installed and renting some property can be incredible hassles. Patience is helpful but probably the most important thing to have to get things done is *guanxi* (connections).

Former Shanghai mayor and Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji has been nicknamed Mr. One Chop because of efforts to reduce the number of chops or signatures on permits and bureaucratic documents. In a speech in March 2004, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao promised to cut red tape for entrepreneurs.

4.0 Conclusion

In this unit, attempt was made to describe Chinese Developing Bureaucracy, its central organization, its administration and the impact of communist party.

5.0 Summary

In this unit, attempt has been made to describe Chinese Developing Bureaucracy. In addition, issues surrounding its central organization department, its administration and communist bureaucracy and officials.

6.0 Tutor –marked Assignment

1. Describe Chinese Developing Bureaucracy.
2. What are the impacts of communism on Chinese bureaucracy?

7.0 References/Further Readings

Barzelay (2001). *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Dunleavy (2005). *New Public Management Is Dead--Long Live Digital-Era Governance*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Farazmand, Ali (Jan 2, 2006). "New Public Management: Theory, Ideology, and Practice". *Handbook of Globalization, Governance and Public Administration*. in "A Public Management for all seasons?", *Public Administration Review*, Voæl 69, Spring1991 (3-19)

Farazmand, Ali (Feb 2, 2006). "New Public Management". *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration*: 888.

Kaboolian, Linda (1998). *The New Public Management: Challenging the Boundaries of the Management vs. Administration Debate*. *Public Administration Review*.

Marozzi, Marco; Bolzan, Mario (2015). "Skills and training requirements of municipal directors: A statistical assessment". *Quality and Quantity*. **50** (3): 1093–1115. doi:10.1007/s11135-015-0192-2.