ASSESSMENT OF THE NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Otohinoyi Samuel
Department of Public Administration,
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
Otohimoyisamuel@yahoo.com

&

Dr. Matthew Funsho Bello
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Gombe State University, Gombe
matthewfbello@gmail.com

&
Dr. Rashida Adamu Oyoru
Department of Politics and Governance,
Kwara State University
rashidaadamu23@yahoo.com

Abstract
The Nigeria public servants over the years have been considered to be ineffective and inefficient in the way and manners in which they carried out their responsibilities to the society .This made past governments to called for reforms in the public service which did not significantly affect their efficiency. The paper looked at the new public management as a reform carried out by government to rigged the public service of Nigeria .the data for the research were generated through secondary source. The paper found out that there is lack of expertise to make NPM successful. Also, with high level of corruption in the country NPM doctrine of decentralization can actually lead to arbitrary action and corruption. It is concluded that new public management is a good reform that can bring efficiency and effectiveness to Nigeria public service if only the necessary precondition menus are met.

Key Words: Public Administration, New Public Management, Decentralization, Civil Service Reform

Introduction

Public administration is administrative organ of government that enable government operates and manage its activities in an effective and efficient manner. It plays a vital role in delivering and distributing of public services to the citizenry. The survival of our society depends to a large extent on the competency or technical know-how of our administrators. Therefore, governments sometimes do come up with administrative reforms to enable the public servants cope with the dynamic challenges which may hamper their efficiency and effectiveness, for example, the Morgan Commission of 1963,the Adebo commission of 1971,Udoji commission of 1974, the Allision Ayida Panel of 1994 and so on .

Azie (2003) opined that the Nigerian Public Service has undergone several organizational and structural reforms, both before and after independence, yet there is no tremendous improvement in the quality of service provided to the citizenry. Corruption still rears its ugly head again after many years of military exit in governance. Anazodo (2009) stated that many unqualified personnel joined the Civil Service and this resulted in over-sized workforce, and absenteeism engulf about 87% of total government employees. All sorts of vices are associated with the civil service despite the reforms carried out and among which are; inefficiency, laziness, absenteeism, wastefulness and corruption. There are many allegations against some civil servants on grand of corruption. For instance, in 2001, a permanent

secretary of the ministry of defence was accused of embezzling funds amounting to N450 million. The chairperson of the Educational Tax Fund (ETF), and the Accountant General of the Federation, the former chairman of the Inland Revenue Services were alleged to have embezzled funds of the ETF to the tune of N40 billion between 1993 and 2000. Some advanced countries like France, US, Germany, Netherlands and Canada have tremendously improved their Civil Service by making it more Client public-oriented. They achieved this by using a model of centralized control allowing a reasonable degree of decentralization, flexibility and delegation of Civil Service Management system. The problem is will adoption of new public management in Nigeria reduce Civil Service inefficiency, corruption, redtapism and at the same time improve performance standards in government?

Objective of the study

The main objective of this paper is to evaluate the new public management and effectiveness of the Nigeria civil service.

Methodology

The methodology adopted is the content analysis. To this end the research will involve a review of existing secondary sources in books, journals, magazines and Newspapers. The researcher employed documentary research. The secondary source of data was generated from published and unpublished materials including the internet.

Review of the Related Literature

The Philosophy of Public Administration

Public administration has long been practiced and recognized as an art. More recently claims for public administration being a science have also been put forward. Today, it is being realized more and more that there must also be the philosophy of public administration because it deals with human beings capable of purposeful activity and ethical judgment. More recently the question of 'philosophy of administration ' received attention in the writings of Chester Bernard, Ordway Tead, Herbert Simeon, Charles A. Beard and Marshal E. Dimock. Charles A. Beard (1939) declared that " the future of civilized government, and even we think of civilization itself rest upon our ability to develop a science and philosophy and a practice of administration competent to discharge the functions of civilized society"

Marshal E. Dimock (1958) in his book "a philosophy of administration" observes: "that administration is more than learned responses, well-chosen techniques, a bundle of tricks. It is not even a science and never ought to become a hard and fast method. It is more than an art. It is a philosophy". According to Dimock (1958), philosophy is a body of belief and practice aimed at achieving better performance. A philosophy of administration is a taught through and viable pattern of survival and influence for individuals and for institutions. It is a good policy and good technique. But most of all it is a real integration, the blending of everything. Thus, administration has the task of integrating "a large number of elements than any other vocation." And this requires of course, that as it borrows from sociology, psychology, political science etc, it should know what to take and how to use it. That implies the need for a philosophy.

Dimock (1958) highlights that public administration is now so vast an area that a philosophy of administration comes close to being the philosophy of life. In certain about this quest, he points out five such tests which a viable philosophy of administration should satisfy. The first requirement is inclusiveness. If our concern ultimately is with survival and influence, we must be sure that all elements entering into administrative action are brought into focus. Secondly, we must see that they are integrated, added up completely and correctly. Everything that is involved must be brought into proper and unified relationship. Thirdly, it should insist that where possible principles be developed they will constitute valid guide to future action under substantially similar conditions. The fourth proposition is that administration is concern with both ends and means and that it is difficult to imagine any step in the

administrative process that does not involved values and goals. Public administration more than subjects is equally concerned with the relation of ends and means and it is consequently self-defeating to try rigorously to separate these two. The fifth proposition is that a philosophy of administration ought to be taught through in such a way that it describes reality and provide the most reliable tool possible in the hand of a skillful administrator, it constitute a grand total which exceed sum of its parts

Conceptual Definition of Public Administration

White (1955) observes "public administration consists of all those operations having for their purpose the fulfillment or enforcement of public policy". Similarly, according to Wilson (1941), "public administration is detailed and systematic application of law". In the words of Dimock (1937), "public administration is the fulfillment or enforcement of public policy as declared by the competent authorities… public administration is law in action. It is the executive side of government". There are writers like Simon (1950) who define the scope of public administration In such a way as to make it coincide with the activities of the executive or administrative branch only. Thinkers like Pfiffner (1965) lay more emphasis on the coordinating role of administration. In his opinion administration consist of "getting the work of government done by coordinating the effort of the people so that they can work together to accomplish their set task".

The Concept of New Public Management

Garson and Overan in Umar (2013) defined New Public Management (NPM) as an interdisciplinary study of the generic aspects of administrations; a blend of the planning, organizing and controlling function of management with the management of human, financial, physical, information and political resources. Some modern authors define NPM as a combination of splitting large bureaucracies into smaller, more fragmented agencies, encouraging competition between different public agencies, and encouraging competition between public agencies and private firms and using economic incentives lines (e.g., performance pay for senior executives or user-pay models). NPM treats individuals as "customers" or "clients" (in the private sector sense), rather than as citizens.

From Public Administration to New Public Management

In the United States of America, Woodrow Wilson is considered the father of public administration. He first formally recognized public administration in an 1887 article entitled "The Study of Administration." The future president wrote that "it is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy." Wilson (1889) was more influential to the science of public administration than Von Stein, primarily due to an article Wilson wrote in 1887 in which he advocated four concepts:

Separation of politics and administration

Comparative analysis of political and private organizations

Improving efficiency with business-like practices and attitudes toward daily operations

Improving the effectiveness of public service through management and by training civil servants, merit-based assessment

The separation of politics and administration has been the subject of lasting debate. The different perspectives regarding this dichotomy contribute to differentiating characteristics of the suggested generations of public administration.

By the 1920s, scholars of public administration had responded to Wilson's solicitation and thus textbooks in this field were introduced. A few distinguished scholars of that period were, Luther Gulick, Lyndall Urwick, Henri Fayol, Frederick Taylor, and others. Frederick Taylor (1856–1915), another prominent scholar in the field of administration and management also published a book entitled 'The Principles of Scientific Management' (1911). He believed that scientific analysis would lead to the

discovery of the 'one best way' to do things and /or carrying out an operation. This, according to him could help save cost and time. Taylor's technique was later introduced to private industrialists, and later into the various government organizations (Jeong & Nor, 2007).

Taylor's approach is often referred to as Taylor's Principles, and/or Taylorism. Taylor's scientific management consisted of main four principles (Frederick W. Taylor, 1911):

- Replace rule-of-thumb work methods with methods based on a scientific study of the tasks.
- Scientifically select, train, and develop each employee rather than passively leaving them to train themselves.
- Provide 'Detailed instruction and supervision of each worker in the performance of that worker's discrete task' (Montgomery 1997: 250).
- Divide work nearly equally between managers and workers, so that the managers apply scientific management principles to planning the work and the workers actually perform the tasks.

Taylor had very precise ideas about how to introduce his system (approach): 'It is only through enforced standardization of methods, enforced adoption of the best implements and working conditions, and enforced cooperation that this faster work can be assured. And the duty of enforcing the adoption of standards and enforcing this cooperation rests with management alone.

The separation of politics and administration advocated by Wilson continues to play a significant role in public administration today. However, the dominance of this dichotomy was challenged by second generation scholars, beginning in the 1940s. Luther Gulick's fact-value dichotomy was a key contender for Wilson's proposed politics-administration dichotomy. In place of Wilson's first generation split, Gulick advocated a "seamless web of discretion and interaction".

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick are two second-generation scholars. Gulick, Urwick, and the new generation of administrators built on the work of contemporary behavioral, administrative, and organizational scholars including Henri Fayol, Fredrick Winslow Taylor, Paul Appleby, Frank Goodnow, and Willam Willoughby. The new generation of organizational theories no longer relied upon logical assumptions and generalizations about human nature like classical and enlightened theorists.

Gulick developed a comprehensive, generic theory of organization that emphasized the scientific method, efficiency, professionalism, structural reform, and executive control. Gulick summarized the duties of administrators with an acronym; POSDCORB, which stands for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Fayol developed a systematic, 14-point, treatment of private management. Second-generation theorists drew upon private management practices for administrative sciences. A single, generic management theory bleeding the borders between the private and the public sector was thought to be possible. With the general theory, the administrative theory could be focused on governmental organizations. The mid-1940s theorists challenged Wilson and Gulick. The politics-administration dichotomy remained the center of criticism.
It has been concluded in (Hood 1991; Larbi 1999; Haques 2007; and Cheung 1996) that the origin of NPM can be simply be traced from public choice principal- agent and institutional theories which together provide the foundation of the NPM concept. The emphasis is on market competition, business principles, managerial autonomy, customer choice, and performance standards. Basing on these assumptions public organizations are set in a way that they can operate in business like. Public choice theory for example, is an application of economies to political analysis, this theory treats the political mechanism, especially voting behavior as the means by which individuals' preferences for public goods are rationally transformed to policy makers and, as such is an extension of economic analysis into political decision making (Howard, 2001). However, the followers of this theory criticize traditional bureaucratic model for its advocacy on management based on input and process instead of result based management (Hood, 1991; Larbi, 1999). They further argue that, public bureaucracies tend to be slow in responding to contextual changes and continue to be passive to public service beneficiaries. This theory

also, reveals the conflict of interests persisting among three groups i.e. politicians, voters, and bureaucrats. Politicians often pursue maximization of votes; voters pursue net benefit maximization of voting; and bureaucrats pursue budget maximization of course for rent seeking, for this case, NPM was brought in to overcome this kind of paradox.

Basing on principal-agent theory, is also a business oriented theory associated with behavioral studies; emphasis is on employer-contractor (employee) interactions. According to this theory, the latter has more information about his or her actions or intentions than the former. Since the principal cannot usually monitor the agent, sometimes agent can decide to act inappropriately especially if the interests between them are not aligned. In relation to public sector, the politician acts as principal and the bureaucrat as an agent, therefore, there must be well and clear interaction between them especially what the bureaucrat should do and for whom (Walsh, 2000; Larbi, 1999). It has been further argued that, is hard to hold the agent accountable while he is not well informed for example about the terms of performance contract. Thus NPM emphasizes on prescription of pre-set performance standards for the bureaucrats to achieve something traditional bureaucratic model has never done before.

Consequently, following the poor performance in the UK public sector particularly in the National Health Service, Margaret Thatcher the Prime Minister of UK in 1970s decided to develop new mechanisms for accountability of the public sector (Kajimbwa 2013). In responding to that situation the government brought in legislation which introduced the concepts of value of money and performance, motivation of public servants towards greater economy and efficiency, deliberate introduction of the concept of "general management" based on largely private sector models, and introduction of market-style structures where government started to play as an enabler of public services and not taking direct responsibility in public service provision (Glynn and Murphy, 1996). This was the starting point of the new pubic management.

It is also believed that NPM was introduced due to increasing world demand for "good governance" as well as the changing role of the state. NPM aims at avoiding the criticism directed towards traditional public administration through improving service delivery and efficiency, and applying accountability. In contrast with traditional public administration, NPM focuses on the outcomes rather than the process of implementation. NPM strongly supports the involvement of the private sector and Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) in the delivery of services, unlike traditional public administration that used to burden the government with implementing too many activities at the same time without any involvement of the private sector or NGOs. Many characteristics are associated with NPM, such as de-bureaucratization, the wide use of the private sector, the implementation of Public-Private Sector Partnership schemes, enhancing the provision of services through outsourcing, and the use of information and communication technology (Sharma, 2007). Al Gore (cited in Sharma, 2007: p.4) offers the following concise summary of the most common characteristics of NPM: (i) Cutting red tape: shifting from systems in which people are accountable for following rules to systems in which they are accountable for achieving results; (ii) putting customers first; (iii) empowering employees to get results; and (iv) going back to basics and 'producing better government for less.

Rationales and Causes of New Public Management

What are the rationales behind the emergence of NPM and its globalization? The most common official explanations for adopting the NPM model are the weaknesses or failures of traditional state bureaucracy, especially in terms of its monopolistic nature, unmanageable size, managerial inefficiency, public inaccessibility, economic inertia, excessive corruption, and self-serving agenda. Although these allegations against state bureaucracy were always there in the past, the intensity of such anti-bureaucratic rhetoric was significantly increased during the 1980s and 1990s by the market-friendly ruling parties in advanced capitalist nations. The new agenda was to reduce the scope and role of public

bureaucracy, transfer resources and services from the public sector to the private sector, and restructure the public service in the image of business management, because the business sector was believed to be more competitive, productive, efficient, innovative, responsive, and customer-friendly.

In both developed and developing countries, the tarnished image of the public service was reinforced further as most governments began to hold the expansive public sector responsible for causing budget deficits and fiscal crisis, and introduced market-driven policies and structural reforms in line with the NPM model. Various forms of fiscal crisis, allegedly caused by an inefficient public bureaucracy, have been used as one of the most oft-cited rationales for adopting NPM as a more efficient model of governance in Western Europe and North America as well as Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Another dominant rationale has been to enhance innovations in the public sector based on NPM principles and techniques such as user-responsiveness, outcome-orientation, and competition in service delivery. These micro-managerial principles and techniques are considered "good practices", and founded upon the macro-level rhetoric of "good governance" used by governments and donors to justify the adoption of NPM. In particular, in the name of "good governance", the World Bank has prescribed various facets of NPM for developing nations to pursue their public sector reforms.

Beyond the above formal rationales of using the NPM approach to governance presented by its advocates, there are other political reasons behind this approach mentioned by its critics. First, for some critics, a common cause behind the emergence of NPM has been the political agenda of the ruling party to use this market-driven approach as an effective tool to boost the political support of an anti-bureaucratic public. For instance, in the 1980s, the neo-conservative political leaders in the UK and the US—especially Thatcher and Reagan—blamed the state-centered public sector, advocated the market-led NPM model, and used such a rhetoric as a campaign ploy to win elections. This political tactic became more effective in the context of globalized private media publicizing the failure of the public sector and success of market forces. The examples of similar political uses of NPM can be found in other developed nations such as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, and more recently in developing countries and transitional economies. In endorsing the NPM model, there has been a considerable degree of convergence among ideologically diverse political parties in most of these countries (Haque,2007).

Another reason for the anti-bureaucratic rhetoric of NPM since the 1980s has been the crisis of public confidence in governance in major capitalist nations, which led political parties and leaders to use public bureaucracy as a scapegoat. They blamed public servants for worsening socioeconomic problems in order to make themselves look good in public eyes. By pointing fingers at the public sector as a trouble-maker and drawing public attention to NPM as an alternative, the ruling parties tried to justify unpopular policies like retrenchment, welfare cuts, and user fees. In an effort to avoid responsibility and regain public confidence, they also held the public service responsible for government failure, focusing on economic and fiscal crises rather than a legitimation crisis. It has been pointed out that in most capitalist nations it is mainly the crisis of the Keynesian welfare state that led to the expansion of the private sector and the redefined (market-driven) role of the state in the form of NPM.

Lastly, in the case of the developing world, beyond the internal socioeconomic problems, the above mentioned external pressure exerted by international agencies played a crucial role in encouraging (often forcing) them to adopt the NPM style of public sector reforms. In particular, since the early 1980s, these agencies have imposed structural adjustment programs as a pre-condition for granting loans, thus forcing developing nations not only to adopt market-led policies such as privatization, deregulation, and liberalization, but also to restructure the public sector based on business sector principles found in the NPM model. Thus, while the major causes of NPM in capitalist nations have largely been internal, including internal vested interests and state crises, in developing countries the causes behind its endorsement have predominantly been external (Haque, 2007).

What can be considered most interesting in the above discussion is the fact that in both developed and developing countries, beyond the official rationales such as state failure, public sector inefficiency, and bureaucratic mismanagement, there are major critical factors such as vested political interests, a legitimation crisis, and external pressure behind the advocacy and adoption of NPM as a new mode of governance. These critical causal factors have often been hidden under the appealing phrases associated with NPM, including reinvention, innovation, facilitation, partnership, empowerment, customer satisfaction, capacity building, and so on. Although there are cross-national variations in the extent to which these internal and external factors led to the emergence of NPM, as mentioned above, today it is increasingly portrayed as a global model of governance.

The Practice of NPM Reforms in Africa

Most sub-Saharan countries including Tanzania; Zambia; Malawi; and Zimbabwe experienced economic hardships in the mid of 1980s. According to the World Bank, introduction of Structural Adjustment Programmes to improve economic situation in these countries was inevitable (de Waal, 2007; Doorgapersad 2011).This programme had to go hand in hand with adoption of NPM. The assumption is that, NPM would create a deliberate effort in tax collection while trying best to cut expenditures as well as professionalizing and modernizing individual public managers and granting them autonomy (Pollit ,2007). Through NPM the relations between states, markets, and societies would be structured by paying high regard on market forces, managerial efficiency, and government accountability. In the reconfiguration of the above mentioned relations in the NPM basis, both decentralization process and civil service reform had to be taken into consideration (Hope, 2001).

Decentralization

Decentralization is a broad term, generally is the transfer of authority or responsibility for decision making, planning, management, and resource allocation from central government to its field units, district administrative units, local governments, regional or functional authority, semi-autonomous public authorities, parastatal organizations, private entities, and non government private or voluntary (Lekorwe,1998). Basing on managerialism perspective, decentralization involves disaggregating and downsizing of public service (Doorgapersad, 2011).

The primary objective for advocating decentralization policy is the assumption that government may become more accountable and responsive to its people and provide relevant and quality public goods and services (Lekorwe, 1998). In Africa for example, pressure for high demand of quality public services has been increasing day after day as the impact of multiparty political system. This situation has really exposed many civilians to their fundamental rights (Hope 2001). The idea to decentralize therefore comes in to meet peoples' demands with high standards. It is through decentralization key aspects of NPM such as managerial autonomy; rewarding system for organizational or individual performance; and capacity building to meet performance targets can be realized. From NPM point of view, decentralization comprise of de-concentration, delegation, devolution and privatization (Hope 2011). These are fundamental modes of decentralization which are also being practiced in Africa.

De-concentration is the passing down of selected administrative functions to lower levels or sub-national units within government agencies or departments (Hope 2001). According to Johnson de-concentration is the transfer of responsibility from central agencies in the national capital to field offices of central agencies (Johnson 1995).

Clear example is Botswana where the central government created district councils and national rural development councils to coordinate agricultural activities among other rural developmental activities (Hope 2001). Also the presence of district and town/city councils; land boards; and also tribal administration and district administration bodies (Doorgapersad, 2011). In Tanzania as well there are district administrations which have their areas of jurisdiction overlapping those of the local government authorities appear to be parallel with de-concentration of public administration functions of central

government. Also all field offices of water authority and roads construction and maintenance agency scattered all over the country especially in cities and municipalities indicate lively examples of de-concentration. (Lubuva, 2007).

However, there is a debate whether creation of executive agencies in the concept of NPM is a pure form of deconcentration or it falls in the category of delegation. As explained, in (Hope, 2001), agencification is regarded as another form of de-concentration. Executive agencies are the tools to unbundle the traditional bureaucracy in order to create more flexible and performance oriented public organizations (Sulle, 2011). For that case therefore, agencification model is a breaking up of monolithic bureaucracies into agencies and it has emerged as decentralization form for many African countries, and good example is a creation of independent revenue authorities in Zambia and South Africa (Hope 2001). This model allows the managerial autonomy since the power to make decision in all managerial areas like financial and human resource is decentralized to Chief Executive Officer of the created agency (Sulle 2011). For instance in Tanzania agencification Act requires CEO of the agency to be accountable for any malfunction that might be proven in his agency.

Taking Tanzania as a case, its Executive Agencies Act of 1997 states clearly that "the permanent secretary of a ministry under which the executive agency is established shall be responsible for strategic general management nature of the CEO, but shall not direct or participate in the day-to-day management of the agency affairs" (GOTEAA, 1997). By the year 2008, Tanzania had already created 24 executive agencies including Tanzania roads agency, Tanzania building agency and many others (Sulle 2011) but, the number has increased to 36 executive agencies by 2011(Kabwe, 2011). However, the implementation of this Act is very challenging, for example it is hardly to see the parent ministry sets performance targets as required rather this task is deliberately left to the CEO of the respective agency who later again evaluates his own performance (Sulle 2011). This is contrary to the provision of the NPM which insists on the parent ministry to set performance standards for the agency to meet. Apart from Tanzania, most African countries are in the same situation and indeed they have shown a marked reluctance to go down this road (Polidano 1999).Delegation is another form of decentralization; this is a transfer of responsibility from agency to organization not wholly under central control (semi-autonomous corporations or sub national units of government) (Johnson 1995). The World Bank defines delegation as whereby the central government transfers responsibility for decision making and administration of public functions to semi-autonomous organizations not wholly controlled by the central government, but ultimately accountable for it (Doorgarpersad 2011). Clear examples include public corporations in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, parastatals in Lesotho, autonomous hospitals in Botswana and Ghana.

Another form of decentralization practiced in Africa is devolution. This is the transfer of decision making power by central government to autonomous units of local government with corporate status (Johnson1995). Is the granting of decision making powers to lower authorities or managers and allow them to take full responsibility without reference back to the authorizing government (Hope 2001). Is the transfer of governance responsibility for specified functions to sub-national levels (Doogarpersad 2011). Devolution is also being practiced in Africa for example public financial program in Ghana where managers exercise greater control of their budgets (Larbi, 1999). The power of local government authorities to make decision and to have control of resources is expanding in Tanzania as a result of ongoing policy of decentralization by devolution (Luvuba, 2007). In so doing therefore, the governments in these countries have encouraged the local initiatives and participation in development planning, implementation and evaluation as emphasized in NPM.

Another form of decentralization is privatization which signifies the transfer of operational control and responsibilities for government functions and services to the private sector (Hope 2001). He further explains that privatization may encompass a wide range of policies in a wider perspective, for example to encourage private sector participation in the public service delivery and eliminate or modify the monopoly status of public organizations. The aim is to improve efficiency and avoid unnecessary

costs state owned enterprises might cause in the centralized public service provision. Furthermore, Doogarpersad gives the list of some of African countries adopted this reform type which include Angola, Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Senegal, Guinea, Mali, Rwanda and Sierra Leone (Doogarpersad 2011). Currently many African countries have definitely gone on this road, and one can hardly find an African country that is not practicing this policy.

Another form of decentralization is privatization which signifies the transfer of operational control and responsibilities for government functions and services to the private sector (Hope 2001). He further explains that privatization may encompass a wide range of policies in a wider perspective, for example to encourage private sector participation in the public service delivery and eliminate or modify the monopoly status of public organizations. The aim is to improve efficiency and avoid unnecessary costs state owned enterprises might cause in the centralized public service provision. Furthermore, Doogarpersad gives the list of some of African countries adopted this reform type which include Angola, Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Senegal, Guinea, Mali, Rwanda and Sierra Leone (Doogarpersad, 2011). Currently many African countries have definitely gone on this road, and one can hardly find an African country that is not practicing this policy.

Civil Service Reform

Following the economic crisis smacked African continent in1980s and 1990s as well as poor performance demonstrated by civil service, ignited civil service reform in most African countries. The reform intended to downsize the civil service and enhance its operational efficiency (Sulle 2011).

The return of democratic governance in Nigeria in 1999 facilitated the radical breakthrough in the implementation of the new public management principles in public sector organization. For instance restructuring the civil service for effective and efficient service delivery. Reducing the over-bloated public service by down-sizing and right-sizing regime, creation of autonomy public organization to create efficiency and effective service delivery. Linking up to and accepting globalization, transfer of new administrative thinking, new or modern technology in managing the new order in public sector administration. These include the introduction of ITC and E-governance. Today, the Nigerian state has embraced the new public management and is trying to capture a stronghold in discouraging wasteful management, cost reduction in governance, budget implementation tie to specific goals, and objectives, or programme of the organization before money is released (Philip,2013). In struggling for recovery from economic crisis most African countries decided to carry out civil service reform which involved downsizing of the civil service. For example Uganda and Tanzania by 1990s the civil service was downsized by 55% and 22% respectively (Hope 2001). By December 1997 in Tanzania civil service was reduced at 30 percent (Otenya ,2006). Likewise in Zambia the public service was retrenched leaving the size of nonmilitary public service excluding police, nurses and teachers dropped from 137,000 in 1997 to 112,000 by the end of 1999 (Hope 2001). In Kenya thousands of public service employees were retrenched at the first phase of 1997-8 and the second phase which was introduced in 2004. This phase was under voluntary basis yet about 20,000 civil service were retrenched (Otenya 2006).

Moreover, downsizing was also associated with some other operational strategies. For example in Tanzania, in 1993 the reform aimed at redefining the role of government as facilitator and not the dower of the role, and the idea was to enhance the greater private sector participation in the economy (Otenya, 2006). Other managerial strategies were introduction of performance appraisal and payroll systems. Therefore, public sector reform in the perspective of NPM has to go hand in hand with civil service reform and these two are connected. For example it could not be possible to implement the policy of privatization with big size of civil service. NPM requires governments to contract out and market size

the public service delivery (Larbi, 1999) and governments could not continue to be paying jobless civil servants, of course for this reason civil service reform was inevitable.

Furthermore, civil service in Africa had to be reformed, besides it was associated with several weaknesses as such as being unprofessional, often lacking capacity to solve the tough new problems of their government; too bloated in size in relationship to their output; suffering from dysfunctional rigidity; lacking in, and not caring about, measurement of their performance; preoccupied with their own rules and practices rather than promoting , protecting and serving the public interests; generally, being too corrupt and intent on maintaining their own patrimonial and territorial interests" (Hope 2001). Basing on these challenges the civil service in Africa had to be reconfigured through reform process. In fact, the reform did not focus only on institutional restructuring of civil service but also it introduced new ideas and techniques in the management of public services. For example in Tanzania a government instituted several reform measures which included creation of executive agencies that are almost detached to their parent ministries, but also introduction of management techniques like result-based management (Sulle, 2011).

New Public Management Criticisms

While ideas about NPM have spread internationally and many countries have introduced reforms associated with it, a number of criticisms have been leveled at it. Before examining these criticisms it is important to emphasize that NPM is not a definitive set of measures. Some observers believe that it is best to perceive NPM as a menu from which choices can be made (Manning, 2001; Turner, 2002). The menu is long as can be seen from the discussion in the previous section and different countries make contrasting choices leading to variation in the form of NPM found in particular countries.

The first criticism of NPM involves a paradox of centralisation through decentralisation. To illustrate the point, Kaboolian (1998), Khademian (1998) and Maor (1999) pointed out that giving public managers more authority to manage programs may result in concentrating decisions making in them. Thus, NPM may lead to centralised decision making by public managers, rather than encouraging decentralization in public organizations as it claims.

The second criticism concerns applying private sector management techniques to the public sector. While NPM has encouraged the use of private sector management techniques, there may be risk associated with adopting some private sector practices (Flynn, 2002). Many academic commentators such as Pollitt (1990) and Armstrong (1998) argued that most areas of public service and administration have distinct political, ethical, constitutional and social dimensions and these factors make the public sector different from the private sector. A complementary view is provided by Savoie (2002) and Singh (2003), who argues that NPM is basically flawed because private sector management practices are rarely adopted into government operations. For them, NPM is inappropriate for the public sector as it has more complex objectives, more intricate accountabilities and a more turbulent political environment than the private sector. Moreover, the relationship between public sector managers and political leaders is of a different order to any relationships in the private sector. In support of the above mentioned argument, Painter (1997) contended that there is danger in using private business models in the public sector because of the contextual differences. Additionally, Cheung and Lee (1995) noted that NPM ideas have limitations in terms of using private techniques for the public sector. They argue that in the public sector there is not the same degree of freedom as there is in the private sector. They provide an example of Hong Kong where private companies lay off staff in times of recession and restructuring while in the public sector, the government gives careful consideration to staff morale issues (Cheung and Lee, 1995). Thirdly, general criticism of NPM involves ethical issues. It is argued by Hughes (2003) that perhaps the new managerialism [NPM] offers greater transparency so that unethical or corrupt behaviour can be detected more easily; the greater stress on measurable performance may impose its own kind of behavioural standard. Perhaps managers can be inculcated with the ethical standards in the old model

(Common, 1998).Even though NPM provides transparency for the public sector, it can nonetheless lead to corrupt practices (Barberis, 1998). Doig (1997) argued along the same line that in rich countries, NPM can undermine ethical standards and lead to corruption. To illustrate the point, Minogue (2001) also noted that increased managerial autonomy has brought blurred accountability and higher risk for public managers to become corrupt, while Ormond and Loffler (2006) contended that increased freedom of management within public sector organizations allows more opportunities for unethical behaviour. Another ethical issue about NPM involves contracts. Hughes (2003) pointed out those contracts are supposed to offer improvement in accountability; however, contracts with government are often kept secret for reasons such as commercial research. Thus, there is no transparency in terms of practice.

NPM is controversial enough within Western countries in terms of the benefits it allegedly brings. Applying these principles to developing countries may encounter additional layers of complexity. While NPM ideas have been introduced in developing countries, some scholars point out that there are constraints and NPM may be inappropriate (Manning, 2001; Minogue, 2001; Polidano, 1999). Most criticisms are, however, based on a prior reasoning about what items in the NPM menu seem to be appropriate for the developing countries, rather than on any empirical assessment of what have worked (Polidano, 1999). Since the NPM reform model originated in a small group of rich countries, the model may not be directly transferred from them to poorer non-Western countries because of contrasting environmental features such as political culture and practice (Minogue, 2001). UNDP in 1997 pointed out that some items of NPM are not useful for developing countries since NPM ideas have derived from a few countries of the OECD. The ideas have been designed and implemented to suit the conditions in those countries rather than in developing countries.

Conclusion

It is found out that we lack expertise to make NPM successful. Also, with high level of corruption in the country NPM doctrine of decentralization can actually lead to arbitrary action and corruption. In drawing conclusion on this work, we can say that new public management is a good reform that can bring efficiency and effectiveness to Nigeria public service if only the necessary precondition menus are met. No matter how successful NPM has been in developed countries, we have these few reservation about the reform in Nigeria and Africa at large.

We lack reliable information system and necessary expertise in Nigeria that can make NPM successful. Polidano (2001) and Caiden and Sundaram (2004) noted along the same line that developing countries have lacked the resources and managerial capacity to adopt rather sophisticated NPM reforms, although countries like India have supported the reorientation of government role and menu of options for providing various functions and services, often extending beyond the original vision of NPM.

Nigeria has been badly affected by corruption, nepotism, favouratism and godfatherism. Even president Buhari clearly stated in his inaugural speech that if we don't kill corruption as a nation, it will destroy the country. Giving a public manager a centralize authority in a country like Nigeria as stipulated by NPM doctrine of decentralization can actually lead to arbitrary action and corruption. A supporting view is provided by Polidano and Hulme (2001) who claims that public management in developing countries is afflicted by corruption and nepotism and that such practices may hinder NPM implementation. NPM may not be useful for public sectors in developing countries that have been greatly affected by corruption (Bale and Dale, 1998).

Allowing forces of demand and supply (market forces) to determine who gets public goods in Nigeria where poverty is on the increase, unemployment is unabated, people who cannot afford quality medical care and physiological needs are on the majority, will amount to political and economic chaos. Moreover, there are various factors which are required before the market can be effective. Hughes (2003) pointed out that markets are ineffective without the rule of law, for example, to ensure compliance with contracts. Yet it could be argued that many people in the developing world are natural traders with a history of commerce lasting for many centuries and that these instincts were stifled during

the period of command economies. But, until capital markets develop or domestic entrepreneurs arise, a market economy may mean greater domination by foreigners and foreign corporations.

Finally, the NPM commitment to privatization may be difficult to manage in developing countries like Nigeria because we lack the administrative capacity to undertake this complex task successfully (Haque, 2005; World Bank, 1995). For instance, concessioning of Ajaokuta steel complex to Global Steel Holdings Limited was not properly handled which made the then president Yaradua to revoke the contract and consequently leads to litigation in international court which Nigeria government later settled out of court after 8 years. Moreover, there are circumstances in which privatization will inevitably mean foreign ownership or ownership by one particular ethnic group which may cause a risk of societal cohesion (Hughes, 2003). An example of failures in privatization is provided by the World Bank (1995).

REFERENCES

Anazodo, R. O (2009). *Civil Service In Nigeria, An Analysis of Its Bureaucratic Effectiveness*, Onitsha: Abbot Books, Ltd.

Appleby, P. H. (1947). Toward better public administration. *Public Administration Review,* 7, 93–99.

Armstrong, A., 1998. A comparative analysis: New public management-the way ahead. *Aust. J. Public Admin*., 57: 12-24.

Azie V. (10 Jan, 2003) Report of the Auditor General for the Federation to the National Assembly for the year ended 31st Dec., 2001.

Bale, M. and Dale, T.(1998). Public sector reform in New Zealand and its relevance to developing countries. World Bank Res. Observer, 13: 103-121

Barberis, P., 1998. The new public management and a new accountability. Public Admin, 76: 451-470.

Caiden, G. E. and P. Sundaram, (2004). The specificity of public service reform. *Public Admin. Develop.*, 24: 373-383.

Common, R., 1998. The New Public Management and Policy Transfer: The Role of International Organisations. In: Beyond the New Public Management, Minogue, M., C. Polidano and D. Hulme (Eds.). Edward Elgar Publishing, Netherlands MA, pp: 59-75.

Cheung, A. and J. C. Y. Lee, 1995. Public Sector Reform in Hong Kong: Key Concepts, Progress-To-Date and Future Directions. Chinese University Press, Hong Kong.

De Waal, A. A. (2007). Is Performance Management Applicable in Developing Countries?, International Journal

Dimock E. M., (1937), the study of administration, *American Political Science Review* ,XXX, No. 1, pp. 31-32

Doorgapersad, S. (2011). Paradigm Shift from New Public Administration to New Public Management: Theory and Practice in Africa, *Journal for Trans-disciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 7, 235-250.

Falconer, P. K. (1997), 'The New Public Management: Principles and Practice in the UK', *Javna Upravna*, 33, 1, 1997, pp.85-108.

Frederick W. Taylor. (1856–1915). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York & London: Harper Brothers; Also see, Jeong Chun Hai Ibrahim, & Nor Fadzlina Nawi. (2007). *Principles of Public Administration: An Introduction.* Kuala Lumpur: Karisma Publications. ISBN 978-983-195-253-5

Cheung, A. B. L. (1996). Public Sector Reform and the Re-legitimation of Public Bureaucratic Power, The Case of Hong Kong, *An International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9, 37-50.

Glynn, J. J., and Murphy, M. P. (1996) Public Management Failing Accountabilities and Failing Performance Review, *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* 9, 125-137.

Government of Tanzania (1997) The Executive Agencies Act

Gulick, L. (1937). Notes on the theory of organization. In: L. Gulick, & L. Urwick, *Papers on the science of administration* (pp. 1–45). New York: Columbia University.

Haque, S., 2005. Reforming public administration in Southeast Asia: Trends and impacts. *Public Org. Rev*., 4: 361-371.

Haque, M. S. (2007). Theory and Practice of Public Administration in Southern Asia: Traditions, Directions, and Impacts, International Journal of Public Administration, 30, 1226-1326

Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons, *Journal of Public Administration,* 69, 3-19.

Hope, K. R. (2001). The New Public Management: Context and Practice in Africa, *International Journal of Management*, 4, 119-134.

Howard, M. (2001). Public Sector Economics for Developing Countries, University of West Indies Press Kingston 7, Jamaica. http://jmlubuva.paj.tl/htm. (February 5, 2014)

Jeong Chun Hai Ibrahim, & Nor Fadzlina Nawi. (2007). *Principles of Public Administration: An Introduction.* Kuala Lumpur: Karisma Publications. ISBN 978-983-195-253-5

Johnson, R. W. (1995). Decentralization Strategy Design: Complementary Perspectives on Common Them, Development Alternative Inc

Kaboolian, L., 1998. The new public management: Challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate. Public Admin. Rev., 58: 189-193.

Kabwe, Z. (2011). Public Enterprises in Tanzania: Challenges and Prospects. [Online] Available: http://www.scribd.com/doc/68453055/Public-Enterprises-in-Tanzania-Challenges-and-Prospects (February 11, 2014)

Kajimbwa, M. (2013) New Public Management A Tribute to Margaret Thatcher, *Policy and Administration Research*, 3, 64-69.

Khademian, A. M., 1998. What do we want public managers to be: Comparing reforms. *Public Admin.* Rev., 58: 269-273.

Larbi, G. A. (1999). Overview of Public Sector Management Reform, United Nations Research Institute for Development, Discussion paper 122.

Lekorwe, M. (1998). The Politics of Urban Governance and Management in Gaborone, Botswana *Journal of African Studies,* 12, 69-84

Lynn, L.E., 1999. The new public management. *Gov. Finance Rev.,* 15: 15-18.

M. Weber, "Politics as A vocation," in From Max Weber, H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, NY: Oxford University Press 1946, p. 95.

Manning, N., (2001). The legacy of the new public management in developing countries. *Inter. Rev. Admin. Sci.*, 67: 297-312.

Maor, M. (1999). "The Paradox of Managerialism." *Public Administration Review* 59(1), 5-18.

McCourt, W., 2001. Moving the Public Management Debate Forward: A Contingency Approach. In: *The Internationalization of Public Management: Reinventing the Third World State,* McCourt, W. and M. Minogue (Eds.). Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA, pp: 220-253.

Minogue, M., (2001). The Internationalization of New Public Management. In: *The Internationalization of Public Management: Reinventing the Third World State,* McCourt, W. and M. Minogue (Eds.). Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA, pp: 1-19

Minogue, M., (2001). Should Flawed Models of Public Management be Exported: Issues and Practices. In: *The Internationalization of Public Management: Reinventing the Third World State*, McCourt, W. and M. Minogue (Eds.). Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA, pp: 20-43.

Montgomery 1989:254 For the stories about Schmidt Montgomery refers to Charles D. Wrege and Amadeo G. Perroni, "Taylor's Pig Tale: A Historical Analysis of Frederick W. Taylor's Pig-Iron experiments" in: *Academy of Management Journal*, 17 (March 1974), 6-27

Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler, 1992. Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA.

Otenyo, E. E. (2006). Vincent Ostrom's Democratic Administration and New Public Management in East Africa, Discussion Paper

Painter, M., (1997). Public Management: Fad or Fallacy. In: *Managerialism: The Great Debate*, Considine, M. and M. Painter (Eds.). Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, VIC, pp: 39-43.

Pfiffner J. M., (1965). Public Administration ,New York, p. 6

Philip D. D.,(2013) New Public Management (Npm) and Public Sector Administration in Nigeria, International Affairs and Global Strategy www.iiste.org ISSN 2224-574X (Paper) ISSN 2224-8951 (Online)Vol.14.

Polidano, C. (1999). The New Public Management in Developing Countries, Working Paper No. 13.

Polidano, C., (2001). Why civil service reforms fail. Public Manage. Rev., 3: 345-361.

Pollitt, C. (2007). The New Public Management: An Overview of Its Current Status, *Journal of Public Management*, 8, 110-115..

Savoie, D. J., (2002). What is Wrong with the new Public Management. In: *Public Management: Critical Perspectives*, Osborne, S.P. (Ed.). Routledge, London, pp: 263-272.

Sharma, C. K. (2007) *New Public Management: Challenges and Constrains*. Botswana: University of Botswana.

Simon s.,(1950), Public Administration, New York, p.3

Sulle, A. (2011). Result-Based Management in Public Sector: A Decade of Experience for the Tanzanian Executive Agencies, *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 4, 499-506.

Turner, M., (2002). Choosing items from the menu: New public management in South East *Asia. Int. J. Public Admin*., 25: 1493-1512.

World Bank, 1995. *Bureaucrats in Business: The Economics and Politics of Government Ownership*. Oxford University Press, New York

Walsh, J., and O'Flynn, J. (2000). Managing through Contracts: The Employment Effect of Compulsory Competitive Tendering in Australia Local Government, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 31, 454-470

White L. D. (1955), *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, macmillan p.2

Wilson, Woodrow. June, 1887. "The Study of Administration", *Political Science Quarterly* 2.

Wilson W., (1941) The Study of Administration , *Political Science , Quarterly* 1941,pp.481-566.