



The Nexus between Policy and Administration in a Changing World: A Thematic Exposition

OKOLI, Ogonna John

**Centre For Entrepreneurship & Development Research (CEDR)
University Of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN)**

Ikechukwu . DIALOKE Ph.D

**Department of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management,
College of Management Sciences,
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Nigeria**

EDWIN, I. Edwin

**Department of Public Administration And Local Government,
Faculty Of The Social Sciences,
University Of Nigeria, Nsukka**

ABSTRACT

Scholars have been paying little attention to one of the most critical relationship between civil servants and politicians in Nigeria. To a certain extent, the neat distinctions of the politicians and civil servants were always more theoretical than real. However, modern government has had a way of eroding whatever truth there was to this distinction. In modern government, implementation failures are often the biggest and most significant political problems a government will face. No wonder we are left asking ourselves three critical questions: Where does policy stop and implementation begins? What is the responsibility of the civil servant to the political appointee and vice-versa? In addition, who should be held accountable? These questions have been answered by them from different strands. But in order to address them more holistically, we located our discourse within the framework of its historiography. Secondary sources of data were collected mainly from relevant textbooks, official documents of various ministries, reports and proceedings papers and analysed them using the technique of content analysis. From our discussions, the paper concludes by positing that the nexus between policy and administration lies essentially and squarely on the mode of decision-making and implementation at every stage of policy formulation and execution.

Keywords: Politicians, Careers Civil Servants, Historiography, Policy Making, Implementation & Evaluation and Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

Let us state, right from the outset, the basic assumptions underlying the title of this paper. It is assumed that “policy” and “administration” are clearly distinct concepts, hence the search for the nexus between them. But we all know that concepts are abstractions. They are ipso factor meaningless, and so useful only in the context of the phenomena they represent-their observable referents, things, events, processes and objects of everyday life. And because they are so common and familiar to us, we tend to forget “that they typify only common features of these phenomena”, and in the process proceed to reify them as concrete phenomena, in which no distinction exists between the construct and the thing it represents.

But we know that the basic function of concepts or constructs is to aid understanding, facilitate application of observed phenomena through proper organization of our world view, our

ontological reality, through placing our perceptions into categories, so that it becomes easy to distinguish one category from another, by specifying the characteristic features of each category. Needless, to say we do this through what Martin Landau calls the “*process of selective perception*”; *not-necessarily to come to terms with the real world but in order to control our observation*” (Landau, 1968: 4).

The discourse on the relationship between political office holders and permanent and career bureaucrats in public administration is simply a discussion on the debate on ‘Politics and Administration Dichotomy’. Although this debate has already been settled long ago, it is always referred to as a basis for determining the nature of relationship that should exist between political office holders and career officials in public organizations. The debate highlights the merits as well as the danger of mixing politics and administration in public organizations. It is against this background that we will first discuss this debate before addressing the patterns it takes, specifying and prescribing the kind of relationship that should exist between political office holders (who are involved in politics and policy-making) and career officials who are involved in administration or execution (implementation) of policies made by political office holders (Obasi, 2002 & Adebayo,1981).

It is this categorization of our perceptions that enables us to define and clearly delineate boundaries between concepts/constructs and the phenomena they represent, in this instant case-policy and administration.

Politics and Administration Dichotomy: A Thematic Exposition

According to Adamolekun (1983:12), although Public Administration began to be accorded a separate identity in the United States during the 1890s, it remained as a sub-field of Politics (the term Political Science is preferred in the United States) for several more decades. In Britain it was not until the 1940s that the first chair of Public Administration was established with the significant title ‘Gladstone Professor of Government and Public Administration’ at Oxford. The majority of academic students of Public Administration in Britain today are still based in the departments of Politics or Government.

Until the past five decades, the political approach focused essentially on political theory or philosophy and political institutions. Therefore, those who approached the study of Public Administration through Political science strand focused attention on the consequences of different political philosophies for governmental administration and the study of the key governmental institutions: namely, the legislature, the executive including the administrative machinery, and the judiciary (Davis, 1974).

At the heart of the political approach is the so-called politics and administration dichotomy, which is really a debate over the extent to which public administration should be studied as part of the total political process. The first shots in the debate were fired in Wilson’s ‘The study of Administration’, in which the thesis of a politics and administration dichotomy was postulated (Wilson,1887). The most influential statement of the antithesis was made by Paul Appleby in his *Policy and Administration* (1949), in which he argues that policy making cannot be separated from policy execution. While the majority of scholars are agreed on the need for a synthesis, there is still no agreement on a common ground. This failure according to Adamolekun (1983) explains the continuing importance of the politics and administration approach in the literature. A useful book on this orientation is Self’s *Administrative Theories and Politics* (1977).

The chief proponent of the thesis that politics should be separated from administration was Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson was the first person who pointed out in 1887 that both these disciplines were quite separate from each other with their own specialized field. In his article on “study of administration”, he said “the field of administration is the field of business”. Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices. In his article titled. “The study of Administration” which was published in

1887, Wilson proposed that political tasks are distinct from administrative tasks, and should as such be separated. According to him, administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics and as such administrative questions are not political questions. He argued that politics sets the tasks of administration. However, some earlier writers on the subject made a sharp distinction between politics and administration. In their view, politics were concerned with laying down of policies, whereas administration was concerned with implementing these policies economically and efficiently (Self, 1977).

Pfiffner, (1935) was one of the strong advocates of this separation. As he rightly said that in some cases, politics and administration ‘are so inter-mingled and confused that a clear distinction is difficult’, and he further adds that “the line between the two should be shaded from black to various shades of grey, finally merging almost imperceptibly into the white”. According to him, politics must be controlled and confined to its proper sphere, which is the determination, crystallization and declaration of the will of the people (state). Then administration is concerned with the carrying into effect of this will once it has been made clear by political processes. He strongly recommended that politics should stick to its policy-determining role and leave administration to apply its own technical processes free from the blight or evil influence of political meddling or interference. Furthermore he said that although politics and administration cannot always be separated and isolated, they should however not be allowed to mix or interact in a meddlesome manner.

Pfiffner’s enumeration of the points of distinction between political and administrative officers is very interesting. These are:

Political Officers	Administrative Officers
Amateur	Professional
Non- Technical	Technical
Partisan	Non- Partisan
Temporary	Permanent
More Public contacts	less public contacts
More legislative contacts	less legislative contacts
More policy formulating	less policy formulating
More Decisions	More advisory
More co-ordination	more performing
Influence by popular opinion	Influence by technical data collected from study and research.

Source: Obasi, I.N., (1992), “Relationship between Political Office Holders and Career (Permanent)

Local Government Staff”, Paper Presented at a Workshop on Effective and Purposeful Legislature in the Third Republic, Organized by Haske Media Services and Department of Local Government Affairs, Sokoto.

Among the many scholars who belong to the Wilsonian school of thought are Frank Good now, and Willoughby, E.F. In his discussion, Good now made a distinction between politics and administration. According to him, politics is the expression of the will of the state while administration is the execution of that will. Then Willoughby on his part did not stop at making a distinction between the two concepts, but he went further to say that, administration is the fourth arm of government.

The proponents of the distinction between politics and administration base their logic on the evil influence which partisan politics usually brings into administration. The merits of the separation include allowing administrators free hand to bring their professional judgment and technical competence into the implementation process of policy already formulated by the political

executives. Furthermore, if political office holders interfere in the implementation process, they would likely bring in their partisan political judgment, which may work against the overall interest of the nation. Some scholars who oppose the Wilsonian thesis do so on the grounds that it is futile to attempt separating two things that are intertwined. For instance in reality, political office holders do not make policies alone without serious input (in the form of advice) from administrators. As Augustus Adebayo puts it; administrators are involved in policy-making. In his view, administrators cannot avoid some policy-making responsibility.

One of the opponents of the distinction Carl Friedrich contended that the distinction between politics and administration is a misleading one. Marshall Dimock, on his part, argued that in fact, the two processes of politics and administration are coordinate rather than exclusive. Seen from this light, the opponents believe that the interaction of politics and administration in a healthy manner would improve the quality of policy making and administration. For instance, the administrators can give the political office holders necessary information they need in the formulation of policy while on the other hand, the political office holders can monitor and evaluate the extent to which the administrators implement faithfully such policy. If this interaction follows laid down guidelines, the public who are being served by the politicians and administrators will benefit more.

Political processes of election, legislation and of defining the broad objectives of administration as well as the manipulation of political power provide the motivating force for the wheels of government. On the other hand, administration and administrators are mainly concerned with the administrative processes of gathering and interpreting data, offering advices and suggestions based on facts for the purposes of policy formulation and helping to implement same. Therefore, for harmonious co-existence between politics and public administration, which are two species of the same genus, there must be a lot of give-and-take between the politicians and the administration. Politics when it loses sight of what is administratively feasible degenerates into mere building castles in the air, and administration, shorn of its political context, becomes an empty nothingness.

The relationship between public administration and political science can be summed up remarking that the two disciplines are in fact species of the same genus. There is a great give and take between the two. However, in spite of the linkages between them we should not over-look the limits of their fields. Finally, in the words of John M.Gaus, there is no denying the fact that there is difference between the duties of political officers and those of administrative officers, but the differences is more of a degree rather than of a kind. If we look to the top administrators, we will find that most of what they do is political in nature. Although, apparently, policy-making is the function of the ministers and legislatures, yet most of the groundwork is done by the administrators behind the scenes. Generally, the top bureaucrats are so well familiar with policy-making that it takes them little time to adjust in the political arena if ever they decide to quit administration. As far as practice goes, most of the Nigerian diplomats posted abroad have, at one time or another, been top-officials in the governmental administration of our country. The bottom-line here is that politics and administration are two closely related social science disciplines, so much, so that it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation to say where politics starts and ends and where administration starts and ends. This position notwithstanding, can be said without fear of contraction that politics and politicians are mainly concerned with the theory of public administration, which means in our time a theory of politics too.

Methods of Data Collection And Analysis

Mayer (1972), Obasi (1999), and Mare (2007) have all stressed on the importance and nature of secondary sources of data collection in social investigations. For Obasi (1999:45), it borders on “a kind of data that was not primarily collected for purpose of its present use. It is usually collected by someone else or other agencies. In other-words, the source is not under the control of the

researcher, and in all most all cases, such data must have been collected for a more general purpose and often quite distinct from the objective of the present user”.

The secondary data for this study will be obtained from extant literature and contributions of renowned authors and scholars, from books, Journals, Newspapers, Magazines, Periodicals, Government Publication and Publications from International Organizations and Non-governmental bodies. It also involves inputs and materials from workshops and conference papers, communiqué, unpublished seminar and theses and on-line materials from the internet.

Secondary data generated in the course of our research shall be analyzed using content analysis. Meyer (1972) and Obasi (1999) were of the view that content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative analysis and description of the manifest content of communications. Content analysis as a method of analyzing qualitative information shall be used to determine the relative emphasis of various information (data) items on cost of governance, economic development and legislature. Questions shall be asked on the content using the communications to be produced. Inferences will be made based on the content of the communications. Therefore in applying this method, government and non-governmental documents, textbooks, journals, magazines, newspaper, unpublished theses and writings of previous researches on cost of governance, economic development, and legislature shall be analyzed using content analysis.

The adoption of content analysis technique is to ascertain whether the data from documentary sources support both the questions and hypotheses underlying the research. By so doing, we align with the views of these scholars.

The Nature of Policy and Administration Dichotomy: The Historiography

Following from our conceptual clarification, it is clear that policy and administration are off springs of the same phenomenon (process) but reified as distinct entities, with different referents. But this reification obscures the other function of a definition which is to outline the principal features of a concept, thus making it definite and precise. The danger of this obscurantism looms larger than life, especially where there is a push-and-pull relationship between reified constructs, in this case policy and administration, and in which one (policy) easily dissolves into the other (administration). To understand the nature of policy and administration and so the nexus between them is, of necessity, to trace the stages in the development of public administration as a distinct field of study, and administration as a set of activities having as their purpose, the realization of the policy objectives of the government.

The First Stage: The John W. Burgess (1841-1933) Tradition

The first stage was led by John W. Burgess. Burgess was credited with having developed the first Ph.D political sciences programme in the United States of America at the Colombia University in 1880 and as would be expected, his primary concern was the development of all branches of Political Science. In this perspective, there was no room for unnecessary segmentation. The state was the focus of study, while the institutions of state were the objectives of study. For Burgess, there is no place for the study of government administration as a separate discipline from the study of political science. Accordingly, “*administrative function is the function of actually administering the law as declared by the legislature and interpreted by the judicial branches of government*” (Willoughby, 1957: 11-12). During this stage, administration was seen simply in terms of management practice and procedure.

The Second Stage: The Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) Tradition

The second stage in the conceptualization of administration was more or less a reaction against or a repudiation of the Burgess tradition. It was led by a political theorist and statesman, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson argued for a separation of administration from politics. While Burgess focused on “governance”, Wilson focused on “government”. Consequently, Wilsonians and neo-Wilsonian

such as Dimock and Dimock, Bulick and Dimock made it a point to separate administration from politics in their respective definitions. Dimock saw administration as being concerned with the 'what' and the 'how' of government. The 'what' is the subject matter, the technical knowledge of a field which enables an administrator to perform his tasks. The 'how' is the techniques of management, the principles according to which cooperative programmes are carried through to success... together they form the synthesis called administration..." (Dimock, et al., 1958: 11-12). For Gulick, "administration is concerned with getting things done with the accomplishment of defined objectives... (Gulick, 1933: 63). Deriving essentially from this orientation the administration segment of politics-administration dichotomy was structured and subsequently ossified into POSDCORB (Planning, Organizing Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting). This was the high stage of organizational development and the crystallization of organizational principles, caustically referred to by Herbert Simon as "proverbs" of Organizational Theory (Simon, 1947).

The Third Stage: Simon and Simonian Tradition

The third stage was crystallized by the writings of such classical organizational theorists like White, Pfeiffer and Simon. Their writings, by conceiving administration as a political process, shifted the pendulum of politics-administration dichotomy towards the public policy end of the continuum. Accordingly, White saw public administration as "all those operations having for their purpose the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy". Pfeiffer, on his part, saw public administration as "the coordination of collective efforts to implement public policy". It is instructive to note that these post-war formulations of administration as a political process found theoretical justification and support in the now classic separation of "factual premises" from "value premise" in the process of organizational decision-making. Simon has postulated that organizational decision-making in a function of facts and values. While factual statements are empirical propositions which can be validated and determined, value statements are imperatives, normative, and cannot be easily validated. According to Martin Landau, Simon employs this distinction to clarify policy and administration. In Goodnow's usage, as well as today, politics has to do with the expression of goals or ends, with the basic question of social policy and, thus, with value judgements. They are validated with the rules of democratic procedure. But with respect to administration, Goodnow referred to a class of activities that differed in character from politics and could, therefore, be freed from the control of political bodies. This class "is unconnected with politics because it embraces fields of semi-scientific, quasi judicial, and quasi-business or commercial activity-work which has little, if any, influence on the expression of the true state will" (Landau, 1962: 19).

In this formulation, Simon notes, there is an attempt by Goodnow 'to aggregate a class of decisions which do not require external control because they possess an internal criterion of correctness'. The difference in the criteria of correctness is the grounds for judgement, forms the basis of the line usually drawn between questions of policy and of administration. If, states Simon, it is desired to retain the terms 'policy' and 'administration, they can best be applied to a division of the decisional functioning along these lines (Simon, 1947: 58-60). In this enterprise, Simon's major concerns were to:

- i. Develop a science administration
- ii. Construct a value-free decision-making process
- iii. Search for general principles of management that guide decision-making
- iv. Emphasize hierarchy as the system for framing organizational decisions and power.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the Simonian organization denies the individual some of his decisional autonomy and replaces it with organizational decision-making process. It does this by placing him in an environment, and by providing him with the information and resources needed to make correct decisions. By limiting the range within which an individual's decisions and

activities lie, the organization reduces his decisional problems to manageable proportions (Simon, 1945). Once the individual wants and desires are constrained by the organizational structure and environment, his efforts are channelled toward the organization goals. In the same vein, even though dominant coalitions may exist within the organization, their work and decision-making are evaluated against the "Objective Rationality" of the principles of "Efficiency", "Cost-minimization" of the ratios of input to output measure if the dominant coalition's actions are rational". And since human mind has a limited ability to handle information, the process reduces the levels of decisions and allows the organization to function within the limits of man's "bounded rationality" (Simon, 1945). This, essentially, is the meeting point between policy and administration, indeed, between Public Policy and Public Administration.

The Fourth Stage: Lasswell/Truman Tradition

The fourth stage marked the integration of policy and administration through innovative decisional processes. Change and adaptation as cardinal goals of the society could not be guaranteed within the existing decision mode. The concept of bounded rationality as propounded by Herbert Simon did not capture the processes of decision making in a changing world. And most activities in such a society are characterized by flux, uncertainty and unpredictability. The future is unknown, infact, unknowable in these societies and, therefore, the need to develop a method of weaving decisions into a coherent mission statement, indeed, a policy.

Harold Lasswell, that foremost political and organizational theorist, better known as the father of modern policy analysis had argued for a multi-disciplinary approach to the development of what he called a "policy sciences of democracy" woven around a problem oriented and contextual analysis of policy. Lasswell's emphasis on process analysis highlighted the deeper layers of interaction and effects created through the policy-making mechanisms (Lasswell and Kaplan, 1950).

David Truman was more direct and unequivocal in locating the nexus between policy and administration in the decisional modes. According to him, "power of any kind cannot be reached by a political interest group, or its leaders without access to one or more key points of decision in the government. Access, therefore, becomes the facilitating intermediate objective of political interest groups. Toward whatever institution of government we observe interest groups operating, the common feature of all their efforts is the attempt to achieve effective access to points of decision (Truman, 1951: 264). No wonder David Easton defines a policy as "consisting of a web of decisions and actions that allocate values" (Easton, 1953: 130).

The concept of values is the driving force in policy-making. After all, policies express preferences, values. But if a policy is a web of decisions and actions to allocate values, it is important to ask the questions; whose decisions? Whose action? Whose values?

David Easton provides the answer. He sees policy-making as "a web of decisions and actions" by those who exercise authority in government, and which reflect the values of the society and which the members of the same society accept s binding and legitimate.

The inter-penetration of policy and administration is brought out clearly in the concept of "policy-subsystems" as developed by Freeman (1955). Freeman sees a policy sub-system as 'pattern of interactions or participants or actors, involved in making decisions in a special area of public policy' (Freeman, 1955: 5). Dominant actors and participants in these interactive processes are the executive, the legislature, the judiciary, the political parties, the bureaucracy, and other interest groups. The nature and content of these interactions are aptly captured by Douglas Carter in these words:

In one important policy after another, substantial efforts to exercise power are waged by alliances cutting cross the branches of government and the key operatives from outside... each seeks to aggregate power necessary to its purpose. Each resists being overridden (Carter, 1964: 17).

Given the struggle over policy determination which is central to organizational politics, one can scarcely speak of a correct organization policy. One can only speak of a policy that will effectuate

the goals of some or all of the participants (Norton Long, 1962). This problem multiplies exponentially in our modern, complex and technologically changing world, consequent upon the variety of policy goals and options and their attendant technological mix.

The Fifth Stage: Development Administration and Administration for Development

The fifth stage is that of development administration. The concern of this stage is how to contend with the developmental challenges facing the modern technological society, given the fact that the prevailing organizational decision-making processes are grossly inadequate to grapple with change and innovation. According to Herbert Simon, there is a distinction between those decisions, on the one hand, that are encountered frequently and repetitively in the daily operations of an organization, and those, on the other hand, that represent, novel and non-recurring problems for the organization. He called them “programmed and non-programmed decisions”, respectively (Simon, 1961: 60).

The domain of non-programmed decisions lies squarely in development administration as a mechanism for translating public policy into achievable goals. No wonder Martin Landau calls development administration, a directive and directional process which is intended to make things happen in a certain way over intervals of time. It is, in this sense, a casual factor or an independent variable, and, therefore, must be seen and treated as an hypothesis. And as an hypothesis its validity can only be futuristic and not a priori. In this context, all change agents have as their point of departure a “here and now”, a present state of affairs, and their objectives always lie in a tomorrow. Any programme of development is, therefore, a description of a future state of affairs and the processes that will bring it about. To design such a programme is of necessity, to conduct an experiment (Landau, 1973).

Developing countries face many developmental challenges. These developmental goals and aspirations are encapsulated in public policies of government. The translation of these policies into reality is done through effective/rational decisions. From public policies emanate decisions, and successful implementation of decisions is carried out through efficient administration. Here, then, lies the nexus between development administration and decisions theory, indeed, between public policy and public administration (Okoli, 2000).

The Nexus between Public Policy and Public Administration: Rational Decision

Development administration is a set of activities intended to achieve future state of affairs. It is a process of improving the living standard of the individuals within time perspective. In this conception, development administration has a lot in common with decision theory. Decisions are hypotheses put forward for the solution of a problem. They are logical propositions of a problem to be solved. In this sense, they are analytical statements not subject to empirical verification. So, like development administration, decisions are hypothetical statements about problematic situations. However, while development administration depicts an ideal or norm, that ought to be followed, decisions depict the actual procedure for its realization (Landau, 1973).

The appropriate decision mode to be applied at any point in time and within any problem context will depend, to a large extent, on the task environment of the relevant organization or its ecology.

Rationality in Decision-Making

The issue of appropriate decision mode raises the question of rationality in decision-making process. A rational decision is one which satisfies the criteria of correctness, and guarantees the realization of its goals or stated objectives by matching policy (goals, ends) with administration (processes). But in our changing world, these goals and processes are in a state of constant flux. Reminiscing on this state of affairs, Guy Hunter observes that:

It is often said that the problems of administering development in Africa have more affinity with those encountered in the Soviet Union than those in Britain or France or the U.S.A. They involve virtually creating a new kind of economy by

government action (as in Russia) rather than regulating an economy powered by private enterprise. In consequence, the burden of development administration falls almost wholly on a civil service which is both less powerful and more confused by the vagaries of political decision than their Russian counterpart... (Hunter, 1973: 21-22).

These “vagaries of political decision” manifest themselves in poorly and hastily articulated policies and disarticulation in their administration, consequent upon the truncation of the coordinating cord between and among the critical actors-policy makers, administrators and relevant organizations and institutions. This happens precisely because a poorly and hastily articulated policy makes the factorization of a policy into programmes, projects and activities problematic. And when programmes, projects and activities are not clearly, neatly and symmetrically streamlined, administration/implementation becomes perfunctory, thus leading to failure of policies. We can, therefore, safely assert that successfully and effectively administered/implemented policies are those that are in tandem with the imperative and criteria of rational decision-making, as conceived in this paper. Any significant deviation from this ideal result in the absence of ‘fit’ in the critical variables involved in the administration/implementation of the policy as was the case with the various policies for Rural Transformation in Nigeria (Korten, 1980: 496).

The Federal Governments of Nigeria (both military and civilian), at different times, articulated policies for rural transformation intended to improve the living conditions of the rural population. The components of these policies included a number of rural development programmes such as:

- i. Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), associated with the Obasanjo (military) regime;
- ii. The Green Revolution (GR) of the Shagari administration;
- iii. The War Against Indiscipline (WAI) of the Buhari regime; and
- iv. The Directorate of Food Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) of the Babangida regime.

To administer/implement these programmes, many organizations/institutions were established. These included:

- i) River Basin and Rural Development Authorities (RBRDAs);
- ii) Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs);
- iii) Community Bank of Nigeria (CBNs);
- iv) Better Life Programme (BLP);
- v) National Directorate of Employment (NDE);
- vi) Guinea Worm Eradication Task Force (GWETF).

An evaluation of the implementation/administration of these programmes revealed the absence of “fit” between.

- i. The beneficiaries and the programmes (Poor policy conceptualization/articulation)
- ii. The beneficiaries and the assisting organisations/institutions (Disjuncture in Policy/Administration Mix).
- iii. The beneficiaries and the organizations/institutions for their implementation/administration (Failure of administrative processes).

CONCLUSION

From all we have said so far, certain conclusions can be made. First, political office holders are no doubt the masters of career public servants. However, in executing their authority as the superiors of permanent officials, they have to follow the established rules of conduct such as the constitution, civil service rules, guidelines regulating public administration and any other established traditions that are not illegal.

As masters over permanent officials, they are to issue orders and directions while the permanent officials are to obey. On the other hand, permanent officials are to offer advice, information and

useful guides which are necessary for sound policy formulation by the political office holders. This function has to be discharged with a good sense of judgment, tact, modesty and professional dexterity.

It is patently obvious from our discussions, which the nexus between policy and administration lays essentially and squarely on the mode of decision-making and implementation at every stage of policy formulation and execution.

REFERENCES

- Adamolekun, L., (1983). *Public Administration: A Nigerian and Comparative Perspective*, London: Longman.
- Adebayo, A. (1981). *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Appleby P. H., 1949. *Policy and Administration*, Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press
- Babbie, E. and Mouton, J., (2005). *The Practice of Social Research*, (4thed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beard, C. A. (1953). "Philosophy, Science and Art of Public Administration". In Dwight Waldo (Ed.), *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration*. London: Macmillan
- Bill, J. A. & Hardgrave, Jr., R.L. (1981). *Comparative politics: The Quest for Theory*. Washington, D.C. Bell and Howell, The University Press of America.
- Braybrooke, D. & Lindblom, C.E (1963). *A Strategy of Decision*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bross, I. D.J. (1953). *Design for Decision*. London: Macmillan
- Burgess, J. W. (1882). "The Study of the Political Sciences in Columbia College" *International Review* 12.
- Caldwell, L. (1944). *Administrative Theories of Humilton and Jefferson*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carter, D. (1964). *Power in Washington*. New York: Random House.
- Chester, B. I. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Cob, R. W. & Elder, C. D. (1983). *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda Building*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K., (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Rout ledge.
- David, A. B. (1974). "Bureaucracy and Economic Development in Africa". *The African Review* vol. 1 No. 1 March.
- DFRRI Bulletin (1988). *Directors Assessment Report Phase I*, vol. I.
- Dimock, M., (1937). *Modern Politics and Administration*, New York: American Book Company.
- Dimock, M., (1936). "Criteria and Objectives of Public Administration." In John M. Gaus, Leonard D. White, and Marshall E. Dimock (eds.). *The Frontiers of Public Administration*, Chicago: University Chicago Press.
- Easton, D. (1953). *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Friedrich, C., (1940). *Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fry, B. R. (1989). *Mastering public administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo*. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers Inc.
- Gaus, J.M., (1947). *Reflections in Public Administration*, Alabama:University of Alabama Press.
- Goodnow, F. J. (1900). *Politics and Administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Goodnow, F.,(1914). *Politics and Administration*, New York: Macmillan.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1893). *Comparative Administrative Law*. vols. I and II. New York: Putnam.
- Griffith, E. (1939). *The Impasse of Democracy*. New York: Harrison-Hilton Books.

- Gulick, L. Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Hunter, G. (1973). Social Structure Bureaucracy and Development Administration in Kenya. *The African Review*, vol. 1 No. 1, March.
- Kingdom, J. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Korten, D. C. (1980). Community Organization and Rural Development: A learning process approach. *Public Administration Review*. September/October.
- Landau, M. (1968). Decision Theory and Comparative Public Administration, *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 1 (July).
- Landau, M. (1973). Redundancy, Rationality and the Problem of Duplication and Overlap, *Public Administration Review*, January/February.
- Landau, Martin (1973b). *On the concept of a self-Correcting organization*. *Public Administration Review* November/December.
- Lasisi, K.M. (1992). A critical evaluation of Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) in Nigeria. An Unpublished M.P.A. Research report submitted to the Department of Political Science and Administration, University of Maiduguri.
- Lasswell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who gets what, when how*. New York
- Lasswell, H.& Kaplan, A (1950). *Power and Society*, New Haven: Yale University press.
- Lela, Uma (1975). *The meaning of political in political decisions*. *Political studies* v. October.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1965). *The Intelligence of Democracy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lowi, T. (1969). *The End of Liberalism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Lynne, Z (1987). Institutional Theories of Organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13, 443-464.
- March, J. & Simon, H (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Mare, K. (ed.), (2007). *First Steps in Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Marini, F. (1971). *Toward a New Public Administration*. Sacraments: Chandler publishing Coy.
- Mayer, L.C. (1972). *Comparative Political Inquiry: A Methodological Survey*. Homewood, III: The Dorsey Press.
- Mensah, S.N.A and Ode O. (1989). Rural Urbanization or rural development: An Analysis of Rural Development Strategies in Nigeria. In I.A. Ega, T.K. Atala and J.M. Baba (Eds.), *Developing Rural Nigeria: Problem and Prospects*. Lagos: The Nigerian Sociological Association.
- Merriam, C. (1920). *American Political Ideas: Studies in the development of American Political Thought, 1665-1917*. New York: Macmillan.
- Merton, R. K., Ailsa, P. Gray, Hockey, B & Hanan C. S. (1952). *Reader in Bureaucracy*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Obasi, I.N. (1999). *Research Methodology in Political Science*. Enugu, Academy Publishing Company.
- Obasi, I.N., (1992), "Relationship between Political Office Holders and Career (Permanent) Local Government Staff", Paper Presented at a Workshop on Effective and Purposeful Legislature in the Third Republic, Organized by Haske Media Services and Department of Local Government Affairs, Sokoto.
- Obasi, I.N., (2002). *Conflict Management in the Nigeria Local Government System: A Model of Harmonious Relations between the Political Class and the Career Officials in the New Millennium* in Okeke M.I. (ed) *Studies in Public and Local Government Administration in Enugu*: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Okoli F.C. (1982). "Organizing for Community Development in Anambra State of Nigerian: Toward a Strategy of Development Humanism". *The African Review: A Journal of African Politics Development and International Affairs*. Vol. 9. No. 2.

- Okoli, F.C. (1985). "Western Ideology and Community Development in Africa: A Nigerian Case Study" *IKENGA Journal of African Studies* vol. 7. No. 2.
- Okoli, F.C. (2000). *Development Administration: Nature and Principles*. Enugu: Education Promotion Agency.
- Ostrom, V.& Ostrom, E (1971). "Public Choice: A different approach to the study of Public Administration". *Public Administration Review*, March/April.
- Perrow, C. (1986). *Complex organizations: A Critical Essay*. New York: McGraw-Hall, Inc.
- Pfiffner, J. M. And Presthus, R.W. (1960). *Public Administration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pfiffner, J., (1935) *The Government of Modern States*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc.
- Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and Grassroots*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sennett, R. (1977). *The Fall of Public Man*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shafritz, Jay M. (1988). *The Dorsey dictionary of American government and politics*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Silverman ,David (1970). *The Theory of Organizations*. London: Heinemann.
- Simon H.A. & William B. D. (1941). "Controlling human factors in administrative experiment". *Public Administration Review*, vol. 1, No. 5.
- Simon, H. (1945). *Administrative Behaviour*. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- Simon, H.A. (1957). *Models of man*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Simon, H.A. (1969). *The Science of the Artificia*, Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. press.
- Simon, H.A. (1973). "Organisation Man" Rational or Self-Actualizing" *Public Administration Review* July/August.
- Simon, H.A., Smithburg, D.W. and Thompson, V.A. (1950), *Public Administration*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Taylor, F. W. (1992). "The Principles of Scientific Management." In *Classics of Organization Theory*. Jay M. Shafritz & J. Steven(eds), California; Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Thompson, & Tuden, A. (1959). *Strategies, Structures and Processes of Organizational Decision: Comparative Studies in Administration*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organization in Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, V. A. (1969) *Bureaucracy and Innovation*, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Thompson, V. A. (1971). *Decision Theory, Pure and Applied*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de (1835). *Democracy in America*, New York: Vintage Books, 1945.
- Truman, D. (1951). *The Governmental Process Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf .
- Waldo, D. (1953). *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York: Ronald.
- Waldo, D. (ed) (1953). *Ideas, and Issues in Public Administration*, West Port: Greenwood press.
- White L. D., Ganf, J.M. and Dimock, M.E. (1936). *The Frontiers of Public Administration*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- White, L. D. (1958). *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Willoughby, W.F. (1927). *Principles of Public Administration*, Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins press.
- Wilson, G (1885). *Congressional Government: 193-215*. Gloucester, Massachusetts; Peter Smith Publisher.
- Wilson, W., (1887). 'The Study of Administration', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 2, (June).Pp197-214.
- Wolf P. (1977). *American Bureaucracy*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Wolin, S. (1961). *Politics and Vision*. London: Granett and Evans.