

International Review of Administrative Sciences

<http://ras.sagepub.com>

Legitimation crisis: a challenge for public service in the next century

M. Shamsul Haque

International Review of Administrative Sciences 1998; 64; 13

DOI: 10.1177/002085239806400102

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ras.sagepub.com>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[International Institute of Administrative Sciences](#)

Additional services and information for *International Review of Administrative Sciences* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://ras.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://ras.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 13 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://ras.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/64/1/13>

Legitimation crisis: a challenge for public service in the next century

M. Shamsul Haque

Introduction

The formation and expansion of modern public service in advanced capitalist nations and its imitative reproduction in many postcolonial societies continued for more than a century without any major interruption except certain structural and functional reforms in response to various contextual socioeconomic changes. However, the last quarter of this century has seen almost a paradigmatic transformation of such a legacy of public service known for its established principles such as merit, neutrality, equality, accountability, and representativeness.¹ In the contemporary global context characterized by the triumph of market forces and reorientation of state policies towards deregulation, privatization, and liberalization, there have been fundamental changes in the scope, structures, principles, missions, and norms of public service all over the world (Djamin, 1991; Haque, 1996a). In fact, most of the recent policy changes in the advanced industrialized countries have been associated, directly or indirectly, with these basic dimensions of public service (Rouban, 1993).

As a result, since the early 1980s, there has been an increasing interest in studying the nature, forms, and rationales of this unprecedented market-centered transition in public bureaucracy. The examples of these contemporary promarket reforms in the public service include the Financial Management Improvement Programme in Australia, the Administrative Management Project in Austria, Public Service 2000 in Canada, the Modernization Program for the Public Sector in Denmark, the Renewal of the Public Service in France, the Fundamental Policy of Administrative Reform in Japan, the Major Options Plan in Portugal, and the Financial Management Initiative and Next Steps in the UK (OECD, 1993). These reform initiatives have been reinforced further by various government reports, white papers, and documents, including 'Reforming the Australian Public Service' in Australia, 'Towards More Result-Oriented Management' in the Netherlands, 'Plan for the Readjustment of Central Government Administration in the 1990s' in Norway, 'Reflections on Modernization of the Public Administration' in Spain, 'Making the Most of Next Steps' in the UK, and 'Creating a

M. Shamsul Haque is Senior Lecturer at the Department of Political Science, National University of Singapore, 10 Kent Ridge Crescent, Singapore. CDU: 35.072.7.

International Review of Administrative Sciences [0020-8523(199803)64:1]

Copyright © 1998 IAS. SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi)
Vol. 64 (1998), 13-26; 003558

Government That Works Better and Costs Less' in the US (see OECD, 1993). The major rationales for this recent bureaucratic transformation have been stipulated in terms of newly emerging challenges — including such issues as unemployment, budget deficits, debt crisis, corruption, drug abuse, natural calamities, population problem, global business, and privatization — which public service has to encounter (De Guzman et al., 1991: 3; Djamin, 1991: 9–10).

Although these issues are crucial and require serious consideration, they should not be considered as serious challenges that are unique to public service, because they affect both public and private institutions in developed and developing countries. In fact, these social, economic, political, and environmental issues and events are always there, and they have always been dealt with by the public service in different ways with varying degrees of success. It is the 'capacity' of the public service to deal with such adverse circumstances and unprecedented events that should be the central focus to understand its current and future challenges. In other words, the events or issues may change and a new set of problems may emerge, but the public service must have the capacity to address such changing events, issues, and problems. However, this capacity of the public service — determined by its possession of adequate financial resources, technical skills, infrastructural facilities, and committed human resource — is largely dependent on the available government revenues, which in turn, depends on whether the taxpaying common people have adequate trust or confidence in the public service, which refers to the question of its public legitimacy.

The main contention of this article is that the most critical challenge to the current and future public service is the erosion of its legitimacy or public confidence: such a legitimization or confidence crisis in the public service often causes a decrease in taxpayers' support for its activities, a reduction in its share of financial and human resources to perform various functions and, thus, a decline in its capacity to deal with the critical socioeconomic issues and problems cited earlier. This emerging crisis of legitimacy or confidence, however, is likely to worsen due to the recent market-oriented changes in the image, objective, structure, norms, commitment, and performance of the public service within the overall context of promarket policies. This article critically examines how the contemporary market-centered changes in the public service accentuate its legitimization crisis that represents the main critical challenge to its future status and existence. The article concludes by recommending some alternative policies for the revival and maintenance of an adequate degree of public-service legitimacy, especially in terms of strengthening public confidence.

Legitimation crisis in public service: nature, forms and causes

Since the public service involves the utilization of public resources and realization of public interests, it must continue to maintain an adequate degree of public confidence in its objectives, programmes, and activities. In other words, public service must have a strong legitimate foundation based on its endorsement by the

public. However, while a public service may be highly endorsed by a certain social group or class, it may still suffer from the legitimation problem if it fails to acquire the confidence or trust of other groups and classes. It is necessary to mention that for the public service, although the bases of legitimacy include such common occupational criteria as efficiency, meritocracy, professionalism, and responsiveness (Warren, 1993: 250–1), the most crucial dimension of such legitimacy is its success in acquiring and maintaining a considerable degree of public confidence.

In recent years, this legitimacy of public service has come under challenge due to diminishing public confidence.² Such a decline in public confidence is evident from various surveys on public belief or opinion regarding the services provided by the public sector. For instance, in the UK, the percentage of people believing that they were receiving ‘good value for money’ from certain public-service activities declined between 1986 and 1988: from 73 to 69 percent with regard to the police service, from 57 to 56 percent regarding the health service (hospital), and from 36 to 29 percent regarding the road system (Hastings and Hastings, 1990: 118–19). In the US, the number of people believing in excessive resource waste by the public sector, increased from 45 percent in 1958 to 76 percent in 1985 (Levine et al., 1990). Similar trends can be observed in many other cases. This section of the article explains the major reasons for this diminishing public confidence in the public service — implying the growing problem of public-service legitimacy — caused by its recent market-oriented reforms.

The emerging rift within the state apparatus

In most countries, despite the past intellectual attacks on public bureaucracy for its alleged inefficiency, incompetence, unresponsiveness, tunnel vision, secrecy, and isolationism (Haque, 1994, 1996c), there were rarely serious open condemnations of the public service by the ruling political parties and leaders. But recently, ‘bureaucrat bashing’ by political leaders has become a common tactic to generate supportive public attitudes and win elections, especially when there has been a considerable increase in public dissatisfaction with the existing political system in advanced industrial countries such as the US and the UK (Campbell and Peters, 1988; Rouban, 1993: 317). This assault on the public service has also become an effective means to justify radical promarket reforms, including the downsizing of the public sector and the transformation of public service in the image of business enterprise, which facilitate the expansion of political control over public bureaucracy.

In this regard, it is well known that the leading political figures in the US, the UK, and Canada have been openly hostile to state bureaucracy, they have denigrated public employees and introduced reforms emulating the techniques used in the business sector (Campbell and Peters, 1988; Dillman, 1994; Gormley, 1989; Hetzner, 1989). As Savoie (1994: ix) mentions, ‘Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, and Brian Mulroney came to office convinced not only that their bureaucracies were inefficient but also that the bureaucracies were responsible

for much of the economic woe that gripped their respective countries.' In the US, Carter promised to 'clean up the horrible bureaucratic mess' and Reagan declared to 'drain the swamp'; in the UK, Thatcher introduced literature on public-choice theory to the top civil servants; and in Canada, Mulroney declared that he would offer 'pink slips and running shoes to bureaucrats' (Gordon, 1992: 3; Savoie, 1994: 4).

However, this unfavorable image of the public service reinforced by the rhetoric of political leaders has serious implications for the erosion of public confidence in the public service. As the political decision-makers, who are supposed to guide and assist public servants, have become the vehement critics of public service, its prestige and credibility have been disparaged considerably (Esman, 1991; Stever, 1987). In the case of the US, the Volcker Commission finds that a more unfavorable public perception of the public service has emerged, to a great extent, due to the recent 'bureaucrat bashing' by presidential candidates and the members of Congress (Volcker Commission, 1990). This diminishing public confidence in the public service implies the deteriorating status of its legitimacy. As the newly elected political leaders in various countries have come to believe in the merits of market forces and the inherent demerits of the public sector, it is most likely that the image of public service will continue to be unfavorable, its public confidence will remain low, and thus, its legitimation problem will continue to be a major challenge in the future.

The restructuring of public-sector programmes

The public confidence in public service not only relies on its public image, it also depends on the quantity and quality of services it provides to various sections of the public. It is usually the case that any major shift in public policies and programmes will change the scope and composition of services provided by the public sector, which in turn, will have varying impacts on different sections of the population who receive such services in terms of whether they are better off or worse off. A restructuring of public-sector programmes may satisfy those who become better off, and thus, increase their confidence in the public service, but it may dissatisfy those who become worse off, and thus, may diminish their trust in the public service. Thus, in both developed and developing countries, the recent market-centered restructuring of public policies and programmes has considerable implications for the quantity and quality of services provided by the public sector to various social groups and classes, which is likely to affect their confidence in the public service.

More specifically, the promarket transformation of the public service and the creation of more market-friendly public organizations to formulate, implement, and facilitate policies such as privatization, deregulation, and liberalization, are likely to be endorsed by private entrepreneurs and business élites who gain considerably by purchasing the privatized government assets sold at lower prices, acquiring government contracts to produce and deliver goods and services, and expanding the volume of import and export under the liberalized trade system.

But these market-oriented restructuring of public policies and organizations are likely to be unfavorable to the major sections of the population — to the peasants because of the withdrawal of agricultural subsidies, to the working class due to the reduction of workforce in the privatized industries, and to the poor in general because of the cutback of welfare programmes related to health, housing, and education.³ Thus, although the promarket reforms in the public service are strongly supported by the affluent business community that has established closer partnership with the public sector in recent years,⁴ such a probusiness public service may not be endorsed by the low-income people⁵ who constitute the majority in many countries. Thus, the recent transition towards a promarket public service may diminish public confidence, especially the confidence of low-income population, in such a public service.

The public dissatisfaction with the market-friendly public service may worsen further as the people become aware of the fact that in the name of streamlining the allegedly expansive and inefficient state bureaucracy, the public sector has been restructured in favor of vested business interests without much reduction in its size and scope. In many cases, while the components of government programmes supporting the low-income population have been curtailed, the components benefiting private firms have been expanded.⁶ On the other hand, a whole range of new bureaucracies has emerged to facilitate market-oriented policies such as divestiture and contracting out, and to deal with various government functions related to the newly expanded private markets, such as licensing, banking, monitoring, and reporting (Chaudhry, 1994; Kaul, 1996; OECD, 1993). In most countries, a set of promarket government bureaucracies has been introduced to carry out divestment programmes, make deals with private contractors, design the terms and conditions of public–private partnership, prepare reports on various policy outcomes, and implement market-oriented reforms in public bureaucracy. Thus, the mission of the newly emerging public service is not to play an active role in production, distribution, welfare, and socioeconomic development, but to design, facilitate, regulate, monitor, and evaluate the restructuring of the public sector itself.

It is likely that most citizens would disapprove that such a public service does not directly deliver goods and services but reproduces itself by assisting market forces and implementing its own market-oriented transformation. This promarket public service, despite its aforementioned endorsement by the business community, will be less acceptable to the majority of taxpayers who would like to see their tax dollars spent by the public service for its concrete and direct contribution to the betterment of their lives, not for its indirect role to enhance economic growth by serving the private sector. In short, the contemporary market-centered restructuring of government policies and programmes is likely to diminish public confidence in the public service,⁷ and thus, weaken its legitimacy. Such a trend may continue in the next century, because most countries are increasingly inclined to restructure the public sector in favor of market forces.

Business-like transformation of the public service

To a great extent, the credibility of the public service as a 'public' domain depends on its identity with the public interests, implying the interests of all citizens; its ethical foundation based on public norms such as representation and social justice; and its people-centered attitudes, referring to its favorable disposition towards people based on equal treatment and accessibility. But since the early 1980s, these basic features of the public service which characterize it as a 'public' realm have come under challenge due to the increasing use of market principles in the public sector and the transformation of the public service in the image of business management.⁸ For instance, in the US, the Report of the National Performance Review emphasizes the creation of an 'entrepreneurial government' and the transformation of state enterprises into more 'businesslike enterprises'; and in the UK, the 'New Public Management' highlights the adoption of a 'businessman's outlook' (Dunsire, 1991: 200; Gore, 1993: 44). This trend towards a business-oriented transition in the public service could be explicated further in terms of the conceptual, normative, and attitudinal guidelines followed in the recent public-service reforms.

First, in many countries, the recently introduced public-service reforms are largely based on the principles and strategies of business management such as cost-effectiveness, value-for-money, market-testing, competitive tendering, result-oriented management, and so on (ILO, 1995; OECD, 1993). In most OECD countries, there is an increasing tendency in the public service to adopt performance-based and result-oriented management composed of contracts, incentives, targets, and results (OECD, 1993). Second, the basic norms of the public service, such as neutrality, impartiality, accountability, representativeness, responsiveness, equality, justice, integrity, and commitment, are being replaced by promarket values like competitiveness, efficiency, productivity, and profitability (Haque, 1996a; Kernaghan, 1986; Massey, 1993; Ventriss, 1989). As pointed out by Whitfield (1992: 11): 'The principles of public service are rapidly being eroded. Commercial values, business practice and market forces are fast becoming the dominant operational criteria.' This recent replacement of public ethics by business norms in the public service is inherent in the aforementioned reform programmes undertaken already in most industrial nations, and increasingly in many developing countries. Third, with regard to attitudinal features, in line with the prescription of Barzelay and Armanjani (1992) to adopt a 'customer-driven' perspective in the public service, and the reproduction of this idea by the US Vice President Al Gore (1993) who emphasizes the preference of 'customers', many countries have attempted to introduce customer-oriented attitudes in their public bureaucracies. Increasingly, public servants are being attitudinally reformed towards customer-oriented behavior through courtesy campaigns, customer-care training, complaint-response systems, and one-stop facilities in countries such as the UK, New Zealand, Canada, France, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, and Mauritius (Kaul, 1996; OECD, 1990, 1993, 1994).

The aforementioned strategic, normative, and attitudinal transformation of the

public service in the image of business management represents a challenge to the established traditions and values of the public service, and raises questions regarding its unique identity as a 'public' domain (Haque, 1996a, b). As the public service increasingly adopts the business principles followed by the private sector, its distinction from the private sector will diminish, its public identity will become questionable, its credibility of serving public interest will weaken, its acceptance by the public will decline, and thus, its legitimacy will come under a greater challenge.

Erosion of commitment in the public service

In order to maintain people's confidence in the public service, the public employees must have adequate motivation and commitment, so that they can serve the public more effectively and satisfactorily. But due to the recent pro-market reforms in the public service, the level of such motivation and commitment has eroded, which is quite evident in the increasing rate of employee turnover and the decreasing availability of high-calibre applicants for the public service, especially in advanced industrial countries such as the US, the UK, and Japan. In the US, during the 1980s, about 45 percent of the top dedicated civil servants (the members of Senior Executive Service) left the civil service, the annual turnover rate reached as high as 20 percent, and it became quite difficult to hire qualified employees (Bellavita, 1991: 156; Farazmand 1989: 189). In Japan, many graduates from good universities now prefer to work in the private sector rather than in the civil service (see Pempel and Muramatsu, 1995: 71). In the UK, according to Gray and Jenkins (1996: 243), the business-oriented changes in the public sector have weakened the overall morale of the British civil service. This diminishing motivation and commitment of public employees implies a decline in the quality of services they provide, a decrease in people's satisfaction from such services, and thus, an erosion of people's confidence in the public service.

However, it is necessary to explain how the recent pro-market transition in the public service is related to this problem of employee motivation and commitment. First, it is necessary to recognize that for public employees, the sources of motivation and job satisfaction are not only extrinsic factors such as salary, status, and working conditions, but also various intrinsic factors inherent in and unique to the public service itself.⁹ These intrinsic rewards in the public service — including the employees' pride in doing something for the people, their desire to serve the public interest, and their feelings of patriotism and benevolence — have diminished due to its recent market-centered reforms that tend to replace the aforementioned public norms and values of the public service by the business principles of the private sector (Handley, 1989–90; Haque, 1996b; Perry and Wise, 1990).

Second, the decline in employee satisfaction may have worsened further due to the emerging pejorative image of the public service reinforced by the neo-conservative political leaders (discussed earlier). In the US, according to the Volcker Commission (1990), one critical impact of 'bureaucrat bashing' by the

contemporary politicians is the erosion of pride and meaning in the public service, leading to the demoralization of public employees.¹⁰ In the case of Japan, such diminishing motivation is evident from a 1994 opinion poll that showed that 88 percent of the people surveyed did not want their children to be public servants (Hastings and Hastings, 1996: 168). Third, the decline in public-service motivation and commitment has also been caused by the recent reduction of its extrinsic factors such as job security and salary and benefits in the context of promarket reforms: there is a growing fear of losing jobs due to the downsizing of the public sector and divestment of public enterprises.¹¹ In countries such as Australia, Belgium, Norway, New Zealand, and the UK, the usual job security in the public service is being replaced by short-term appointments based on contracts, and the tradition of guaranteed promotion is being undermined by the hiring of skilled private-sector managers for top positions (Kaul, 1996: 139; OECD, 1990: 13).

This situation of diminishing motivation and commitment of public employees caused by various factors (related to the promarket transition in the public service) — including the decline of intrinsic job satisfaction from unique public-service norms, the negative image of the public service perpetuated by political leaders, and the growing job insecurity caused by divestment, reduction in workforce, and short-term contracts — is likely to degenerate the quality of services, be unsatisfactory to the people receiving such services, and thus, weaken public confidence in public bureaucracy. As mentioned earlier, this erosion of public confidence implies a crisis of legitimacy in the public service.

The diminishing performance of the public service

To a great extent, the public confidence in public service depends on its performance in delivering goods and services, which has been constrained due to the recent promarket reforms requiring a reduction in the number of public employees. Such a constraint to public-sector employment is likely to diminish the performance of the public service by reducing its ability to carry out various socioeconomic programmes, and this diminishing performance may create a negative public perception about the public service. However, under the current market-centered policies, almost all countries are trying to streamline the public sector and reduce its workforce. For instance, in the UK, since 1979, the government has reduced the number of public-sector employees by 25 percent, transferred over 930,000 public employees to the private sector, and announced a 25 percent cutback in its senior posts (Gray and Jenkins, 1996; Mottram, 1995; OECD, 1993). From time to time, the central government introduced measures to reduce public employment by 2 percent annually in Australia, by 15,000 persons per year in Canada, by 20,000 jobs in the Netherlands, by 10 percent in Sweden, and by 252,000 positions in the US (Gore, 1993; OECD, 1993). Similarly, the government intention to freeze or reduce public-sector employment has been announced in Greece, Italy, Finland, and Japan (OECD, 1993, 1994). This employment barrier imposed on the public service is likely to undermine its performance in dealing with the growing number of complex socioeconomic

problems. Another barrier to the performance of public service, of course, is its growing financial constraints caused by the overall budget cut and the transfer of resources from various social programmes to market-oriented initiatives such as divestment and contracting out.

The diminishing performance of the public service may also be caused by its subjection to an increasing amount of political control and interference resulting from the recent market-oriented reforms. The politicization of the civil service has increased in countries such as France, the UK, and the US due to the emergence of managerialism in the public sector (Rouban, 1993: 317), which refers to the power of political executives to hire and fire public managers appointed on the basis of individual contracts. In the case of the UK, it has been pointed out that although 83 percent of senior civil servants want to preserve their political neutrality, the Next Steps initiative has introduced 'executive agencies' run by chief executives, expanded the 'macho' ministerial control over these agencies and executives, and affected the system of service delivery (Gray and Jenkins, 1996; OECD, 1993). Similarly, the government has created 'executive agencies' in the Netherlands, 'special operating agencies' in Canada, and 'free agencies' in Denmark (OECD, 1993: 10). Although these newly created agencies are given managerial autonomy for personnel and financial matters, the subservience of these public agencies to political control, and the lack of job security (due to contractual employment) among their employees, will undermine their performance in dealing with serious policy issues on a long-term basis.

These are some of the major consequences of the current promarket reforms in the public sector — such as employment constraint, financial constraint, and political interference discussed earlier — which have adverse implications for the performance of the public service. However, the more important point here is that this decline in the public sector's performance caused by its recent promarket changes is likely to worsen the negative image of the public service and erode public confidence and legitimacy.

Recommendations and conclusion

In this discussion, it has been pointed out that during the last decade of this century, due to the worldwide transition to a mode of governance based on pro-market policies and reforms, there is an emerging challenge to the public service posed by its diminishing legitimacy or declining public confidence. Given the global trend towards the expansion of market-centered administrative reforms, this critical challenge of a legitimation crisis is likely to continue in the next century. It has been explained how various issues related to the promarket reforms in the public service — including the worsening image of the public service, its market-biased restructuring of social programmes, its own business-like transformation, its loss of employee commitment, and its diminishing performance in delivering services — may weaken public credibility and exacerbate the legitimation crisis. After examining the major factors accentuating the challenge of legitimation crisis, it is necessary to explore some possible alternatives to

address this emerging challenge. In this regard, the central concern is how to revive public confidence in the public service in order to enhance its public legitimacy.

First, for reviving public confidence in the public service, it is necessary to neutralize its extreme negative image and publicize its positive outcomes, so that the people have a more favorable impression regarding its roles and objectives. Such a venture requires the end of 'bureaucrat bashing' by politicians, which has become a common trend in many countries. Political leaders must understand that the public service represents a fundamental part of the state apparatus, and its pejorative image will eventually weaken public trust in all government institutions, including their own political parties.

Second, in order to strengthen public confidence in the public service, it is also necessary to adopt a more balanced allocation of public resources based on the needs and desires of various social groups and classes. In this regard, it is necessary to re-examine the current fetish for promarket reforms that have led to the transfer of public assets to the private sector and the diversion of public funds from social programmes to business interests. In fact, most of these reform programmes were undertaken without much concern for public opinion and reaction. Although the government introduced promarket reforms in the UK based on the belief that the private sector could do a better job than the public sector, it was found in a 1988 opinion poll that the percentage of common people holding such a belief was only 18 percent with regard to housing, 8 percent regarding education, 4 percent regarding social services, and 2 percent regarding fire and police (Hastings and Hastings, 1990: 117). The majority of these people also opposed the sale of various public-sector enterprises.¹² Similarly, in the US, most people disapproved any reduction in certain public programmes.¹³ Thus, a more critical assessment of the current promarket reforms in the public sector is necessary, and these public-sector reforms must take into account the needs and expectations of the common people in order to acquire their confidence in the public service.

Third, for maintaining a credible degree of people's confidence in the public service, it is necessary to revive the public identity of the public service: it not only requires the reinforcement of unique public-service norms such as fairness, equality, accountability, and representation, it also demands a critical examination of the compatibility of business norms (e.g. competition, productivity, and profit) with the public service. It is also important to re-examine the applicability of business-sector attitudes such as 'customer-orientedness' to the public service, and to adopt more 'people-oriented' attitudes. The public confidence in the public service cannot be sustained unless its moral leadership is based on public norms and attitudes.

Fourth, the diminishing motivation and commitment of public employees must be restored in order to ensure a strong public endorsement of the public service. Without adequate motivation and commitment, it is quite unlikely that public employees will deliver services effectively and treat people with compassion and courtesy. A lower level of such commitment often disparages the public service

and erodes its public confidence. In order to strengthen this commitment, it is necessary to create a more favorable image of the public service and ensure an adequate level of job security, which have recently become serious concerns affecting the morale of public employees.

Finally, the public confidence in the public service requires a satisfactory level of public-sector performance in terms of its responsive delivery of goods and services in order to satisfy various sections of the population and earn their trust. But this performance of public service is increasingly becoming difficult to maintain¹⁴ due to its aforementioned problems of employment constraint, political interference, and financial constraint that have worsened under the promarket policies and reforms. In this regard, it is essential to determine the size of the public sector based on its needs for material and human resources to carry out its programmes and activities rather than on a market-biased policy stance. In other words, it is necessary to have a rational rather than an ideological attitude towards public-sector employment and finance, so that the public service can effectively address the emerging socioeconomic issues and problems. In addition, a minimal degree of political neutrality must be ensured to allow public servants to make operational decisions based on rational standards rather than political criteria imposed by the promarket (neoliberal) political leaders. In this regard, a certain degree of job security must be maintained in the public service, so that public servants feel less vulnerable to the influence of political decision-makers exercising the power to punish and reward.

Notes

1. These are some of the 'formal' principles of public service that emerged as the basic administrative features in liberal democracies, although the 'real' administrative situation could be the violation of these principles as experienced in many developing countries. For a detailed analysis of the major barriers to the realization of these public-service principles in developing countries, see Haque (1996c).

2. In this regard, Nigro and Richardson (1990: 630) observe that in the US, the growing public distrust in the public service has led to 'a serious erosion of the citizenry's belief in public administration's legitimacy'.

3. Even in an advanced economy like the US, there was considerable restructuring of the public sector in the 1980s: as a percentage of the total federal expenditures, education expenditure declined from 5.3 to 3.0 percent and housing expenditure decreased from 1.7 to 1.3 percent (Levine et al., 1990: 24). Between 1980 and 1990, there was a reduction in federal spending on welfare and unemployment by 21 percent (Clements, 1994: 93).

4. A partnership between the private and public sectors has been established in countries such as Australia, Canada, Malaysia, New Zealand, the UK, and Zambia (Kaul, 1996: 137–45; OECD, 1990: 10).

5. It was found from a 1994 opinion poll that in the UK, the public perception of whether the public sector was doing too much or too little, varied according to social classes: the government was doing 'too much' according to 75 percent of the affluent-class people but 'too little' according to 85 percent of the working-class people (Hastings and Hastings, 1996: 148).

6. In the US, for instance, the Reagan administration diverted billions of dollars from the public programmes on education, housing, health, and welfare to the defense sector that benefited private firms working as the major contractors in defense. In 1988 alone, the

US federal government spent more than \$200 billion on contracting out, mostly related to the defense sector (Massey, 1993: 118).

7. This public concern is evident in the fact that the people want to see their government spend more on such concrete social issues as health, education, housing, crime, environment, and so on. In 1994, the percentage of Americans feeling that their government was spending 'too little' for education was 71 percent, health 64 percent, environment 59 percent, and crime 75 percent (Hastings and Hastings, 1996: 171). In 1990, the percentage of British population believing that their government was spending 'too little' for education was 84 percent, health 87 percent, roads 55 percent, and old-age pension 84 percent (Hastings and Hastings, 1992: 147–8).

8. The recent public-service reforms in major industrial nations (e.g. France, Sweden, the UK, the US) have been based on business principles such as managerialism, deregulation, privatization, contracting out, customer-orientedness, and competitive prices, and 'all the new rules of the game are causing crises within public organizations and the civil service' (Rouban, 1993: 316). Even in Third World countries, the public service is being changed towards similar business norms of managerialism, efficiency, competition, and profit, especially under the influence of the World Bank (see World Bank, 1994).

9. For Perry and Wise (1990: 368–71), there are three categories of intrinsic motives in the public service: (a) the rational motives or the feelings of self-importance by participating in the process of public policy, (b) the norm-based motives or the desire to serve public interest and ensure social equity, and (c) the affective motives or the feelings of patriotism and benevolence.

10. According to the 1989 General Accounting Office (GAO) report, about 90 percent of the Senior Executive Service (SES) members are dissatisfied with the negative attitudes held by the current political leaders, the media, and the public toward the federal service (Ingraham and Rosenbloom, 1990: 215).

11. According to Sharma (1994: 208), in African countries, the adjustment programmes and privatization have not only curtailed public programmes and reduced civil service positions, they have also diminished public-service morale and motivation.

12. A 1988 opinion poll showed that the percentage of British people opposing the sale of public enterprises was 66 percent for the water authorities, 63 percent for electricity industry, 52 percent for British Railway, and 66 percent for the National Health Service (Hastings and Hastings, 1990: 104).

13. In 1989, the percentage of Americans disapproving the reduction of public-sector programmes was 93 percent for social security and 95 percent for programmes for elderly (Warren, 1993: 253).

14. An increasing number of people disapprove of the current level of government performance. According to the 1994 opinion polls, in Canada, about 32 percent approved while 58 percent disapproved the government's performance records; in Britain, only 12.6 percent approved while 77.8 percent disapproved the government performance; and in Germany, only 1.5 percent considered the government performance as very good while 48 percent considered it as 'not so good' and 23 percent as 'very poor' (Hastings and Hastings, 1996: 151–4).

References

- Barzelay, Michael and Armanjani, Babaj J. (1992) *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bellavita, Christopher, (1991) 'The Public Administrator as Hero', *Administration & Society* 23(2): 155–85.
- Campbell S.J., Colin and Peters, B. Guy (1988) 'The Politics/Administration Dichotomy: Death or Merely Change?', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 1(1): 79–99.

- Chaudhry, Kiren Aziz (1994) 'Economic Liberalization and the Lineages of the Rentier State', *Comparative Politics* 27(1): 1–25.
- Clements, Laurie (1994) 'Privatization American Style: The Grand Illusion', in Thomas Clarke (ed.) *International Privatisation: Strategies and Practices*, pp. 87–104. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- De Guzman, R.P., Reforma, M.A., Reyes, D.R. and Kouzmin, A. (1991) 'Public Management in the 1990s: An Agenda of Change', in G. Bahadur, N. Pradhan and M.A. Reforma (eds) *Public Management in the 1990s: Challenges and Opportunities*, pp. 3–8. Manila: EROPA.
- Dillman, D.L. (1994) 'The Thatcher Agenda, the Civil Service, and Total Efficiency', in Ali Farazmand (ed.) *Handbook of Bureaucracy*, pp. 241–52. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Djamin, Awaloedin (1991) 'Public Management in the Coming Decade: Perspectives for Development and Reform', in G. Bahadur, N. Pradhan and M. A. Reforma (eds) *Public Management in the 1990s: Challenges and Opportunities*, pp. 9–16. Manila: EROPA.
- Dunsire, Andrew (1991) 'The Politics of Public Administration Reform', in Brian C. Smith (ed.) *The Changing Role of Government: Management of Social and Economic Activities*, pp. 191–208. London: Management Development Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Esman, M.J. (1991) *Management Decisions of Development*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Farazmand, Ali (1989) 'Crisis in the U.S. Administrative State', *Administration & Society* 21(2): 173–99.
- Gordon, George J. (1992) *Public Administration in America*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Gore, Al (1993) *Creating a Government That Works Better & Costs Less: Report of the National Performance Review*. New York: Random House.
- Gormley, W.T. (1989) *Taming the Bureaucracy: Muscles, Prayers, and Other Strategies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gray, Andrew and Jenkins, Bill (1996) 'Public Administration and Government 1994–95', *Parliamentary Affairs* 49(2): 235–55.
- Handley, Elisabeth A. (1989–90) 'Stay or Go: Public Service Rewards and Challenges', *Bureaucrat* 18(4): 49–52.
- Haque, M. Shamsul (1994) 'The Emerging Challenges to Bureaucratic Accountability: A Critical Perspective', in Ali Farazmand (ed.) *Handbook of Bureaucracy*, pp. 265–86. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Haque, M. Shamsul (1996a) 'The Intellectual Crisis in Public Administration in the Current Epoch of Privatization', *Administration & Society* 27(4): 510–36.
- Haque, M. Shamsul (1996b) 'Public Service Under Challenge in the Age of Privatization', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 9(2): 186–216.
- Haque, M. Shamsul (1996c) 'The Contextless Nature of Public Administration in Third World Countries', *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 62(3): 315–30.
- Hastings, Elizabeth Hann and Hastings, Philip K. (1990) *Index to International Public Opinion, 1988–1989*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hastings, Elizabeth Hann and Hastings, Philip K. (1992) *Index to International Public Opinion, 1990–1991*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hastings, Elizabeth Hann and Hastings, Philip K. (1996) *Index to International Public Opinion, 1994–1995*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hetzner, C. (1989) 'Accounting and Accountability: Bottom Lines and Basic Mistakes', *International Journal of Public Administration* 12(4): 595–615.
- ILO (International Labour Organization) (1995) *Impact of Structural Adjustment in the Public Services*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Ingraham, Patricia W. and Rosenbloom, David H. (1990) 'Political Foundations of the

- Federal Service: Rebuilding a Crumbling Base', *Public Administration Review* 50(2): 210–19.
- Kaul, Mohan (1996) 'Civil Service Reforms: Learning from Commonwealth Experiences', *Public Administration and Development* 16(2): 131–50.
- Kernaghan, Kenneth (1986) 'Evolving Patterns of Administrative Responsiveness to the Public', *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 52(1): 7–16.
- Levine, C.H., Peters, B.G. and Thompson, F.J. (1990) *Public Administration: Challenges, Choices, Consequences*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education.
- Massey, Andrew (1993) *Managing the Public Sector: A Comparative Analysis of the United Kingdom and the United States*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Mottram, Richard (1995) 'Improving Public Services in the United Kingdom', *Public Administration and Development* 15(3): 311–18.
- Nigro, Lloyd G. and Richardson, William D. (1990) 'Between Citizen and Administrator: Administrative Ethics and PAR', *Public Administration Review* 50(6): 623–35.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) (1990) *Public Management Development Survey 1990*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) (1993) *Public Management Development Survey 1993*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) (1994) *Public Management Development Survey 1994*. Paris: OECD.
- Pempel, T.J. and Muramatsu, Michio (1995) 'The Japanese Bureaucracy and Economic Development: Restructuring a Proactive Civil Service', in Hyung-Ki Kim, Michio Muramatsu and T.J. Pempel (eds) *The Japanese Civil Service and Economic Development: Catalyst of Change*, pp.19–76. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, James L. and Wise, Lois R. (1990) 'The Motivational Bases of Public Service', *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367–73.
- Rouban, Luc (1993) 'Public Administration and Political Change — Introduction', *International Political Science Review* 14(4): 315–18.
- Savoie, Donald E. (1994) *Thatcher, Reagan, Mulroney: In Search of a New Bureaucracy*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Sharma, K.C. (1994) 'Africa's Economic Crisis, Public Policies of Structural Adjustment Programmes, Considerations for Political Restructuring and Role of Public Service Bureaucracies', in R.B. Jain and H. Bongartz (eds) *Structural Adjustment, Public Policy and Bureaucracy in Developing Societies*, pp. 201–16. New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications.
- Steuer, J.A. (1987) *The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-Progressive Era*. New York: Transnational.
- Ventriss, Curtis (1989) 'Toward a Public Philosophy of Public Administration: A Civic Perspective of the Public', *Public Administration Review* 49(2): 173–9.
- Volcker Commission (1990) *Leadership for America: Rebuilding the Public Service*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Warren, Kenneth F. (1993) 'We Have Debated Ad Nauseam the Legitimacy of the Administrative State — But Why?', *Public Administration Review* 53(3): 249–54.
- Whitfield, Dexter (1992) *The Welfare State: Privatisation, Deregulation, Commercialisation of Public Services*. London: Pluto Press.
- World Bank (1994) *World Development Report 1994: Infrastructure for Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.