From Paradigms of Orthodoxy to Postmodernism: The Changing Perspective of Government

Dr Tahir Ul-Mulk Kahlon[*]

Dr Aneel Salman[**]

Abstract

Governance has now become a popular jargon in every day political discourse. However, in this globalised world, it is no longer just about 'for the people and by the people' as it was during the last century. Instead, it has and is undergoing administrative transformation with strong democratic norms, upsurge in new forms of state structures, diverse policy networks, assorted organisations, and peoples' rising desire to participate in the business of government. For understanding this milieu, it is essential to trace, identify, and describe the evolution of multiple paradigms of governance from their orthodoxy to postmodernism with a view to master the instruments of societal solutions. This article endeavours to comprehend these philosophical paradigms and principles, their development and application in Pakistan's national context in order to determine the practices that lead to the success of public governance.

Key words: Governance, Public Management, Public Policy, Paradigms, Administration, Pakistan.

[*] The author is Assistant Professor at the Department of Government and Public Policy, National Defence University in Islamabad, Pakistan.
[**] The author is Assistant Professor at the Department of Economics, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology in Islamabad, Pakistan.

Introduction

Emergence of Pakistan in 1947 put a heavy burden on the government to build a nation ravaged by Partition calamities. It called for an overhaul of the inherited governing regime that was obsolete, colonial and despotic. Numerous commissions/committees for governance reforms were constituted at tandem with studies by international donors designed to embrace paradigm shifts from the traditional, colonial system to a new democratic system of governance. Nonetheless, such reforms could only be partially implemented. Consequently, Pakistan continues to remain reluctant in adapting to emerging paradigms of governance. Meanwhile, governing concepts have seen remarkable changes in the developed world, with globalisation as its driving force. Since the middle of the Twentieth Century, the social complexion and political cultures have been radically changing, with national governments unable to grapple with cultural and ethnic diversities and their global obligations.

Events around the globe are now flashed at lightning speed, altering public perceptions. Citizens are now better educated and informed, making them less willing to absorb crookery and spin of traditional, bureaucratic political elites. These changes have ushered in complexity, interdependence and rise in public expectations for transparency and accountability. Governments are now increasingly confronted with policy problems which are not linear, simple and even national, are rather global and multifaceted. Hence, collective issues can no longer be solved by any government acting alone. They have to relentlessly engage in crafting public policies with or without encompassing all of their implications. The emerging landscape of governance is evidently highlighted by the Democratic Party's minority leader in his inaugural speech at President Donald Trump's oath-taking in January 2017:

> We live in a challenging and tumultuous time. A quickly evolving, ever more interconnected world. A rapidly changing economy that benefits too few while leaving too many behind. A fractured media, a politics frequently consumed by rancor. We face threats foreign and domestic.

> In such times, faith in our government, our institutions, and even our country can erode.[1]

While governing practices of the developed world are informed by their expert policy knowledge and practices, Pakistan mainly remains stuck in its inherited governing orthodoxy. Resultantly, there continues to be incongruity between governing inputs and their outcomes.

This article examines the evolution and development of governing paradigms, in an endeavour to educate public policy actors in Pakistan, emphasising the need to embrace contemporary ideas and discriminately draw on new models that are contextually appropriate to satisfy the needs of its citizenry. It highlights the rigidity and incapacity associated with our traditional governing approach in capturing problems of public policy fragmentation in the emerging governing landscape. The rising complexity of public problems demands appropriate solutions from government with the cooperation of agencies and actors across a multilayered government. The article also exposes the necessity to transform from directorial form of governance towards emphasis on citizens' motivations and collaborative solutions. It concludes with suggestions that identify motivations, incentives, privileges, interests and needs of people and growing complexities of public policy processes.

Governance Paradigms

Orthodoxy: The Traditional Government

American academic turned statesman, President Woodrow Wilson, expounded politics-administration dichotomy and called for the separation of public policy implementation from public policy formulation. Wilson was deeply impressed by the idea of Frank Goodnow (American educator and legal scholar) that public policy politics must be insulated from the Executive which should execute the will of policymakers in its true spirit as enunciated in laws and directives. Wilson, in an influential article, made the following points:

---

[1] Mark Landler, "In Inaugural Address, Trump Continues to Shun Establishment," *New York Times*, January 20, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/20/us/politics/trump-presidency.html?_r=0.

a. Government administration was a linear and unitary process which could be exclusively studied and observed at multiple levels - local, provincial and federal.

b. Study of the execution of public policies should not be done from a political perspective, instead should be rooted, for example, in the principles of law and management.

c. Public administration is in essence an art, but with advances in science and technology, availability of sophisticated tools and instruments, its methodology must be scientifically studied.

d. Modern governance should locate its heart in its administrative faculties and capacities.[2]

Wilson's ideas led to extensive studies and discoveries of the principles of administration, the most influential being the acronym given by Luther Gulick, that is, planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.[3] The focus during this period of orthodoxy was on the development of capacities and expertise of the bureaucracy and on Organisational Science. Public managers, thus, became popular and equally sought after human resources both by the government and businesses.

Contemporary theorists began to rediscover wisdom in the work of Frederick Taylor who had expounded principles of 'Scientific Management' in his study of 'Time and Motion' which gave rise to Classical Organisation Theories.[4] From the perspective of government as well as public policy, the most significant work during this period was by Herbert Simon who by using logical positivism in dealing with making of public policy and decision-making gave the philosophy of 'bounded rationality'[5] which meant that public policymakers make decisions within

---

[2] Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," *Political Science* 2, no. 2 (1887): 197-222.

[3] Luther Gulick, "Politics, Administration, and the 'New Deal'," *The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 169 (1933): 545–566.

[4] Frederick Winslow Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1919).

[5] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Free Press,1957).

limits imposed by rationality, and thus, merely propound satisficing policy solutions. He advised dividing public servants into two categories. One who should be concerned with the pure science of administration (execution) of policies, drawing from the discipline of Social Psychology and the other, a bit larger group, prescribing public policies.

In 1947, Simon strongly criticised the concept of 'Principles of Administration' exhorting that for every so-called principle, there is sufficient room for a counter principle and conclusively termed the whole idea of 'principles' absurd.[6] During this period, civil servants and public service was also strongly influenced by the Weberian approach of classical bureaucracy.[7] It was considered rational, professional and non-political, modeled on the principles of hierarchy and meritocracy; and a panacea to trounce patrimony and favouritism in governmental decisions. The concept relied on centralised control, separated public policymaking from public policy implementation, set rules, followed organisational hierarchy, efficient and effective budgeting and human resource management.[8] The central features of this model can be summarised as follows:

a. It was firmly believed that the work of government should be clearly divided into decision-making (public policymaking) and execution (administration) - a separation between elected politicians and administration.

b. Administration is continuous, predictable and rule-governed and governing through bureaucracies is a science, which is separate and exclusive.

c. Public servant appointments should be based on qualifications and merit.

d. There needs to be division of labour, with hierarchy of tasks and people.

---

[6] ———, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 4th ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1997).

[7] Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters, eds., and trans., *Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society: New Translations on Politics, Bureaucracy, and Social Stratification* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

[8] Stephen P. Osborne, "The New Public Governance?" *Public Management Review* 8, no. 3 (2010): 377-388.

e. Organisational resources are not for individuals employed, but for the people.
f. Public bureaucracy serves public interests and not those of private groups.
g. Democracy[9] means efficiency, and hence, both must remain reconciled at all times. Attainment of one means attainment of the other.[10]

Pakistan's governing structure was created in the waning period of classical orthodoxy in the early Twentieth Century. Like other developing countries, it has followed the practices of developed countries in governance reforms, mainly supported by donors. Hence, it sustained a governing system theoretically and practically grounded in tenets of this paradigm. Top-down elitist public service has remained its hallmark. Civil servants were kept insulated from politicians and citizens and trained to acquire the values of hierarchy, integrity and independence. Organisations were also similarly structured on the principles of organisational efficiency and bureaucratic ethos.

The system performed well, under the political leadership of the Independence Movement which was determined to build a top-quality civil service. However, soon it started experiencing decline. The quality of governance retarded, initially due to political instability and later under despotic and patrimonial pressures. Public money and appointments succumbed to the influence and manipulation of rulers and their protégés. Successive donor funded reform initiatives were undertaken advocating varying tones of decentralisation, anti-corruption, development, and effectiveness of government agencies.[11] Due to fiscal imbalances,

---

[9] Democracy in this period was the leading Western development norm in the face of Communism as its competitor. The democratic world was, thus, flooded with ideologies of populist and participative governments.

[10] Willy McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach" (paper no. 6428, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit, East Asia and the Pacific Region, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2013).

[11] Beginning with creation of what is now called the Ministry of Planning, Development and Reforms, almost every reform was undertaken at the behest of and mainly funded by donors.

Pakistan's government frequently embarked on reform initiatives for cost containment and reduction in the size of the bureaucracy, adjustment of departments and pay rationalisation efforts. Most of these efforts had mere reductionist overtones to limit the size and scope of government. Results were never encouraging due to lack of resolve and direction, bureaucratic friction and frequent changes in government and development ideologies. Resultantly, it could never discard the model of Weberian bureaucracy.

Pakistani experience does have academic justification. The World Bank claims that bureaucratic quality has positive association with economic growth, appointments of bureaucracy based on merit and provision of stable careers to them.[12] The ragtag development history of Pakistan, thus, takes its attributes from recurrent governmental failures. The nation has continued to follow a centralised, orthodox top-down, hierarchical model of governance despite the needs to the contrary for realignment with evolving paradigms. Patrimonial rule has remained a subtly desired goal in all government reform undertakings.

New Public Management (NPM)

On the other side of the world, multiple studies on governance reforms continued to be conducted in reaction to limitations of the traditional paradigm, that is, politics-administration dichotomy and the need to sustain in a competitive market economy. Emergence of a managerial 'mood' wanted a new label for governance reforms that were a mixture of the 'new right' as well as labour and social-democratic parties. The traditional model was, thus, substituted by a market inspired or enterprise model.[13] The label 'New Public Management (NPM)' was created and adopted in the late 1980s to denote the importance of production engineering and management in governance.[14] It remains debatable as to how far this paradigm is connected to managerial ideals. It is also difficult

---

[12] World Bank, *World Development Report 1983* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983),
https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/5966/WDR%201983%20-%20English.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

[13] Kieron Walsh, *Public Services and Market Mechanisms: Competition, Contracting and the New Public Management* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995).

[14] George A. Larbi, "The New Public Management Approach and Crisis States" (paper no. 112, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva, 1999).

to dissect the rudiments of NPM paradigm because the dawn of public sector managerialism overlapped with the unease of various Western democratic governments to enhance regulatory transparency, curtail authority of trade unions, and deal with inadequacies of public corporations.[15]

NPM has also generally been confused with 'New Public Administration (NPA)'. They do have some common features, but their themes are different. NPA had an academic locus, whereas NPM was managerially focused on production and operation of government. The latter focused on accountability, public service values, due process, and internal dynamics of government organisations.[16] Principles of competition, cost control, and business management lay at its heart shifting the state towards managerialism. It encompassed decentralised government with autonomous public agencies, budgetary and financial devolution, contracting mechanisms of market-types, emphasising performance and outputs, and most importantly, considering the public a customer, with a focus on the division of public services into its indispensable units and focusing on cost management practices. There was a general shift from inputs towards outcomes, measurement and quantification, performance indicators and standards. NPM also focused on learning from businesses and their management, such as more frequent deployment of market-type mechanisms, privatisation of public services, instituting competition and contracts in budget allocations for public projects. There was an inclination towards horizontal/flat organisations in which creation of managerial cadres to manage their domains autonomously was stressed. Contractual relations replaced existing top-down command relationships. The idea being that government organisations should be led by entrepreneurial leadership. This model was about arm's-length organisations, depoliticisation and separation of politics from management - policy implementers should be insulated from policymakers.[17]

---

[15] Michael Barzelay, *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

[16] Jan-Erik Lane, *New Public Management: An Introduction* (London: Routledge 2000).

[17] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

It is difficult to comprehend the rise of NPM without looking at parallel developments in other disciplines. Avoiding a detailed interdisciplinary review, this article only focuses on theories which had profound impact on the configuration of this paradigm. Principal insights come from the discipline of Economics, and in that from Neoclassical Economics. It is ingrained in the concepts of New Institutional Economics (NIE) propounded by James Buchanan, Gordon Tullock, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler. Sub-themes that left impressions on NPM and promoted the ideas of efficiency and responsiveness, also take strong cues from the rubric of Public Choice Theory (PCT), Transaction Cost Economics (TCE) and Principal Agent Theory (PAT).[18] All these stress on performance management and 'management by results' instead of governing by inputs and outputs.

NPM provided a thrust for reforms which were successful in some countries and unsuccessful in others.[19] It was adopted very selectively in developing countries due to their feeble capacity and limited political support. In Pakistan, the idea came a bit late and that too through the Bretton Woods Institutions (World Bank and the International Monetary Fund). It was in the 1990s that government moved vigorously to peruse large-scale privatisation reforms leading to disinvestment and sale of major public businesses.[20] Some prominent examples were foreign currency deregulation, privatisation of public banks and Pakistan Telecommunication (PTC) and move towards fragmentation of the Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA). However, it needed consistent leadership which remained absent due to political instability and rapid changes in government. Simultaneously, with a sluggish but powerful bureaucracy, universal and large-scale application of most principles of NPM either remained unsuccessful or virtually unnoticeable.

---

[18] Christopher Pollitt and Geert Bouckaert, *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[19] Christopher Hood and Guy Peters, "The Middle Aging of New Public Management: Into the Age of Paradox?" *Journal of Public Administration, Research & Theory* 14, no. 3 (2004): 267-282, https://oied.ncsu.edu/selc/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/The-Middle-Aging-of-New-Public-Management-Into-the-Age-of-Paradox.pdf.

[20] Andrea Cornwall and John Gaventa, "Participation in Governance," in *International Development Governance*, ed. Ahmed Shafiqul Huque and Habib Zafarullah (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2006).

Globally too, NPM was disparaged for its overemphasis on the efficacy of business methods in the public sector without regard to cultural and historical differences in economies. It was also criticised for diluting the concept of public accountability and utter disregard of public interest.[21] This was amply visible in Pakistan in the regulatory capture by predatory businesses and rise of mafias and cartels that grabbed public enterprises offered for sale - many times almost in peanuts. Instead of reducing pervasive public poverty, several Pakistanis (including political leaders) were listed in the world Billionaires' Club.[22] Evidence of regulatory capture in the banking, financial, industrial and real estate sector thrived and continue to resonate in the media and courts. This was a painful dimension of reform initiatives in Pakistan. In the civil service, strong central bureaucracy provided stiff and successful resistance to shed power or to be held to account by embracing political elites.[23] A reversion to the colonial 'Commissioner' system by all four provinces is a glaring example of the power of bureaucracy.[24]

Internationally, NPM was also subjected to charges of being incapable of heeding the needs of citizens, scuttling unity amongst various tiers of government and causing public policy fragmentation.[25] Osborne criticised the very foundations of NPM, terming it an amalgam of some scattered heuristics drawn from multiple managerial concepts, and hence, lacking solid internal philosophical underpinnings.[26]

---

[21] Christopher Hood and Ruth Dixon, *A Government that Worked Better and Cost Less* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

[22] Zahid Gishkori and Qamar Zaman, "The Ruling and the Rich: ECPs Assets List Reveals 'Billionaire Club'," *Express Tribune*, December 26, 2013, https://tribune.com.pk/story/650740/the-ruling-and-the-rich-ecps-assets-list-reveals-billionaire-club/; and "Billionaires' Club," editorial, *Dawn*, June 18, 2017, https://www.dawn.com/news/1340226.

[23] Nasir Islam, "Colonial Legacy, Administrative Reform and Politics: Pakistan 1947-1987," *Public Administration and Development* 9, no.3 (1989): 271-285.

[24] This is top-down ruling colonial system was inherited via Imperial Civil Service, India Civil Service, and Civil Service of Pakistan. The reference is to the current Pakistan Administrative Service whose officers enjoy ruling powers through existing colonial laws of Pakistan.

[25] Tom Christensen and Per Lægreid, *Transcending New Public Management: The Transformation of Public Sector Reforms* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007).

[26] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

Meanwhile, another concept mainly from Political Science and its sub-disciplines was emerging under the rubric of governance with emphasis on the role of non-state actors (NSA) in the formulation and implementation of public policies. These approaches considered citizens instead of the bureaucracy as a fulcrum of public service efficacy, instead of coveting business and market approaches that were the hallmark of NPM.[27] Hence once again, it was back to the role of politics in the administration and provision of collective needs and public policies. The emerging paradigms looked at new governing relationships in the framework of public organisations. The changing external circumstances became significant due to new organisational arrangements, consequently shaping the very quintessence of government and public policy management. Analysts began to highlight the implication of globalisation, complexities of an interdependent global economy and the need of linking government to an influential global milieu.[28] Some wrote about extensive threats and opportunities of globalisation, wherein governments need to be vigilant to the repercussions of capital flows and international production structure of internal financial systems and its consequences for the very character of government.[29] Governance, thus, entered a postmodernist stage.

Postmodernism and the Governance Landscape

The move towards globalisation places mounting stress on the international governance system rather than on national governments. Koppell identified growing institutional practices which transcended the traditional concepts of government. A blend of government and non-government organisations (NGOs) started playing a fundamental role in shaping public policies and providing public services in almost all

---

[27] Peter Ho, "Governing for the Future: What Governments Can Do" (paper no. 248, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore, 2012), https://www.rsis.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/rsis-pubs/WP248.pdf.

[28] George Abonyi and David M. Van Slyke, "Governing on the Edges: Globalization of Production and the Challenge to Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century," in *The Future of Public Administration in 2020*, ed. Rosemary O'Leary and David M. Van Slyke, special issue, *Public Administration Review* 70, no.1 (2010): 33-45.

[29] Mark Robinson, "Hybrid States: Globalisation and the Politics of State Capacity," *Political Studies* 56, no. 3 (2008): 566-583.

government departments. Moreover, regulation and distribution of scarce public assets began through market systems. Transnational collaboration and dependence on global corporations and agencies became pronounced in international public policies.[30]

Scholars claim that public policy problems have now become complex, relentless and contested.[31] A public policy jargon of 'wicked problems' has come into common use. Such problems cut across hierarchy and authority structures within and between organisations and across policy domains, political/administrative jurisdictions, and political 'group' interests.[32] This dictates the need of multiple intercessions and technological solutions by government departments. Events anywhere in globe now impact everywhere including countries and governments; and are many times more difficult to predict and measure. There has, thus, been a visible movement towards models such as post New Public Management, New Public Governance (NPG) and New Public Service (NPS).[33] These models are in contrast to NPM which emerged from New Institutional Economics. The NPM concept demanded oversight and supervision of public servants to control their selfish behaviour in order to inhibit inefficiency and corruption. The postmodernist approaches, entrenched in democratic theory, stress the need for public accountability; wherein government servants provide and act in response to the needs of people instead of the NPM's concept of 'steering society'. Under the new paradigm, public officials are considered to be 'motivated' to public service with 'dedication', to respond to public needs/expectations, and hence, committed to responsive public service.[34]

---

[30] Jonathan G. S. Koppell, "Administration without Borders," *Public Administration Review* 70, no.1 (2010): 46-55.

[31] Jocelyne Bourgon, *A New Synthesis of Public Administration: Serving in the 21st Century* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011).

[32] Edward P. Weber and Anne M. Khademian, "Wicked Problems, Knowledge Challenges, and Collaborative Capacity Builders in Network Settings," *Public Administration Review* 68, no. 2 (2008): 334-349,
http://frst411.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2015/01/25145606.pdf.

[33] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

[34] Janet V. Denhardt and Robert B. Denhardt, *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*, 3rd ed. (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2011).

New paradigms of governance and public policies highlight the emerging role of networks as corollary to the growth of government capability to solve public problems. These emphasise the character of 'capacity builders' and to solve collective problems as 'honest brokers'.[35] These brokers, having legal power in their domains, no longer need to be government servants. To resolve 'wicked problems', their functions are to be pooled with responsibility for capacity building, managing, and solving problems through collaboration with societal networks. Collaboration between bureaucrats, the public and NGOs is vital for the resolution of public problems as an alternative to hierarchical systems in public service delivery. The post-NPM, NPG and NPS highlight that no single government department should possess the ability to craft and create solutions of contemporary problems, instead should be compelled by 'the need to share, appreciate and incorporate varied perspectives of the problem.'[36] This has significant repercussions for designing public policies and initiating government reforms warranting a change of focus from a fixation on internal/local context to international focus and response. Many scholars now recognise limits of traditional approaches and acknowledge existence of hybrid techniques of governing. They suggest a synthetic approach encompassing various governing paradigms.[37] A brief description of these new approaches follows.

New Public Governance (NPG)

This paradigm projected by Osborne espouses a very unusual foundation.[38] Instead of relying on bureaucratic hierarchy as the defining feature of orthodoxy or the managerialism or contractualism of NPM, NPG brings citizens rather than the government at the centre. It demands inter-organisation associations and processes through trust and social capital as the nucleus of governance, instead of organisational form and function. NPG, thus, runs in contradiction to traditional paradigms of public management that hinge on intra-organisational responses by

---

[35] Bourgon, *A New Synthesis of Public Administration*.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Koppell, "Administration without Borders."
[38] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

government as opposed to inter-organisational responses by government, business and not-for-profit sectors.[39]

Bringing citizens at the centre as joint creators of public policies is the fundamental distinction of NPG. It is not merely a theoretical exercise for adding a new phrase or metaphor into the discipline of governance. Bourgon has highlighted the fragmentation of public policy domains due to appearance of numerous actors and jurisdictions and increasing interdependence of actors, locally, nationally and globally. NPG visualises the state as plural, where provision of public goods and services is shared by multiple co-existing and collaborative actors. It also underlines the plurality of processes and demands articulation in shaping public policy formulation. NPG treats government as simply one stakeholder and actor along with many other actors involved in public policy considerations. Provision of public goods is no more the sole domain and in the capacity of government nor can it shape public policies or direct their execution:

> Policies which guide society are the product of a multifaceted
> set of relations connecting numerous groupings and interests
> eventually coalescing in fascinating and impulsive ways.[40]

New Public Service (NPS)

NPS builds on the NPG argument bringing in lateral and expansive thought. It takes the governance paradigm to the domain and focus of citizens and civil society. The main responsibility of bureaucracy here is to help the public communicate and converse to cater for their communal needs and aspirations. At no time, should they try to steer, take care or control them.[41] This is in contrast to the philosophy of NPM and slightly tangent to that of NPG, where transactions between civil servants and 'customers' are framed on market ideology. It is distinct from the

---

[39] Stephen P. Osborne, Zoe Radnor and Greta Nasi "A New Theory for Public Service Management? Toward a (Public) Service-Dominant Approach," *American Review of Public Administration* 43, no. 2 (2013): 135-158, http://paulallen.ca/documents/2015/07/osborne-sp-z-radnor-and-g-nasi-a-new-theory-for-public-service-management-toward-a-public-service-dominant-approach-2013.pdf.

[40] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

[41] Ibid.

orthodox views on governance which considers the public its client or submissive beneficiaries of hierarchical service delivery. Plurality with proactive outreach lies in norms rather than control and direction.

NPS incorporates democratic theory and calls for an involved and vibrant public. People are not considered a self-interested lot, and the role of bureaucracy is seen as facilitating citizen engagement in finding solutions to public policy problems. Under this model, public servants need to acquire broader skills in management and pursuit of policy solutions through brokering, negotiating in partnership with citizens. They must develop solutions in the public interest by being accessible, accountable and responsive to community needs. Accountability should extend to elected officials along with bureaucrats, especially in the management of budgets and projects. NPS also asserts public service ethos and values for bureaucracy which must be committed to public interest.[42] Bourgon see bureaucrats as 'egalitarian citizens' who are not merely reactive instruments in meeting public needs or executing government orders, rather they develop shared relationships with public and societal organisations by encouraging sharing of responsibility in articulation of solutions to public problems. They are seen as providing honest and neutral information to the public to help them engage in dialogue to promote and discern the complexities of public issues. This creates the space to engage people in governance activities.

NPS stresses public interest by providing practical remedies to the contemporary ideas of management, navigating even through traditional paradigms. However, it has yet to develop into an all encompassing and comprehensive paradigm to overcome the shortfalls and failures of its precursors.[43] Politics, in NPS, is value-driven, and is also highly value-sensitive. It must capture the scope of developments in the discipline of Public Policy, especially of new theories and frameworks of public policy formulation. Similarly, the rise of networks and private governance poses challenges for NPS to capture the import of responsive government.[44] A

---

[42] Ibid.

[43] Hood and Peters, "The Middle Aging of New Public Management: Into the Age of Paradox?"

[44] James L. Perry, Annie Hondeghem and Lois Recascino Wise, "Revisiting the Motivational Bases of Public Service: Twenty Years of Research and an Agenda for the Future," *Public Administration Review* 70, no. 5 (2010): 681-690.

few features of post-NPM also need consideration for more inclusive governance. For example, technology savvy Digital Governance necessitates the drive to remedy the issues of coherence associated with NPM and for extolling governing ethos.

The 'governance' theory is growing at tandem despite some coherence and the coordination troubles of various paradigms. Pakistan saw the growth of a regulatory regime and devolutionary undertones of constitutional amendments, which beg to the concept of governance. It intended to improve public service standards in crucial policies through deregulation, transparency, procedural efficiency, and constant measurement of outputs. While regulatory governance may be efficient, it has adverse bearing on the coherence and strength of governmental authority. It makes execution of policies more difficult, especially in fiscal and security issues. It demands concerted thrusts to synchronise governmental policymaking and provision of goods across sub-governmental boundaries.

The idea of NPS also connects comprehensively with the idea of modern democracies. An interesting dimension of NPS is its focus on attitude and motivations of public bureaucracies. The changes taking place in polity must feed and complement special capacity building measures in bureaucracies. It emphasises their training and grooming in societal values and within those creating incentives for their performance. Scholars distinguish intrinsic motivations and ethos of managers/employees of public organisations and their motivations which hinge on extrinsic rewards and incentives. This motivational aspect has led to the explosion of literature on rewards and sanctions as motivation for bureaucratic performance. Empirical work in this dimension is, however, lacking.[45] Presently, few elements of motivation/dedication have so far been identified, which include appreciation by communities where public servants have shown their empathy to public problems, performance-related rewards and prominence in media. Improvement in the behaviour of public servants was exhibited through their voluntary engagement in

---

[45] Ibid.

tasks on top of their additional official assignments, and their willingness to present themselves for downward accountability.[46]

Public Value Management (PVM)

The idea of public value derives from the social nature of humans who interact and communicate in groups as well as in organisations. People are not impressed by organisational services, rather from the values that organisations and institutions create for society at large. Public Value Approach was conceived by Moore to offer a solution to the lack of innovation, creativity and public passivity inherent in the NPM paradigm.[47] It proposed that market concepts of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and shareholder/stakeholder/customer values should be transposed in the public sector for the common good and legitimacy of the government.[48] Corporations, civil society organisations (CSOs), public institutions, associations, universities etc. build an ecosystem or a productive social system of human life. The concept moves beyond markets, taking account of diverse sociopolitical factors. It underpins public motivation and involvement and rejects rules-based practices of rewards or incentives for public behaviour modification. Such motivations come from public partnerships, networks, mutual respect and collective learning processes. PVM interlinks with the concept of 'Network Governance' which espouses building successful and sustainable relationships as core objectives of public service. Conclusively, it shifts focus from state/market to civil society by aligning and adjusting public services/outputs/outcomes/results to build public trust and loyalty by coordinating markets, hierarchies and networks. Public value is, hence, created through efficient public services, increased public confidence, cultural cohesion, economic expansion, prosperity and well-being. Benington (2011) dissects public value into the following components:

---

[46] Judith Tendler, *Good Governance in the Tropics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
[47] Mark H. Moore, *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).
[48] Timo Meynhardt, "Public Value Inside: What is Public Value Creation," *International Journal of Public Administration* 32, no. 3-4 (2009): 192-219.

a. Economic value that is provided through generation of employment and promoting economic activities.

b. Social and cultural values that are created through social capital, societal cohesiveness, cultural identity, communal affinity, individual welfare, and protecting ethnic/cultural diversity.

c. Political value that is generated through creating and sustaining democratic norms and citizen participation in public decisions.

d. Education value that is created through universal and equitable education opportunities, creation and acquisition of contemporary knowledge in order to have well-informed citizens.

e. Ecological value that is attained through promotion of eco-friendly public policies.[49]

PVM, thus, puts public managers in entirely different perspective than NPM and earlier paradigms. It demands improved performance, developing effective management systems and governing methodologies to enhance transparency, participation and accountability. It entails restructuring and realignment of public organisations to overcome emerging challenges to achieve PVM objectives like equity and efficiency of public service, satisfaction of sociopolitical aspirations of people and building public loyalty and trust. Public managers have to be catalysts to create a system of values, rules and norms - a way of living together in which everyone benefits. PVM sounds a note of caution that public managers acting conversely can destroy public value as it is not about materials, rather about emotions. It hinges on the images of public policies in the citizens' minds; and this is what determines legitimacy or otherwise of a governing system.

Digital Governance

NPS and PVM have led to fermentation of the concept of 'Digital Governance (DG)', though there is still confusion as to what really constitutes 'digital' and how it differs from e-government. It is the

---

[49] John Benington and Mark H. Moore, *Public Value: Theory and Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

explosion of technologies, especially data collection and analysis techniques which forced academics and practitioners to study their impact on transformation of relationships between government/non-governmental actors and the broader civil society. Preliminary DG scholarship focuses on outcomes which could be achieved through the use of technology and its efficacy. The concept also took cues from NPM and orthodox models. It promises great capacity for joint user and citizen engagement in delivery of public services.[50] It opens up public information to user access, enlightening them to agitate collective issues and raise demands of transparency and accountability. This phenomenon feeds back into the expansion and relevance of DG. From a public policy perspective, it brings citizens closer to the government and enhances their trust in the state as it is likely to make governing mechanisms transparent through digital outreach and public accountability. New technologies will continue to provide improved chances of programme and policy monitoring and evaluation.[51]

The thrust towards DG, has however, yet to cope with a number of issues, like creation and sustenance of digital systems that citizens can trust, and hence participate in. There are issues also with the collaboration/coordination of the public and private sphere, strategies of cloud-based solutions, and finally, the acquisition and management of financial resources for digital transformation. Likewise, digital security and privacy have also become a profound concern, especially in the backdrop of cyber espionage, robberies and hacking etc.

Pakistan - Dribbling with Governance

Not voluntarily, rather through nudging by international institutions and foreign loans, Pakistan has occasionally endeavoured to catch up with governance paradigms. Numerous reforms were introduced, but failed to produce significant results. Most reforms originated from and inside the central bureaucracy who manipulated the same in their own favour. While

---

[50] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

[51] Renata Avila, Hazel Feigenblatt, Rebekah Heacock and Nathaniel Heller, *Global Mapping of Technology for Transparency and Accountability*: *New Technologies* (London: Transparency & Accountability Initiative, 2010), http://ict4peace.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/global_mapping_of_technology_final.pdf.

most governments were infested with political infighting, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto (1971-77) was the most prominent politician who ventured to reform the bureaucracy and expose them to popular accountability. However, his reforms boomeranged with vengeance, toppling him instead.

Reform processes later reappeared with every change of government, but have eventually entrenched the orthodox mindset deeper. Many studies for governmental reform were conducted but few saw the light of day. The last such study was by Ishrat Hussain under the National Commission of Government Reforms (NCGR) initiative which also disappeared without being seriously considered.[52] Rationalisation of government departments, reducing/cutting the government size and expenditure, eliminating superficial bureaucratic layers in decision-making, delegation and deregulation of administrative and financial powers, flattening the hierarchy, empowering local bureaucracies are just some of the reform maneuvers that have time and again been proposed. While very little is known about the outcome of NCGR,[53] every new government, nevertheless, has pursued a vigorous reform agenda with their own political ambitions.[54]

---

[52] This was a study on bureaucratic reforms by the NCGR in 2008. It focuses on the structure of civil service in Pakistan and examines their recruitment, training, postings and compensation etc. It recommends how the same could be improved. Due to changes in government and lack of political ownership, the report has become merely an academic reference material. NCGR is a misnomer, not focusing on 'governance' but instead on civil service reforms.

[53] NCGR, GoP, *Reforming the Government in Pakistan: Vol-I*, report (National Commission for Government Reforms, Government of Pakistan, 2008), http://pc.gov.pk/uploads/report/NCGR_Vol_I-1.pdf; NCGR, GoP, *Reforming the Government in Pakistan: Vol-II*, report (National Commission for Government Reforms, Government of Pakistan, 2008), http://pc.gov.pk/uploads/report/NCGR_Vol_II.pdf; Ishrat Husain, "National Commission of Government Reform" (presentation, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.), accessed September 7, 2017, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PAKISTANEXTN/Resources/293051-114726111 2833/Session-7-1.pdf; and "Govt. Begins Work on Civil Service Reforms," *Dawn*, May 23, 2011, https://www.dawn.com/news/631190.

[54] Editor's Note: See for details, Saeed Shafqat, "Pakistani Bureaucracy: Crisis of Governance and Prospects of Reform," *The Pakistan Development Review* 38, no.4 (1999): 995-1017, http://www.saeedshafqat.com/articles/pakistan.pdf; Muhammad Usman Asghar, "Governance Issues in Pakistan: Suggested Action Strategy," *ISSRA Papers* 5, no. 1(2013):113-134, http://www.ndu.edu.pk/issra/issra_pub/articles/issra-paper/ISSRA_Papers_Vol5_IssueI_2013/06-Governance-Issues-Mr-Usman-Asghar.pdf;

On the sidelines of government[55] and sometimes in collaboration with it, the most interest shown in bureaucratic restructuring has been by donors[56] like the World Bank,[57] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),[58] and Department of Foreign and International Development (DFID).[59] They have had objectives similar to those of the Government of Pakistan (GoP), but with dissimilar jargons, such as building management and organisation capacity, incentives for superior performance, instituting financial management and performance systems, creating merit-based promotion, inculcating transparency and accountability.[60] Most encompassed abstract undertones of NPM, such as privatisation of government institutions and industries, public service contracting, reducing manpower and restructuring federal ministries. As of now, outcomes have been contradictory to the propagated objectives. For example, instead of downsizing, bureaucracy has swollen with increase in ministries, espousing merit but promoting patronage, professionalism

Mushahid Hussain and Akmal Hussain, *Pakistan: Problems of Governance* (New Delhi: Center for Policy Research, 1993),
http://www.akmalhussain.net/Publish%20Work/PakistanProblemsOfGovernance/chapter1.pdf.

[55] Planning Commission, GoP, "Institutional Reforms and Governance," *Annual Plan 2015-16*, (Government of Pakistan, 2015), http://pc.gov.pk/uploads/docs/Ch17-Institutional-reforms-governance.pdf.

[56] Javed Ahmed Malik, "Governance and Development: In Search of a Model for Pakistan" (presentation, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad, 2006), http://pide.org.pk/pdf/Seminar/Seminar_Pre09-08-2006.pdf.

[57] PREM Network, *Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance: A World Bank Strategy*, report (Washington, D.C.: Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network, 2000),
http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/civilservice/Strategy.pdf. The study focused on ambiguous terms like fixing targets, redefining the frontiers of government, increasing operational scope of the private sector and NGOs, enhancing responsiveness, reformation of processes, laws and regulations, creating a professionally committed and efficient bureaucracy etc.

[58] UNDP, "Governance Reforms and Innovation" (Islamabad: United Nations Development Programme), accessed September 7, 2017,
http://www.pk.undp.org/content/pakistan/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/governance-reforms-and-innovation-.html.

[59] "Strengthening Sub-National Governance in Pakistan" *Oxford Policy Management*, accessed September 7, 2017, http://www.opml.co.uk/projects/strengthening-sub-national-governance-pakistan.

[60] PREM Network, *Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance: A World Bank Strategy*.

translated to foreign junkets and training; performance standards meaning figure fudging; market-based salary translating into excessive governmental perks and unaccountability combined with business/ corporate pay structures; devolution to local bodies leading to power concentration, bureaucratic glut and complexity at the local level-usurping even what existed; e-governance meaning multiple governments and fragmentation imposing high costs to public and price tags on previously free tax paid services; NAB meaning no/jaundiced accountability and getting an indictment 'NAB is dead' by the Supreme Court of Pakistan.[61]

Governance reforms in Pakistan portray a dismal story of excessive political ambition, bureaucratic impediments and tepid implementation. Thrust of reform efforts has generally been on consumption of loans provided for structural adjustments under the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank programmes.[62] Most initiatives, hence, were kept strongly grounded in orthodoxy while promising merit, efficiency and effectiveness. NPM approaches were adopted selectively, usually alongside and in conjunction with classic models. Every reform initiative strengthened central bureaucracy, while efforts to dilute its power were scuttled on technical, technological and human capacity grounds.

Problems encountered by Pakistan have also been experienced by other developing countries, with generally similar consequences of fragmentation and lack of coherence amongst governmental departments. World Bank initiatives in Africa provide ample such evidence for Pakistan to learn from.

Reforms have also been deeply tinted in the contemporary neo-liberal philosophy. Since Zia-ul-Haq (1977-87) who rolled back the

---

[61] "NAB Died in Front of us the Other Day: SC," *Nation*, February 23, 2017, http://nation.com.pk/national/23-Feb-2017/nab-died-in-front-of-us-the-other-day-sc.

[62] For details about the programme, see, World Bank, *Pakistan - Structural Adjustment Program Project*, report (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1982), http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/731091468286267481/Pakistan-Structural-Adjustment-Program-Project; Jamil Nasir, "IMF Programs in Pakistan (1988-2008)- An Analysis," *Criterion Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (2012), http://www.criterion-quarterly.com/imf-programs-in-pakistan-1988-2008-%E2%80%93-an-analysis/; and Shahrukh Rafi Khan and Safiya Aftab, *Structural Adjustment, Labour and the Poor in Pakistan*, report 8 (Islamabad: Sustainable Development Policy Institute, 1995), https://www.sdpi.org/publications/files/R8-Structural%20Adjustment,%20Labour.pdf.

socialist reforms of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto (1971-77), there has been no looking back. On the positive side, these reforms limited the power of bureaucracy through privatisation of state enterprises. Promulgation of the Eighteenth Amendment in the Constitution of Pakistan[63] is another landmark reform which has decentralised and devolved bureaucracy to provincial and local governments. It has ushered in dissipation of the power of federal bureaucracy - a giant leap in a postcolonial state. Government accountability and transparency are now subjects of daily public debate. Consequently, Pakistan portrayed a rare manifestation of elite accountability by ousting its incumbent Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif (2013-17) and subjecting him to criminal investigations.[64] Greater concern of public efficiency under close watch of the media has positively impacted the quality of governance.

However, neo-liberal public administration reforms in Pakistan have their critics. There are accusations of marginalisation of the poor, cuts in subsidies, inadequate public health, education and housing, lack of public job opportunities and extreme exploitation of labour. Public bureaucracies are blamed for abandoning the masses, and absolving themselves from their public responsibilities. Labour movements have broken up, leaving adverse impacts on the morale and rights of public employees. Reduction of the public sector has consequently hampered the capacity of government and social sector spending.

Can Pakistan 'Catch Up' with Contemporary Governance Paradigms?

Governance has a deep connection with national harmony, prosperity and equitable development. Public policies are ineffective without a supportive bureaucracy and institutional infrastructure. For the common man, the services and behaviour of a street-level bureaucrat is the total reflection of good or bad governance. Pakistan was fortunate to inherit a vibrant governing system which was by and large competent, neutral and

---

[63] "18th Amendment 2010," *Pakistan Constitution Law Blog*, April 19, 2010, https://pakistanconstitutionlaw.com/18th-amendment-2010/.

[64] Haseeb Bhatti, "Nawaz Sharif Steps Down as PM after SC's Disqualification Verdict," *Dawn*, July 28, 2017, https://www.dawn.com/news/1348191.

honest. However, the system has remained unsuccessful in adapting to changing governance paradigms which suited the civil and military bureaucracy, mostly to the exclusion of political parties especially till 1971. Consequently, it became the immediate focus of reforms by the incoming political regime of Z. A. Bhutto, who struck hard on the constitutional protection and neutrality of the civil service. The Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP) was made defunct and a new unified grade system was introduced. Bhutto's reforms had a limited agenda and were created in haste without taking cognizance of the larger governance landscape and questions of public service effectiveness. Negatively, it ushered apathy, inaction and indifference towards the public.[65]

The next major overhaul came through the Devolution Programme in 2001. Once again, it hit the symbol and anchor of bureaucratic power - the Deputy Commissioner. The new system, however, was 'kicked out' after 2008 and was not provided the opportunity to mature. Excessive political influence has, since then, caused bureaucracy to be acquiescent and loyal to political parties due to job insecurity. NCGR was consequently created to recommend a new system. It, too, has become relegated to history in line with other major reform reports like the Rowland Egger Report (1953), Bernard L. Gladieux Report (1955), Paul L. Beckett (1957), Cornelius Report (1962), Fulton Commission Report (1968), Civil Service Reforms (1973), Local Government Ordinance (LGO) 2001- 02 etc.

Pakistan's government of today now has numerous textures and concoctions in the periphery of governance and business philosophies.[66] It is positioned at the junction of markets and polis, has an assortment of public hierarchies and market mechanisms, a jumble of dissimilar organisations in and under ministries, maintains state as well as semi-state ventures, and finally, has multiple levels and tiers of government. A finance ministry, which is closely monitored and directed by donors instead of the sovereign,[67] portrays having implemented NPM tenets, that

---

[65] Saeed Shafqat, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: From Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Benazir Bhutto* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997), 57-65.
[66] For example, the way WAPDA is being run.
[67] An IMF representative sits inside the Ministry of Finance (MoF), close to the Minister's

too at the expense of other governmental departments, and merely as a model of implementing donor objectives.[68] In other places NPM-style reforms have neither improved efficiency nor reduced corruption, as has been the NPM reform experience in Africa.[69]

Academics highlight that reform failures point to the fundamental political economy of countries where bureaucracy maintains the power and interests of ruling elites, instead of economic and societal improvement.[70] The concentration of interests in patrimonial regimes like Pakistan runs against the fundamental ethos of governance reforms, which thus leads one back to the basics due to the absence of organisational ability and sustained political volatility. The prominence of security issues, narrow tax base and weak application of laws consequently scuttle reforms in terror-prone states (like Pakistan) and hamper creation of institutional frameworks to improve legitimacy of the state.[71]

For reforms, to catch up with contemporary governing paradigms, there need to be changes in the structure of institutional frameworks, checks and balances in the bureaucratic power and accountability systems. With all good intentions, the GoP has failed to adapt to the principles inherently essential for incorporating the paradigms of NPM, NPG or NPS - it did not budge or improve shortfalls to create a rule-based system, and hence, reaped dysfunctional consequences.

Non-cooperative public servants have also played a critical role whenever the Government has tried to reform due to resistance from 'reform implementers.' They exhibited a protectionist mindset which benefitted vested interests, including themselves. Reforms were considered a reduction in their status and power, and hence, they opted to

---

office. See current contact list: Ministry of Finance, GoP, "Finance Division Telephone Directory," http://www.finance.gov.pk/directory/detail/details/directory.html.

[68] Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP), Competition Commission of Pakistan (CCP), Federal Board of Revenue (FBR) and Accountant General Pakistan Revenues (AGPR) are attached departments of the MoF and have been through NPM-style reforms.

[69] McCourt, "Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach."

[70] Richard C. Crook and David Booth, "Introduction: Working with the Grain? Rethinking African Governance," *IDS Bulletin* 42, no. 2 (2011): 1-10.

[71] Robert Egnell and Peter Haldén, *New Agendas in Statebuilding: Hybridity, Contingency and History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).

preserve the *status quo* or contrarily extend their power and influence further through red-tape.

Vision, sincerity and determination of politicians have to be a driving force to move towards postmodernist approaches. Pakistani governments, however, have reflected a strange confluence of interests of rulers and bureaucrats to perpetuate power and corruption. Politicians were never affable to rationalise governance to improve outcomes, efficiency, performance and accountability, except during elections in their manifestos and media advertisements. Upon coming into power, their commitments get hemmed in clientelism and create bottlenecks to any meaningful changes.

Politicians are not prone to taking initiatives which destabilise their power. Since modern paradigms shift power to the people, it does not find motivation with political leaders because it tends to diminish power, privilege, and wealth-making opportunities. Politicians make tall claims of reforms in their manifestos. But for plutocracy in Pakistan, a manifesto is a mere registration requirement to be a political party. Above all, criminalisation of politics, extortion by armed wings of political parties, promotion of corrupt individuals to political hierarchies, war of words among political factions, and finally, unproductive Parliamentary Committees[72] have crippled the functional abilities and wisdom of Pakistani politicians to govern. Political interests are 'business and wealth interests' and not 'public interests'.

Bureaucratic factionalism is also the principal reason for sticking to orthodoxy and the colonial system of governance. Both political as well as despotic governments have been unable to break the colonial clench of the 'Commissioner' system. Meek efforts to weaken their clutch have resurged mostly with additional powers to bureaucracy and its one faction, that is, the Civil Superior Services (CSS) especially. This has led to a bizarre combination of oligarchic rulers and a factional bureaucracy to keep the rest subdued. It has raised factional tendencies within bureaucracy, which remains engaged in lateral infighting amongst various factions. Political rulers find comfort in this situation, and patronise one

---

[72] Parliamentary Committees are the lynchpin of public power and oversight in a democracy.

faction over the other for their own interests.[73] Governance has, thus, remained a stage of factional strife, *status quo*, turf protection and serfdom to the exclusion of all kinds of reforms and modernity. Consequently, this deep-seated factionalism has turned adverse with political patronage. Whenever reforms threatened any faction, they joined politicians to resist implementation. Resultantly governance efficiency, performance, effectiveness, outputs and outcomes remain regressive.

All governments in Pakistan entice bureaucracy to provide services for select constituencies or business groups. Through this, the public has been indoctrinated and accustomed to a spoils system, promoted on political interests. Consequently, bureaucratic recruitment has been politicised. Appointments in federal and provincial services are discretionary, hinging on selection process based on bribery and personal/ party loyalty.[74] It has encouraged a culture of patronage and corruption which is not aligned or friendly to any modern and developmental ideologies:

> Political affiliation always plays very important role in the promotions of bureaucrats.[75]

This hits the very foundations of professionalism and integrity. In such a fuzzy system, intellectual growth and reforms become impossible.

Conclusion

This article has described the development of various paradigms of governance from traditional orthodoxy to the current postmodernist thoughts. It has endeavoured to put the contemporary discussion in perspective to discern what plagues governance in Pakistan or breeds inefficiencies. The discussion can offer constructive remedy to governance and creation of public policies, through a focus on the national

---

[73] Ishrat Hussain, "Bureaucracy Needs Reforms," *Dawn*, January 25, 2014, https://www.dawn.com/news/1082534.

[74] Mirza Khurram Shahzad, "Analysis: Promotion Dilemma of Bureaucracy," *Dawn*, June 4, 2015.

[75] Ibid.

political landscape, inter-governmental affairs, and public engagement. While postmodern ideas of governance are grounded in the culture and tradition of European and American societies, nevertheless they proffer a broad solution to the tribulations of governing efficacy in Pakistan. Simple juxtaposition of postmodernist paradigms may run the risk of replicating practices that may have scant utility in this country. Academics have no doubt cautioned replicating experiences of sophisticated developed countries.[76] Nevertheless, empowering and bringing people at the centre of governance and public policies with a focus on governing ethos have significant impact on creating better societies.

It is, therefore, of utmost importance to be sensitive to our national history, culture and context, while considering alignment to modern paradigms and also remember that there is no magic bullet for efficient governance. The situation of Pakistan necessitates strengthening its institutional fabric and getting rid of colonial authoritative institutions and 'old' forms of governance through a state-building lens. Move towards postmodernist approaches is not possible without restructuring the present mechanisms. Past unsuccessful attempts to reform can be partly attributed to structural flaws, for example, when Pakistan aspired toward Digital Governance and competitive public-private regime, without heeding to established structural constraints.

The NPS paradigm alleviates the hazards of NPM/NPG and augments effectiveness and transparency concurrently. It is a need of the contemporary globalised world to satisfy its enlightened citizenry so that they act as a bulwark against extremist tendencies. Pakistan must ground its governance in the welfare and aspirations of its people, rather than being driven by the impetus of technocracy, bureaucracy or corrupted democracy. It must protect the 'steel frame' of the state from political hiring, patronage and appointments on expediency. Government should adopt diverse approaches for professional growth of the bureaucracy and create a crop of public servants who are value sensitive and attuned to transparency and accountability. Central bureaucracy should develop a mindset of putting citizens at the centre of their profession, instead of

---

[76] Matt Andrews, *The Limits of Institutional Reform in Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

power politics. Governance must be directed to deepen motivation and instill public service ethos in public servants as much to enhance administrative capacity.

A hybrid approach to government is generally very appealing to governments in the developing world who want to surmount restrictions of traditional governing techniques but at the same time are hostile to business leaning NPM-type reforms. Such a model may be a solution for Pakistan which needs to rely more on its context than any single paradigm. The model must emphasise on functionality or 'best-fit' instead of 'best-practices'. It should embrace adaptive responses to complexities, emphasise implication of motivation, and privilege the needs of citizens as its prime concern. Simultaneously, it should recognise the significance of preserving proficient and competent governmental services. Adoption of postmodernist approaches that appear drastically dissimilar contextually, would require bold political thrusts, which is not close to our reality. It would entail treading a difficult arena against the grain of patrimonial politics. Despite being desirable theoretically, practical success would be questionable. It is much better, therefore, to begin with a mixed approach drawing from the tenets of multiple approaches, right from orthodoxy to postmodernism, and aligning these in consonance to our democratic and ideological culture. Politics, hence, has to stay in governance to build constituencies of support in bureaucracy, politicians and citizens - all together - as herein lies the scope of successful governance.■