

# The relationship between public administration and good governance

## The case of South Africa

**P Pillay**

Anti-Corruption Centre for Education and Research (ACCERUS)  
Stellenbosch University

### ABSTRACT

*The article will demonstrate the relationship between public administration and good governance with special reference to South Africa. It begins with a conceptual analysis of public administration through a periodisation from its roots and historical development and its meaning and functions in the era of rampant globalisation as well as the repercussions of systemic and structural changes associated with changes. The conceptual definition and understanding of good governance follows, accompanied by an exposition of international debates on meanings, application, implementation and planning of good governance indicators and the relationship between theory and practice in its analysis world-wide. The examination of the approaches, comprehensive legislation, rules and regulations underlining the South African government's efforts to enhance good, transparent, and corruption free governance are outlined. A brief outline of a process followed in state institutions and entities is proposed that concludes that without firm and innovative leadership and key ingredients and efforts to install and maintain transparent, accountable and corruption-free financial and human resources imperatives cannot lead to developmental service delivery to communities. The article concludes that financial viability is the key foundation of good governance performance of an entity. Without it, there is mismanagement of resources, which in most instances, is the result of weak human resources and financial management, political interference and the lack of a clear mission and leadership.*

### INTRODUCTION

The article is based on the reality of the close relationship of public administration and good governance. A brief conceptual analysis of public administration begins with the ideas of the



discipline's pioneers to the present day and outlines its meaning and functions diachronically. It is shown that the realities of the era of ever-increasing globalisation and its consequences in the sphere of government have ultimately led to a significant shift in the changing nature of public policy management that has been facing the increasingly contradictory nature of national and international interests, economic and financial competition and the dominance of the G8 worldwide.

Good governance in theory and practice is examined through an examination of international debates concentrating on the meanings, application, and implementation and planning of 'good governance indicators' through the exposition of a variety of schools of thought. The brief exposition of South African government's efforts to enhance good, transparent and corruption free governance that has been empirically shown not to have produced encouraging results, is followed by a brief step-by step proposed plan that combines innovative leadership, financial management plans and implementation and solid human resources processes as the way forward.

## **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ROOTS AND EVOLUTION**

Public Administration as an academic, research and political discipline have evolved since the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and well into the perpetually changing globalised environment. Respect for the rule of law and a committed public service that displays high levels of integrity and impartiality are requirements for effective public administration.

From its historical beginnings rooted in Charles Jean Boning's presented *Principles of Public Administration* and Woodrow Wilson's *The Study of Administration*, L.D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* in 1926 and W.F. Willoughby's *Principles of Public Administration* in 1927 to Dwight Waldo's definition of Public Administration as "the art and science of management as applied to the affairs of state" (Kernaghan 2010), there is a broad agreement that the key element of the discipline is the management and implementation of public policy at all levels of governance.

In its broader sense Public Administration has basically two meanings:

*Firstly*, it is the implementation of government policy and *secondly*, an *academic discipline* that studies the implementation of government policy and prepares public servants for work in the public service (Denhardt & Denhardt 2009:12). As an academic and research discipline, its priority is to research and advance management and policies so that government can function in an appropriate manner that fulfills the needs of all citizens in a given country. Amongst other things, it deals with the study and research of government decision-making, the analysis of the policies, the various inputs that have produced them and the inputs necessary to produce alternative, better, policies (Kettle & Fessler 2009:11).

Public Administration is the discipline that studies and analyses the organisation of government policies and programmes as well as the behaviour of public officials (who in most cases throughout the world are not elected). Many unelected public servants are basically public administrators, such as the municipal manager of am, a director-general of a provincial or national department, a human resources (HR) deputy director of a university or a manager in a state hospital. This means that public administrators are public servants

working in public departments and agencies, at all levels/spheres of government, in South Africa, Africa and throughout the world.

As globalisation sweeps across the planet, a wide variety of systemic changes in all societies and types of governance unfold through various phases of development that have led to changes in the discipline. The Stalinist spectre of command economies that collapsed in and around 1989 and the first years of the decade in the 1990s led to new administrations and governance dominated by rampant neo-liberalism where the market forces are supreme.

There is no doubt that the relentless globalisation processes have been instrumental in shaping and re-shaping the actions, duties and responsibilities of government and Public Administration as a discipline because of their direct and indirect repercussions in respect of all aspects of the developmental terrain and economic growth as well as both the perceptions and realities of governance, government planning, designing, implementing and monitoring policies, rules and regulations in its actions as a facilitator regulator and key actor (Amin 2006:3-4).

Thus within this ever-changing process, globalisation has resulted in ever-increasing international trade and investment; the technological revolution including the never-ending emergence of new knowledge economies and electronic commerce; new developments in communications and transportation technology; relentless production mobility; continuous transmission of financial capital across borders; and the worldwide expansion of markets for goods and services (Cheema & Rondinelli 2007:5-6). Globalisation has created new conditions that demand new policies, understanding, planning and actions on the part of the government's efforts to intervene decisively in the spheres of economy, technology, organisation and strategic relationships in order to govern. The continuous inter-relationship between the state and the private sector/markets demand a public service that is alert, knowledgeable, ethical, skilled, ready to enhance their performance in a highly competitive environment shaped by both domestic and global markets, that on many occasions temper their competitiveness with collusion and corruption (Bailey 2004:10).

Globalisation has inevitably created new conditions, duties and responsibilities for public administration at all levels/spheres and governments world-wide have been forced or coerced into enhancing their capabilities in the spheres of legislation, regulations, fiscal priorities and regional economic and social cooperation. In addition, as growing inequalities widen in many developing countries, the demands on governments to intensify attempts to, *inter alia*, alleviate poverty and unemployment have made them more responsive to increasing social needs that on occasions have led to the increase in national and international debt and occasional diversions from global public policy frameworks (Cheema & Rondinelli 2007:5).

Within this context, embracing democracy has not been enough as the urgent need of new and more sophisticated standards of governance. Consequently, public administrators became more obligated to comply with the principles of political transparency, higher efficiency, efficacy and a customer-base mode of operation that could hopefully lead to service delivery acceptable by the majority of the citizens, especially the poor and the marginalised.

The new demands of the globalised political, ideological and economic environment almost became a burden for many developing countries as the demand for new and



elevated skills and expanded and sophisticated administrative systems became the *sine qua non* characteristic of the new administrative terrain. Human capabilities, always a major attribute of a serious, well-educated and ethical public servant meant nothing with advanced knowledge and application of technology (Beynon & Dunkerley 2000:11). Hence, the challenge of politicians and administrators to seriously rethink, reassess and re-strategise in respect of existing organisational and institutional structures in most cases led to increased fiscal demands which have moved government into a higher-level system of organisational and structural complexity (Ashkenas *et al.* 2002:xvi).

Inevitably such earth shattering historical developments world-wide moved the exponents, researchers and practitioners of the discipline into a more scientific, sociological and anthropological exploration and study of government decision-making, the analysis of the policies themselves, the various inputs that have produced them, and the inputs necessary to produce more developmental, anthropocentric alternative policies (Brinkerhoff & Goldsmith 2006; Arndt & Oman 2006).

Despite the fact that the *New Public Management* school dominated the field for several decades, the spectre of Max Weber's crucial analysis of bureaucracy still prevails in both developing and other countries, including South Africa, thus replacing theoretical debates with practical empirical realities associated with fundamental pillars of public administration such as human resources, organisational theory, policy analysis and statistics, budgeting and ethics (Mantzaris & Pillay 2014). There has been an interesting emphasis in the new millennium on research and the applicability regarding Weberian-type bureaucracy that has led to suggestions pointing to existing administrative realities both in Western Europe and the United States with emphasis on what has been called its *re-structuring* (Gualmini 2008). There have been suggestions that politicians and administrators should begin *re-discovering* bureaucracy (Olsen 2005).

There have been a number of both national and international trends that have significant influence on the field and discipline of public administration, most likely the most important being the ever-changing role of the state. Judging from the history and evolution of public administration, the state was always a central (if not the most central) figure in relation to the policies, struggles and processes of national development. If one considers the current, especially societies where the state was the basic foundation of development (China, parts of India, Russia/USSR and its satellites amongst others) the phenomena has changed radically (Rodrik 2006).

The operations of the market mechanisms have in many instances taken over the state functions besides the fact that the role of the State in national development continues to be important in many aspects and sectors (known in South Africa as the *developmental state*). International literature points to the fact that the ideological and political struggles in terms of societal consensus on the role of the state has been changing with regard to national strategic imperatives, policy ramifications and functions designed by and assigned to the state in its relation with business, communities and NGOs. This has led to inevitable re-think, re-conceptualising and re-developing of a wide variety of relationships amongst key developmental foundations within a country (state institutions, social classes and trends e.g. the free market) (Sharma 2004:48).

The above realities have inevitably led to a significant shift and is increasingly evident in the changing nature of public policy management that has been facing the increasingly

contradictory nature of national and international interests, economic and financial competition, the dominance of the G8 worldwide, the climatic/environmental realities, international poverty, regional wars and disease as integral ingredients of human rights, the direct and indirect effects of economic, financial and trade wars and the inability of transnational organisations to combat and defeat social ills, aptly described by Piketty (2014).

The technological communications revolution have all but destroyed the difference between the concepts and realities of *national* and *international*, although in many instances the nationalist fervour at political level contradicts the new desires of governments for decentralisation within multi-nation and nation-state systems. Many national states and their governments throughout the world face major economic and social challenges that ultimately lead to dilemmas regarding policy choices at a number of levels. These are related to the increasing levels of joblessness, poverty and income inequality evident internationally, climate change and consequent environmental concerns, de-industrialiation, almost uncontrollable international migration and labour mobility, international and national violation of basic human rights and the oppression of women and other disadvantaged ethnic, national and regional groups. The combination of natural and human-made disasters has created fresh dilemmas for both politicians and public administrators alike. One of the most crucial aspects of the radical changes in the sphere of public administration practice is the increasing dominance and significance of the technological revolution associated with computerisation of all aspects of public sector functionality, data communication and storage and technologies, information systems development that have become integral parts of the development and sustainability of effective and efficient functions not only at every level of public administration but also existing and future economic and social development processes (Dunn 2012).

This means that throughout the developed and developing world (including South Africa), honest, transparent and effective applications of technology have become essential not only for clean and corrupt-free public administration, but also a developmental one based on carefully and scientifically based changes. Hence, the design, planning and well-monitored implementation of such systems become instrumental in solid decision-making, good governance and resource utilisation in the spectrum of administrative practice.

Thus, it becomes imperative that for public administration to meet medium and long term challenges head-on, the need for upgrading skills, operational modification, and institutional changes sometimes become inevitable as the complexities of multi-layered governance levels need not only strengthening but also coordination, cooperation, and synergy amongst key societal role players and stakeholders such as the government, the private sector, civil society and non-governmental institutions and communities. Within this developmental cycle, there is always the need for a review of most, if not all administrative functions that could lead to processes of re-think, re-strategising or reengineering in terms of planning, control, changing strategic and tactical directions and accountability (Kakabadse & Kakabadse 2006).

There can be no debate on the truth that internationally, public administration plays (or should play) a key developmental role, especially in the developing world including the continent of Africa in general and South Africa in particular. In this context the re-connection and articulation of the relationships amongst states themselves as well as the market forces nationally and world-wide have become an inevitable step forward towards a more people-



centred and developmental world. The establishment of BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) can be seen as one of the important such initiatives.

A more humanistic, people-centred and developmental human society, thus, can only be based on a public administration terrain rooted on close relations between people and administrative agencies. In short, a public administration that influences and is influenced by the day-to-day life of the communities they serve. This public administration and its servants are the custodians and implementers of a democratic political system that has close links to people who in their own right are the watch -dogs of the political system (Maphunye 2009).

New international circumstances, the continuous processes of globalisation and its financial, political, social and ideological ramifications the role of public administration and its theoretical and practical foundations have shifted considerably, especially in relation to the domination of the *New Public Management* school of thought, based on the utilisation of functional private sector-style models, organisational ideas and values aimed at improving the efficiency and service-orientation of the public sector. The acknowledgement of dominance of the theoretical and practical application in countries such as United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia led to the dissemination of the phenomenon throughout the world (Rosenbloom & Kravchuk 2005).

There are an ever-increasing number of researchers who have questioned and showed empirically that the implementation of the *New Public Management* principles do not necessarily lead to an expected excellence, efficiency and effectiveness. Thus, the treatment of citizens as customers or “clients” has been severely questioned as to its essential meaning that is always related to the private sector market forces that see customers as a means to an end (profit), rather than as the proprietors of government (the owners). *New Public Management* proponents view people as economic units not democratic participants. Despite the criticism, the model is still widely accepted at all levels/spheres of government and many nations (Kernaghan 2010).

One of the key underlying factors that characterise public administration is the reality that under the prevailing circumstances, the state is no longer regarded as simply a preserver of the *status quo*, as in its present form. The role of the state as the accelerator of economic and social change, and the fight against poverty, unemployment and hunger has been intensified (Dunn 2012). This reality points to the adoption of a series of mechanisms and applied methodologies in the quest for positive socio-economic change, which is, in turn, based on the co-existence of state entities with democracy. As social and economic needs increase throughout the globe, the adoption of progressive, more responsive, efficient and effective public policies need to be rooted in managerial practices devoid of corruption and based on good governance.

## **DEFINING “GOVERNANCE” AND “GOOD GOVERNANCE”**

Governance and good governance are terms that have been used extensively in both the private and public sector. The terms, in many ways, as it will become evident in the article are properly understood when applied, researched and examined within their particular and concrete social and historical context.

Within the context of public administration the specificity of institutional realities and environments such as operational processes, systems, allocation and management of resources, history capacity, the existence or lack of skills, knowledge and the analysis of present conditions are vital in understanding the significance of its relationship to developmental service delivery.

The term *good governance* was coined several decades ago and was initially rooted on the historical conditions set by international donor agencies, countries and institutions to connect aid conditional upon reforms in the recipient country, which was found largely ineffective in encouraging real policy changes (Abdelatif 2003).

Throughout the historical period of the 1980s and the 1990s donors, such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the United States, have been insisting upon performance and good governance as a prerequisite for aid. This insistence on 'good governance' has been intensified in the new millennium, as the requirements of a recipient state to demonstrate the seriousness of its commitment to economic and social reforms, steady and democratic government and other similar steps such as political stability, the rule of law, control of corruption, and accountability have become essential (Acemoglu & Robinson 2010).

There are different definitions of governance which, however, have definite common roots.

The World Bank (1994:xiv) defines governance as the manner in which power is exercised in the way the economic and social resources of a country are managed. Thus the importance of the existing political regime is stressed significantly as is the emphasis on utilisation of economic and financial resources in relation to sustainable development and the capacity of the government to design, formulate and implement policies for the benefit of the whole population.

A similar definition by the UNDP (1997:2-3) described governance as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority inherent in the management of a country's affairs at all levels amid a wide variety of mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences.

OECD's definition OECD (1995:14) describes governance as the use of political authority and exercise of control in a country in relation to the management of its resources aiming at sustainable development through the creation of a conducive environment leading to a proper functioning of the state for the benefit of the population.

There have been a number of differing views on both conceptual and methodological ground in respect of what constitutes good governance. There have been researchers and theorists who believe there is a lack of a clear well-defined scope for what governance encompasses. Hence, this *reality* allows users to choose and set their own parameters in defining and researching the phenomenon.

Nayef Al-Rodhan (2009) has proposed eight minimum criteria for ensuring good national governance: participation, equity, and inclusiveness, rule of law, separation of powers, free, independent, and responsible media, government legitimacy, accountability, transparency,



and limiting the distorting effect of money in politics. In the book, he argues that good national governance is an important component in creating a history of sustainability for the human race. For Al-Rodhan, the eight minimal criteria of good governance are expressions of the fundamental values of democracy and more liberal constitutionalism.

Other definitions of good governance describe it as an “an authoritative policy-making process on a wide-ranging set of problems and the implementation of these policies”. One of the most widely respected experts on the issue, Huberts (2012:188), defines governance as “an authoritative policy-making process on a wide-ranging set of problems and the implementation of these policies”, while Ewadlt (2001:9-11) views it as directly related to both public administration processes as well as the essential ingredients of accountability, democracy, ethics, rule of law and transparency.

Andrews’ (2008) seminal paper states clearly that effective government matters, but he questions the validity of definitions of good governance indicators and their relationship to the reality of their effectiveness. He asks ‘what effectiveness is, why this is so, and how it matters to development?’

His article articulates the position that prescribed models cannot be seen or considered as the panacea in a deeper understanding of realities and particularities nationally or internationally because existing models lack consistency, and are thus inappropriate for use in the development dialogue since they are not easily replicated. Despite that, almost all of them describe democracy, ethics, rule of law and transparency, as key ingredients (Andrews 2008:380).

This means that the good governance picture of effective government is not only of limited use in development policy but also threatens to promote dangerous isomorphism, institutional dualism and *failing states*. This means that the impositions of inappropriate model or models of government that *kick away the ladder* need to be avoided (democracy, ethics, rule of law and transparency) (Andrews 2008:389). His reasoning of the critique is that the model or models’ major weakness lies in the lack of an effective underlying theoretical framework to assist in understanding government roles and structures in development. Hence, he proposes a framework before measurement/s of government effectiveness or propositions of specific models of governance. He concludes that given the evidence of multiple states of development, the idea of a one-best-way model actually seems problematic (democracy, ethics, rule of law and transparency) (Andrews 2008: 401).

In a much debated book, Poluha and Rosendahl (2002) contests standards that have been considered common to western democracy as measures of *goodness* in government. By applying political anthropological methods, they conclude that while governments believe they apply concepts of good governance while making decisions, the existence of cultural differences amongst people can cause conflict with the heterogeneous standards of the international community.

Despite this, it is accepted that in the approximate last fifteen years there have been concerted efforts by transnational organisations as well as the administrative leaderships of developed countries to establish assessments, monitoring and ranking governance performance. The relevant literature points to rampant corruption as the key reason for such initiatives and undertakings spearheaded by the IMF, the World Bank, OECD and non-governmental organisations such as Transparency International (Jones & Kettle 2003).



The key differences in approach of such initiatives are that while some are rooted on empirical research based on real situations, others are based on personal perceptions of populations. Over the years there have been assessments of international rankings related to good governance, their relationships with organisational and financial management reforms of both international and national contexts and *first* and *second* generation governance indicators (Knack, Kugler & Manning 2003 ; Jones and Kettl 2003; Hood & Dixon 2007; Kauffman, Kraay & Mastruzzi 2007).

The direct relationship of good governance and development in Africa has been outlined as a key element of the struggles against poverty, inequality and the fulfilment of the *Millennium Development Goals* in an almost prophetic way by Chabal (2002), following the establishment of *New Partnership for Africa's Development* (NEPAD), while Goldsmith (2007) suggested that governance reforms could be a catalyst for development outlining the key significance of the relationship between a country's political environment and processes as a vital link between good governance and sustainable development.

In the same vein, Gridle (2004) emphasises that good governance is synonymous with freedom and was one of the most important elements in the fight for poverty reduction and equitable economic growth in developing countries. He concluded that political freedom as a foundation of good governance has been not the only but the most significant guarantee for the fight against corruption and socially-based ills.

The importance of the fundamental theoretical and practical/empirical understanding and implementation of organisational, financial, ethical and effective functional management leadership has been emphasised in the terrain of good governance by a number of researchers (Ghosal 2005).

In the African and South African environment, the significance of the marriage between theory and practice has been epitomised by the work of Kuye and Mafunisa (2003) on the value of responsibility, accountability and ethics as fundamental ingredients of public service leadership and Kuye and Ile (2008) in their comparison of public service delivery reform philosophies while utilising the empirical examples of *Servicom* in Nigeria and the *Batho Pele* principles in South Africa in the era of global restructuring and reform.

In fact, Kuye and Ile's (2008) historical periodisation of South Africa's turbulent past and its relationship to a hopeful and peaceful and prosperous future as well as description of the articulation of the institutional transitional mechanism, alluded both theoretically and practically to the direct connection of freedom, democracy and good governance (Kuye and Ile 2008:126-127). Within this context, the relationship between political democracy and administrative reforms are presented as processes belonging to the same historical, present and future continuum, where legislation as well as rules and regulations could in an ideal

world guarantee an ethical and well-governed public administration. Such efforts relating the importance of theory and practice have also been articulated by Kemoni and Ngulube (2008) in Kenya.

It can be understood that despite the wide array of definitions regarding good governance, there is a common belief that the sole custodians of the integrity, accountability and efficiency are the public officials who ought to be honest, ethical, transparent and accountable to the citizens (Kjær 2004:138).

Hence corruption, bribery, kickbacks and poor financial management are the antithesis of good governance. The issue has been highlighted by Mantzaris & Munnik (2013:101) who,



while utilising the empirical example of Brazil, have indicated the destructive consequences of corruption which through its multiplicity of guises has become a real structural and functional reality that poses a threat to national economies throughout the world.

## **GOOD GOVERNANCE: THE SOUTH AFRICAN REALITY AND THE WAY FORWARD**

In South Africa, the historical negotiations that were initiated in the early 1990's and passed through a number of turbulent moments produced a Constitution that paid significant attention to detail with regard to good governance which deals exclusively with the role of just administrative action that advocates lawful, reasonable and procedurally fair action that promotes efficient administration (Section 33), underlines the significance of professional ethics in Section 195 (1), transparency, in Section 195(1) (g) states that transparency must be maintained; and the key obligation of public administrators representing all citizens in Section 195 (1) (i) (RSA 1996).

Following the adoption of the country's Constitution in 1996, a plethora of legislative and regulatory measures have been put in place as foundations of a clean, ethical and honest government of which the cornerstone is considered to be the *Batho Pele* principles. They aim through consultation, setting service standards, increasing access, ensuring courtesy, provision of information, openness and transparency, redress; and value for money (RSA 1997:15) to establish the foundations upon which good governance is rooted. They have been articulated in great detail in the Department of Public Administration's (DPSA) documents where the foundations and principles of good governance are outlined (DPSA 1997; DPSA 200).

It can be understood that the Constitution, 1996 and the *Batho Pele* principles have been supplemented throughout the years with legislation such as the *Promotion of Access to Information Act*, 2000, the *Protected Disclosures Act*, 2000, the *Public Service Regulations*, 1999 as well as advanced and detailed anti-corruption measures (Woods & Mantzaris 2012).

South Africa's anti-corruption legislation, the most advanced in Africa, should provide the foundations and guarantees of good governance if or when implemented as the planning, designs and mechanisms against *bad governance* are in place and for the three spheres of government. The challenges of implementation of legislative and regulatory measures have been dealt with extensively elsewhere as there is strong evidence that a wide array of fundamental tenets upon which 'good governance' can become a reality, such as knowledge, capacity, performance as well as strategic forward planning, risk analysis and comprehensive financial systems and organisational development are lacking. Such realities have led to a situation, where despite the regulations and laws being in place, *good governance* on many occasions has become an illusion (Mantzaris & Munnik 2013; Mantzaris & Pillay 2013).

There have been continuous efforts on the part of the government to deal with many of the problems facing all levels of government and to promote the strategic and tactical planning and implementation of *good governance* (Mantzaris & Pillay 2014).

There is a process of integrated functional and knowledge imperatives that under circumstances are characterised by innovative leadership, commitment and determination and can ultimately lead to the path of good governance.

It starts with a *comprehensive skills audit*, an assessment that will identify the skills gaps existing within a government entity and will outline the appropriate skills development priorities amongst public administrators.

This step needs to be followed by a performance management agreement and implementation leading to the fulfilment of departmental goals and objectives as identified both in the relevant legislation and regulations as well as the internal policies of the government entity.

The knowledge and implementation of key legislation such as the Municipal Financial Management and Municipal Systems Acts, the Local Government Anti-corruption Strategy, the Public Service Anti-corruption Strategy, Minimum Anti-corruption Capacity Requirements, the Public Sector Integrity Management Framework and municipal policies, internal Code of Ethics, anti-corruption and integrity measures for public sector organisations that will promote ethical governance and integrity. The tightening up of public sector systems for risk management and internal audit, the oversight functions and processes of municipal councils as well as the development and application of assessment methodologies for policy implementation will follow.

The thorough implementation of the *Public Finance Management Act, 1999* and the *Municipal Finance Management Act, 2003* is instrumental in fulfilling a key role as the foundations of good corporate governance practices because they are considered the cornerstones of transparency, accountability and sound management of the fundamentals of financial management such as expenditure, revenue, assets and liabilities of the respective government entities.

The continuous assessment and monitoring of governance financial systems through the oversight of the political leadership of the respective government institutions is crucial, thus supplementing the work and functions of the Auditor-General, the Public Protector and the Public Service Commission, the Department of Public Service and Administration and the National Treasury.

It can be deduced from the above that well planned, developed and implemented financial management systems, combined with innovative leadership are the cornerstones of good governance that is based solidly on fighting and eliminating corruption, graft, fraud, poor management of resources, nepotism, and incompetence. The success of the financial system of a government entity strengthens, but not ensures good governance, upon which the process of sustainable delivery of services to the citizens is founded (Woods & Mantzaris 2012).

## CONCLUSION

By its own definition and historical development and mission, public administration both as an academic discipline and a material, political reality aspire, plan, preach and research good governance despite the evident differences of approaches, ideas, theories and ideologies.

It is very clear that debates, research and development of new understanding, theories and empirical research can only advance the course of the existence or re-invention of our common humanity.



The article showed that despite the existence of legislation, rules and regulations in South Africa, which are comparable with the best in the world, the dream of good governance seems elusive. The article suggested that developmental service delivery to communities cannot be achieved without a combination of processes rooted in innovative leadership, well embedded financial management systems and transparent, accountable and knowledgeable human resources management.

## REFERENCES

- Abdelatif, A.M. 2003. *Good Governance and its relationship to democracy and economic development*, Global Forum on Fighting Corruption. Seoul, May 2003.
- Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. 2010. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Power*. New York: Crown Business.
- Al-Rodhan, Nayef. 2009. *Sustainable History and the Dignity of Man: A Philosophy of History and Civilisational Triumph*, Fighting Corruption.
- Amin, S. 2006. Beyond liberal globalization: A better or worse world? *Monthly Review*, 58(7):1-17.
- Andrews, M. 2008. The Good Governance Agenda: Beyond Indicators without Theory. *Oxford Development Studies*, 36(4):379–423.
- Arndt, C. and Oman. 2006. Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators. OECD Development Studies. Paris: OECD.
- Ashkenas, R., Ulrich, D., Jick, T. and Kerr, S. 2002. *The boundaryless organisation. Breaking the chains of organisational structure*. Revised and updated edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bailey, S.J. 2004. *Strategic public finance*. New York: Macmillan.
- Beynon, J. and Dunkerley, D. 2000. What is globalization? In Beynon, J. and Dunkerley, D. (eds.), *Globalization: the reader*. Routledge: New York.
- Brinkerhoff, D. and Goldsmith, A. 2005. Institutional Dualism and International Development; a Revisionist Interpretation of Good Governance. *Administration and Society*, 36:199–224.
- Chabal, P. 2002. The quest for good government and Development in Africa: Is NEPAD the Answer? *International Affairs*, 78:447–462.
- Cheema, G.S. and Rondinelli, D.A. 2007. *Decentralizing governance. Emerging concepts and practices*. Washington DC: ASH Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation Harvard University.
- Denhardt, Robert and Denhardt, Janet. 2009. *Public Administration: An Action Orientation*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thomson Wadsworth, Belmont CA:12.
- DPSA. 1997. BATHO PELE: People First White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery. Pretoria: DPSA.
- DPSA. 2000. BATHO PELE: Together beating the drum for better service delivery. Pretoria: Department of Public Service and Administration
- Dunn, W.N. 2012. *Public Policy Analysis*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Ewaldt, J.A.G. 2001. Theories of Governance and New Public Management. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration, March 2001. New Jersey, United States of America.
- Ghosal, S. 2005. Bad Management theories are destroying good management practice. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4:75–91.

- Goldsmith, A. 2007. Is Governance Reform a catalyst for Development? *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 20:165–186.
- Griddle, M. 2004. Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and freeform in developing countries. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 17:525–548.
- Gualmini, E. 2008. Restructuring Weberian bureaucracy: comparing managerial reforms in Western Europe and the United States. *Public Administration* 86(1):75–94.
- Hood, C. and Dixon, R. 2007. Rating the Rankings: Assessing international rankings of public service. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(3):298–328.
- Huberts Hubers L, Good Governance in the Caribbean <http://sidsgg.webs.com/2012/proceedings/Huberts%20Good%20Governance%20in%20the%20Caribbean.pdf> (Accessed 11 January 2015).
- Jones, L.R. and Kettl, D.F. 2003. Assessing public financial management reform in international context. *International Public Management Review*, 4:1–16.
- Kauffman, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, E. 2007. *The Worldwide Governance Indicators Project: Answering the Critics*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No 2196.
- Kakabadse, A. and Kakabadse A. (Eds.). 2006. *Governance, Strategy and Policy: Seven Critical Essays*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kemoni, H. and Ngulube, P. 2008. Relationship between records management, public service delivery and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals in Kenya. *Information Development*, 24:296–306.
- Kernaghan, K. 2014. Public administration. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Available online: <http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0006540> (Accessed 19 August 2014).
- Kettl, D. and James F. 2009. *The Politics of the Administrative Process*. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Knack, S., Kugler, M. and Manning, N. 2003. Second Generation Governance Indicators. *International review of Administrative Sciences*, 69:354–364.
- Kjær, A.M. 2004. *Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kurtz, M. and Schrank, A. 2007. Growth and Governance: Models, Measures and Mechanisms. *The Journal of Politics*, 69:538–554.
- Kuye, J.O. and Mafunisa M.J. 2003. Responsibility, Accountability and Ethics: The case of public service leadership. *Journal of Public Administration*, 38:421–437.
- Kuye, J.O. and Ile, I.U. 2008. Public Service Delivery reform philosophies: A re-think of Nigeria's 'Servicom' and South Africa's 'Batho Pele' principles in an era of global restructuring and reform. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 2:122–130.
- Mantzaris, E. and Munnik, L. 2013. *Can a Society Get Rid of Corruption through Legislation Alone? The Case of Brazil*. 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Public Administration, 31 October-2 November 2013. Cape Town: South Africa.
- Mantzaris, E. and Pillay, P. 2013. *Organisational Anti-Corruption Detection and Integrity in the Public Sector: A South African Case Study*. 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Public Administration, 31 October-2 November 2013. Cape Town, South Africa.
- Mantzaris, E. and Pillay, P. 2014. Combating Corruption – the offensive infrastructure: Towards a decisive action in South African municipalities. Paper Presented at IASIA Conference, Port Elizabeth.
- Maphunye, K. 2009. Public Administration for a Democratic Developmental State in Africa: Prospects and Possibilities, Research Report 114. Centre for Policy Studies, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Olsen, J.U.P. 2005. Maybe it's time to re-discover bureaucracy. Center for European Studies, University of Oslo [https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena\\_publications/workingpapers/workingpapers2005/wp05\\_10.pdf](https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena_publications/workingpapers/workingpapers2005/wp05_10.pdf) (Accessed 3/1/2015).
- Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the 21st Century*. Boston: Harvard University Press.



- Poluha, E. and Rosendahl, M. 2002. *Contesting 'good' governance: cross-cultural perspectives on representation, accountability and public space*. London: Routledge.
- Republic of South Africa. 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Republic of South Africa. 1997. *White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (Batho Pele White Paper)*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Rodrik, D. 2006. *Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion?* Kennedy School of Government, Working Paper.
- Rosenbloom, D.H. and Kravchuk, R.S. 2005. *Public administration: understanding management, politics and law in the public sector*. 6th Edition, Singapore, McGraw-Hill International.
- Sharma, S. 2004. Government Intervention or Market Capitalisation: The Korean Financial Crisis as a Case of Market Failure. *Progress in Dev*