



## Between Social and Management Sciences: Problems and Issues in Carving Separate Identities for Public Administration and Political Science

ADEBAYO T. SALAMI

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria

**Abstract.** What indeed are social and management sciences, and why is the question still being asked in this 21<sup>st</sup> century? To what extent do connections and disconnections exist between and among them? What are the forms and patterns of the connections and disconnections? How have globalization and its forces and factors enhanced the connections and disconnections? Within what intellectual framework should the investigation and probe of the connections and disconnections be patterned? What do we hope to gain from the knowledge and understanding of the connections and disconnections? How important is the knowledge of the connections and disconnections in the probe and investigation of the independence and relationships between social and management sciences? The questions no doubt form the bedrock of the understanding of the issues and problems that are inherent in the carving of separate identities for political science and public administration as disciplines of study. The paper traces the intellectual and academic origins of the connections and disconnections bringing out an evaluation and assessment of the contending arguments and debates, and further seeks an exhaustive and comprehensive examination and analysis of the issues and problems. It finally determines the extent to which the issues and problems represent the basic and fundamental distinctions between social and management sciences. The methodology is qualitative drawing from sources in books, journals and official publications.

**Keywords:** Science, Social Science, Management Science, Public Administration, Political Science.

### 1. Introduction

What indeed are social and management sciences, and why is the question still being asked in this 21<sup>st</sup>

century? To what extent do connections and disconnections exist between and among them? What are the forms and patterns of the connections and disconnections? How have globalization and its forces and factors enhanced the connections and disconnections? Within what intellectual framework should the investigation and probe of the connections and disconnections be patterned? What do we hope to gain from the knowledge and understanding of the connections and disconnections? How important is the knowledge of the connections and disconnections in the probe and investigation of the independence and relationships between social and management sciences? The questions no doubt derive relevance in contemporary scholarship when deliberate attempt is made to justify the significance of the topic within the emerging debates and arguments trailing the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) implementation in the Third World during the 1980s. Part of the hang-over effect of the structural adjustment and stabilization measures is the continued emphasis on the need to reduce the running costs of higher education in the face of budgetary constraints through the reviews of curricular. Answering the questions especially from the perspective of the Third World as earlier emphasized requires that relationships in both theory and practice are first established between humanities as fields of study and development as political, economic and social aspirations. The starting point hence involves raising some fundamental questions and posers that would in turn help us to address the relationships in both theory and practice. The questions, among others, include: what are the indices that help in the advancement of knowledge and by extension, societies?

Societal progress is greatly facilitated when our reasoning system and ability are patterned along

certain carefully formulated indices and criteria of evaluation and assessment. Critical to the procedures and processes of evaluation and assessment is how to ensure that the criteria of evaluation and assessment have in them the necessary scientific elements so as to be able to reduce our biases and value predispositions to the barest level. No doubt, relationship exists between and among the humanities, broadly defined, and national and social development. The relationships in both theory and practice have helped in determining and conditioning the contents and methods of the humanities as disciplines to the extent that critical components and brands of social and management sciences remain entrenched in it and continue to give it defining and unique characteristics. In the Third World, there is ever the challenge of development. There is, in particular, the challenge of what type of development that is needed and how to approach the processes and procedures of its institutionalization and accomplishment. Again, critical to the understanding and knowledge of the type of development that the Third World desires is how social and management sciences are organized and arranged for teaching especially at the university level. There is the imperative need to, among others, have a clear understanding of what social and management sciences are before their organization and arrangement for teaching are investigated and elaborated upon.

Again, what indeed are social and management sciences, and why is the question still being asked in this 21<sup>st</sup> century? The questions are two in one. But they require separation for the purpose of understanding the relevance and importance of the topic in this contemporary era of globalization with all its attendant consequences and effects, consequences and effects in particular on the organization, patterning and arrangement of the intellectual efforts at advancing the study and understanding of man's behaviour. A bit of historical excursion is however, important for us to be able to understand the relevance of the first question to the examination and analysis of the relationships between public administration and political science and the problems and issues enveloping the carving of separate identities for the two especially in the developing world. In Nigeria, especially following the end of the civil war in 1970 and the introduction and implementation of the 3Rs programmes (reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction), the significance of the discipline of public administration came into the front burner. Coincidentally, the former Director of the Institute of Public Administration at the then University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo

University), Prof. Adebayo Adedeji who later became the United Nations Under-Secretary and Director-General of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) with headquarters in Addis-Ababa, Ethiopia was appointed the Federal Minister of Economic Development and Planning. A University of London trained economist and holder of the master's degree in public administration from the Harvard University, Prof. Adebayo Adedeji left a legacy of service while at Obafemi Awolowo University as the Director of the Institute of Administration which later metamorphosed into the Faculty of Administration with public administration as one of the departments. It is important to emphasise the fact further that before 1970 when Prof. Adebayo Adedeji was appointed as Federal Minister in Nigeria, the Institute of Administration had pre-occupied itself with the public service training programmes of the then Western Region of Nigeria. In actual fact, the then Western Region of Nigeria established the Obafemi Awolowo University in 1962 before its take-over by the Federal Government of Nigeria in 1971. The different military regimes that ruled Nigeria between 1983 and 1998 appreciated the relevance and importance of the discipline of public administration to national development and consequently adopted three centers (the University of Nigeria, Nnsuka; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife; and Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria) apart from the establishment of the Centre for Management and Development, Lagos and the Administrative Staff College, Badagry for the advancement of the knowledge and understanding of the discipline of public administration in both theory and practice.

The issue of standard is usually of concern to any reasonable government. The Federal Government of Nigeria established the National Universities Commission for the purpose of regulating and maintaining standards in the Nigerian university system. Part of the regulatory duty, responsibility and function of the National Universities Commission is the development of what it calls the Minimum Bench Mark for the Nigerian Universities. Included in the Minimum Bench Mark is the arrangement and organization of courses and their departmentalization under the umbrella of faculties. The Minimum Bench Mark specifically makes distinctions and differences between social and management sciences and clearly further provides that political science should be in the Faculty of the Social Sciences and public administration in the Faculty of Administration and Management Sciences. Universities in Nigeria such as the University of Lagos, Akoka; University of Benin, Benin City; Olabisi Onabanjo University,

Ago-Iwoye; University of Calabar and the University of Ibadan, to mention just a few, already have public administration either taught independently as a programme or as an integral element of the instruction in political science. And since adjustment of, and alignment to, the Minimum Bench Mark of the National Universities Commission are critical, important and pre-requisite to the accreditation of academic programmes, most universities are left with no other alternative option than to comply. This no doubt has created a number of issues and problems of implementation and as well as of epistemology of understanding and knowledge. First, there is the problem and issue of understanding and knowledge of social and management sciences. Equally are other problems and issues cleverly articulated here as research questions to provide direction to the thrust of the paper. Even though it is tentatively agreed to that we know what social and management sciences either are or likely to be, it still remains uncertain whether our answers are exact, precise and comprehensive enough. It is therefore further asked for the purpose of emphasis: to what extent do connections and disconnections exist between social and management sciences? What are the forms and patterns of the connections and disconnections? How have the forces and factors of globalization enhanced the connections and disconnections? Within what intellectual framework should the investigation and probe of the connections and disconnections be patterned? What do we hope to gain from the knowledge and understanding of the connections and disconnections? How important is the knowledge of the connections and disconnections in the probe and investigation of the independence and relationships between social and management sciences? And with specific and special regard to political science and public administration, to what extent do independence and relationships exist between them? How can the independence and relationship be investigated? What should the investigations bring out? What should be the manner or mode of presentation of the result/outcome? And finally, to what extent do the questions constitute in themselves the basis for the advancement of knowledge? All the questions, it is further emphasized, form the fulcrum of the paper and consequently its substance and stuff. We need to, at this juncture, make some important conceptual clarifications. This is the preoccupation of part one of the paper.

## 2. Conceptual Clarifications

The following words and concepts are critical to the understanding of the position of the paper. They are: science, social science, management science, public

administration and political science. It is further admitted to that what these concepts are and especially as used in the paper do not differ from the common understanding of them. However, it is still considered important to define them because the common understanding of them constitutes or creates another problem of understanding and knowledge. There is the tendency for instance to assume that science is about laboratory and the application of complex mathematical and statistical techniques. There is the tendency further to either think or wanting to think that administration involves management, and finally that the word: humanities best capture social and management sciences. There are, it is here argued, degrees of variations between and among them. Consequently, what is the paper's understanding of 'science' as the basis of the knowledge of the distinctions and differences between social and management sciences, and for the purpose and objective of the investigation, analysis, examination and discussion of the connections and disconnections between them? Science, it is further argued and submitted, involves the simplification of the procedure for the discovery of the truth- see Berger and Luckmann (1973), Ayer (1961), Blum (1974), Dewey and Bentley (1948), Sarantakos (2005), Babbie (1995), Crotty (1998) and Eneanya (2012), among others. Science, from the understanding of the paper, is an activity which aims at the discovery of the truth. This raises another question. What does the paper hold or accept as the truth? The truth is here referred to as when ideas or pieces of information about our existence are generally consistent to the extent that they remain ever reliable and dependable. Science, from the understanding and perspective of the paper, is therefore the deliberate initiation and use of a generally accessible procedure that leads to the discovery of the truth. The procedure, it is further meant, either arises from or it is the outcome of the application and utilization of existing or known theories.

A 'social science' understanding of the paper emanates from the Webster's Dictionary explanation and meaning of the word: 'social'. According to the Dictionary, social is: "of or relating to human society, the interaction of the individual and the group". The concept of social, from the perspective of the Dictionary, is one that is used to describe and explain the interactions and relationships between and among individuals. Individuals and groups therefore constitute the understanding and meaning of the word, social. Social science is therefore a form of science that deals with the study, investigation, discussion and analysis of the behaviours of

individuals and groups with the goal and objective of developing and formulating generalizations. As distinct from other forms of sciences, social science has a goal and objective for its study and investigation of human behaviours. The fact that individuals and groups constitute the meaning and understanding of the word, social, provides the information and knowledge further that there are many manifestations of human behaviours. These manifestations, it is important to emphasise further, can be political, economic, psychological, cultural, geographical and spatial. This explains why disciplines such as political science, economics, sociology, psychology, anthropology and geography are immediately mentioned as the social sciences. That the above are immediately referred to as the social sciences has contained in it the understanding that there could be the other social sciences or a more elaborate understanding of the social sciences. Yes, of course. These other social sciences include history, philosophy, education and law- see Smelster and Baltes (2001), Kuper and Kuper (1985), Backhouse and Philippe (2014) and Krimerman (1969), among others. Distinctions and differences can hence be made between the “core” social sciences and the “peripheral” social sciences. The former are unarguably the core social sciences and the latter, the peripheral social sciences. The argument further is that the peripheral social sciences are important to the knowledge and understanding of the core social sciences. For instance, notwithstanding the level of sophistication that has been achieved in the core social sciences and especially in the study and knowledge of “human behaviour”, the fact remains that it is either that history plays critical role in the understanding of the behaviour or that the behaviour has attached to it moral and philosophical problems and issues. Furthermore, economic, political and sociological theories are influenced by legal theories. The right that man exercises and his behaviour within the context of market are for instance, both regulated and defined by law. Finally, the purpose of social organization is fundamentally regulated and defined by law.

What is management science? This requires an immediate probe into the meaning and understanding of management. So, what is management? How can it not be confused with administration? In other words, what is the difference and distinction between management and administration? There are two senses and perspectives to the understanding and meaning of management. These are here labeled as semantic and technical. They both require careful explanation. In the semantic category and according to Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, management is:

“the act or art of managing: the conducting or supervising of something (as a business)”. The Dictionary goes further to define it as the: “judicious use of means to accomplish an end”. The Dictionary finally defines it as the: “capacity for managing: executive skill”. What, it can now be asked, is the contribution of the semantic perspective to the understanding of management and by extension, management science? Management, going by its definition and characterization so far, has three outstanding and unique understanding and meaning. They are that: (i) it involves supervision; (ii) it is about judicious application and utilization of resources; and (iii) it is about the inculcation of relevant skills. The above no doubt both distinguish and differentiate management from administration- see Hughes (1998), Dwivedi and Henderson (1990), Dunsire (1973), Farnham and Horton (1996) and French and Saward (1993), among others. Administration is much more limited in scope. It is a component of management. But this is still not enough. We need therefore an understanding and meaning of management from the technical sense and perspective to be able to answer the question.

Yalokwuwu (2006:4) defines management as “the process of planning, organising, leading, and controlling the efforts of members of an organization and using all other resources to achieve set goals”. The definition no doubt requires further detailed examination and analysis. From the definition, management involves all of the following: (i) it is a process of relationship and interaction; (ii) it is a process of relationship and interaction happening only in organizations; (iii) it is about the use and application of resources; and lastly (iv), it is about the achievement of clearly defined goals. The difference between the semantic and technical perspectives to the understanding and explanation of management exists not only in the comprehensiveness of the technical perspective but in the fact that it helps in addressing important issues and problems which the paper has set for itself. Therefore, how have the understanding and explanations of management so far given assisted in the understanding and explanation of management science? Management and management science, one should emphasise, are different but related subject matter- see Stoner (1995), Yalokwuwu (2006), Gulick (1965), Stoner and Wankel (1988), Holt (1993), and Miller and Feldman (1983), among others. Management has both theoretical and practical dimensions. In fact, distinction, difference and relationship can be made and established between the theory and practice of management- see Nwachukwu (1988), Drucker (1954) and Holt (1993), among others. Management

science is therefore the body of idea that exists to help in the understanding of both the theory and practice of management. It is a body of knowledge of accounting, finance, insurance, business, banking, advertising, etc., working together to ensure that resources are judiciously used for the purpose of achieving clearly defined goals. The science of management exists in the fact further that it involves the formulation of problem and the articulation of testable propositions with regard to how difficulties are resolved in organizations. The difference between management science and social science can therefore be anchored in the point that management science is much more restrictive in application. Social science has a wider application of its knowledge and understanding of science to include organizations and the larger society. This perhaps particularly explains the reference to social sciences as the “soft sciences” because of the fact that understanding human behaviour requires the joint application and utilization of the tools and techniques of the broad social sciences. What for instance manifests itself as economic behaviour might have its roots in politics and culture which makes the knowledge and understanding of political science and anthropology important to its study, examination and analysis.

How does the paper view public administration and political science? The paper views them as disciplines of study. The above point underscores the need for the paper to make some facts known about disciplines of study. A discipline of study is an area of human inquiry. This means that as an area of human inquiry, disciplines need to have: (i) an understanding of the nature and character of the inquiry; (ii) identities and defining elements and characteristics which distinguish the discipline from other disciplines; (iii) contents describing and detailing what the discipline is all about; and (iv), methods for investigating its focus. It is further important to make some other observations known about disciplines. Disciplines as areas of human inquiries have their histories of growth and development. Second, part of the history of the growth and development of disciplines is the existence of relationships with other disciplines. In fact, a discipline for instance might be an offshoot of another discipline. Third, the histories of disciplines revolve around certain personalities and individuals. In addition, disciplines generally differ in degrees of sophistication and levels of scientific attainment. Finally, disciplines differ in orientation.

Given the above, it is apt to now ask: what are public administration and political science as disciplines of study? What are the connections and disconnections

between them? What does the knowledge of the connections and disconnections say about them? More importantly, can public administration meaningfully exist and rigidly maintain its independence from political science? Solid and fundamental as the questions are, it is however, important to emphasise that only the first question mentioned and stated above has relevance to the purpose of the paper. In literature, politics and political science are both confused- see Ball (1983), Appadorai (2004), Kapur (2006), Harris (1979), Pickels (1972) and Herbert and Bellows (1981), among others. The confusion emanates from the fact that politics is the subject matter of political science. It is here emphasized that even though they are related ideas, they do not however amount to the same thing in the light of our earlier explanations of disciplines. A politician is not a political scientist. However, a political scientist might choose to be a politician. This is the starting point of the clarification between political science and politics. As a discipline/area of human inquiry, political science concerns and preoccupies itself with the scientific study, examination and analysis of all activities and competitions in relation to the production, distribution/allocation and consumption of scarce political resources. The mix-up between politics and political science exists in the definitions of two academic giants in the field. They are Professors David Easton and Harrold Lasswell. Easton’s definition and characterization of politics as “the authoritative allocation of values”, and Lasswell’s understanding of it as: “who gets what, when and how” are not strictly speaking, the definitions of political science, but rather the definition and characterization of politics- see Easton (1965a), Easton (1965b) and Lasswell (1958), among others. The point needs clarification, no doubt. They are not definitions of the discipline further on the ground that the science component of it is either lost or absent. In fact, both Easton and Lasswell failed, neglected or refused to make reference to it. Some institutions and universities still refer to the department of political science as the department of politics. This is still part of the ensuing confusion. In the paper therefore, reference is made to the discipline and department of political science and not that of politics, the subject matter of study. Political science is hereby defined as the academic study of politics.

Let us now attempt to define public administration. So, what is public administration? An understanding of the discipline requires an immediate explanation of the two words in which it is being described. These two words are: (i) public and (ii) administration.

According to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, public is: "of, relating to, or affecting all the people or the whole area of a nation or state". While administration, according to the Dictionary, is: "the act or process of administering". The Dictionary further defines it as the: "performance of executive duties", and "the execution of public affairs as distinguished from policy-making". Finally, the Dictionary views public as: "a body of persons who administer". One should quickly note and observe that the definitions only conform to the understanding of public administration from the angle of practice. While the perspective is important to it, it however, misses the special reference to its teaching and theory. In this sense, an administrationist is not the same thing as an administrator, even though an administrationist can as well be an administrator. The missing point, it is particularly emphasized here, is the specific reference of the paper and therefore constitutes its understanding of public administration. The understanding further requires detailed explanation as documented in literature. According to Rosenbloom (1986), public administration: "...is the use of managerial, political, and legal theories and processes to fulfill legislative, executive and judicial governmental mandates for the provision of regulatory and service functions for the society as a whole or for some segments of it". Hughes (1998) declares boldly that the definition is: "...comprehensive, overarching..., putting within public administration every conceivable part of the public sector". The submission cannot be controverted. It provides for the paper useful and correct perspective to the understanding and meaning of public administration from the angles of theory and practice.

### **3. Connections and Disconnections between Social and Management Sciences**

One should begin the subsection by asking the questions: What are the connections and disconnections between social and management sciences? Why do social and management scientists need to know the connections and disconnections between them? And finally, of what use is the knowledge of the connections and disconnections? The subsection seeks first the knowledge of the connections. So, what are the connections between social and management sciences? Before the question is here answered, there is the imperative need to elaborate on our understanding of connection. Connection is used here from the perspective of relationship. Again, what is the relationship between social and management sciences? The idea of connection and relationship is further a construct

intended to establish whether or not a link exist between social and management sciences. The construct is hence an investigation deliberately patterned to bring out and highlight the relationships between the two sciences. The connections between them exist in many ways. Quite aptly, what are these many ways? Both social and management sciences are disciplines of study. They both have their defining attributes and identities existing principally in the fact that they are areas of human inquiries. Human civilization has accompanied with it the urge by man to wanting to know himself and why he relates with his fellow beings and the physical environment that he finds himself. As man grows in the knowledge of himself and his environment, he discovers further that his behaviour is conditioned by other factors and forces, the knowledge of which is vital on daily basis.

Human civilization creates additional complexities and complications in the knowledge of the individual and the group and society that the individual belongs to. As the individual functions and relates in organizations and in the larger society that he belongs to, he discovers further that his new knowledge all of the sudden becomes stale and further that relationships exist between and among the past, the present and the future. He discovers further that the relationships need be steadily studied, examined and analyzed before more remarkable progress can be recorded. Man, as an embodiment of many parts, finds and realises further that he needs to arrange and re-arrange, adjust and re-adjust, align and re-align all his instruments, techniques and tools of examination, study and analysis of individual and aggregate relationships within a system of knowledge accumulation that allows for test and re-test to be able to determine the extent to which he can regularly make generalizations for accuracy of prediction of study. Beginning from the understanding and idea that he can know himself and the world, man started to make some fundamental assumptions and propositions about the world and in particular, about his role in it. When he encounters difficulties and problems, he re-strategises by either recognizing that he needs to break into pieces his knowledge of his behaviour and that of the world. When he records successes and breakthroughs, he thinks of how to consolidate and sustain the gains and plans for further advancement. Social and management sciences eventually develop to complement each other as knowledge accumulation about how our world continues to grow.

The second connection between social and management sciences can be explained from the

angle and perspective of shared focus. Disciplines are known for what they study or aimed at studying. Whether approached from the angle of individual and group behaviour within an organization or from the larger perspective of the society, social and management sciences concern themselves with the study of human/social behaviour. What motivates man/individual to behave in a particular way and not in other ways? What is the relationship between individual and group behaviours? What are the many manifestations of man's behaviour? What are the factors conditioning the manifestations of these behaviours? How can these behaviours be put together for the purpose of greater study, examination and analysis? How consistent and reliable can these behaviours be? What is the extent of the reliability that is contained in the behaviour? What should be the basis for the continued focus on the study of the behaviour expressed by man? How is human/social behaviour modified, and why? What is to be gained from the modification? How will the modification affect existing result/knowledge, and to what extent? What would and should allow for consistency in the study, examination and analysis of man's behaviour? How can the emphasis on the study of human/social behaviour be sustained? What are the rules of logic involved? And to what extent can they be objectively applied? All the questions are critical to social and management sciences as disciplines of study focusing on the knowledge of man's behaviour at either individual and/or group level. The emphasis on shared focus is to re-iterate the fact that agreement exists on what should be the subject-content between the two sciences. Focus provides further the basis of investigation and the building of generalization between the two sciences. Human behaviour, as a phenomenon of study of the two sciences, happens within and outside of organizations and in the larger society as well. This focus remains the binding unity between the two sciences.

Thirdly, because social and management sciences focus on the study of human behaviour, they are both concerned with how to regularly improve their instruments and techniques of research. Research is critical to the advancement of human knowledge especially about man and the group that he finds himself. Again, because human nature is generally lacking in dependability and reliability, there is always the concern about how existing instruments and tools of research can be improved upon. The idea of test and re-test is to allow for confirmation of data before analysis so that the result can be dependable enough. Researches in social and management sciences are generally conditioned by similarity of rules, procedures and processes. There are

agreements and consensus on what type of data, how to get them, how to arrange, analyse and present them. Data, the agreement is still further maintained, should not be for the purpose of data only. Rather, it should be for the purpose of ameliorating or solving societal problems. Advances in econometrics, finance and in the presentation of accounting reports for instance should be in relation to how production, distribution and consumption activities can be enhanced and leakages addressed. The point further draws from the fact that social and management sciences have similar orientation with particular respect to the development of shared philosophy and principle of research. Researches in social and management sciences, according to the principle, should derive from the problems of the society. This is what is called problem-solving orientation. The two sciences believe in the need for regular refinement of the instruments and tools of research. Regularity is important to the making and development of generalizations. Regularity however, can only come when a system of test and re-test is established for the purpose of ensuring the development of a pattern. Social and management sciences share this connection in common.

In addition, social and management sciences have the same meaning and understanding of science. Science, in the two disciplines, is about the simplification of the procedure for discovery of the truth. The understanding of science therefore exists in certain assumptions and further described in terms of peculiar characteristics and attributes. Fundamental to the assumptions is the knowability of the world and that we are able to know it through our senses. The principles of systematization, openness to modification, inter-subjectivity, among others, are to ensure that research in the two sciences is anchored in intelligible reasoning indicating relationships between our conclusions and procedures. Systematization principle, as practiced in the two sciences, ensures the use of theories and theoretical frameworks of analyses. Theories are to drive research, and the goal of research is the development and formulation of new and additional theories. Science, according to the two sciences, is about objectivity in the specification and detailing of the procedures for the discovery of the truth. There is further the shared feeling that the procedure of an objective science starts from the selection of the topic of research. The guide is usually that social and management scientists should, in the interest of developing meaningful generalization, detach themselves from the circumstances and interests enveloping their research topics. Furthermore, because social and management scientists have the

same meaning and understanding of science, they seek objectivity in the entire process and procedure of research. The two sciences recognize the need for value-detachment right from the selection of the research topic to the presentation and analysis of data and findings. Subjectivity is generally accepted to be detrimental to social and management sciences patterned researches. It limits the opportunities that are contained in research challenges and thereby further constrain how we are to approach the numerous problems plaguing our societies. Human progress is further limited and our problems appear bigger than us.

The connections between social and management sciences can be seen and demonstrated further in the fact that they share the same goal of study. Both disciplines share the mentality of ensuring that they develop and formulate their orientation to research from the larger problems of the society. A principle and rule of research in social and management sciences emanates from the accepted idea that there should be relationship between the research topic and the problems of the society. This specifically means that research in social and management sciences should be directed towards solving the problems of the society. This is what is called the problem-solving goal and mentality of social and management sciences. In fact, the relevance and importance of the two sciences seem to be dependent on how they are able to proffer solutions to the problems of the society. Social advancement, according to social and management scientists, can only be accelerated when social problems are confronted and dealt with. This again explains the uniqueness of social and management sciences. And the uniqueness reveals itself when we consider the necessity of recommendations to social and management sciences patterned researches. It is particularly agreed that arriving at a conclusion should not be the end of research. Research can only come to an end when recommendations of public policy significance are made on how the problems investigated can either be solved or ameliorated. Social and management sciences patterned researches without recommendations are violations of established rules.

Both social and management sciences have the traditions of being theory-oriented and theory-directed. Within the larger idea of the principle and rule of systematization, researches in the two sciences derive their investigation and analysis from existing theories and they aim further at the development of further theories. In both sciences, the idea of theoretical framework of analysis is very sacrosanct. This is important in further helping in the

actualization and fulfillment of the idea and principle that we begin the conduct of research from the known to the unknown and that there is always a relationship between existing theories and the development of new ones. The two sciences further assume that existing knowledge and information about our world are critical to the investigation and discovery of the unknown. Nothing, it is often said is absolutely and completely new under the sun. Even though it is true that the commencement of a research might be affected by the problem of paucity of information, knowledge and data, this should however, be seen as a challenge. The commencement of research in the two sciences, it is generally believed, should be preceded by the accumulation of existing knowledge (bibliography development) that is directly and indirectly related to the topic of investigation. This further explains why review of literature is an important arm of research in social and management sciences.

Finally, among the connections between social and management sciences, is the general agreement that there exists a relationship between the contents and methods of study and investigation. Human behaviour, from the perspective of either individual or group, remains the focus of the two sciences. There is the further agreement that the study of human behaviour can either be quantitative or qualitative. The topic, it is further agreed, determines its mode of investigation. All these are the agreed principles and rules determining and defining the understanding of the two sciences and their orientation to research.

Having examined and analyzed the connections between social and management sciences, what are the disconnections between them? There is the urgent need to expatiate on the meaning of disconnection. Disconnection in this sense refers to the dissimilarities between the two sciences and how the dissimilarities in turn define and determine the contents and methods of their understanding, investigation and analysis. It is further the demonstration of the extent to which they differ in level of rigour and sophistication in the understanding and study of human behaviour, the focus of their study and research attention. First, even though the two sciences have the same orientation and understanding of science, they however differ in the extent of appreciation of the meaning and understanding of science. Science no doubt connotes simplification of procedure in the two sciences. A social science understanding of science is clearly and comprehensively more critical. Social scientists would emphasise (within the perspective of

developing and formulating critical indices of measurement and analysis) the need to further situate every scientific investigation within the complex and multiple forces and factors of history and philosophy that gave birth to the science and the urge to be scientific. This is because, science, according to social scientists, serves not its purpose but that of the fundamental existence of man as he relates with his fellow men and makes and enforces binding decisions and imposes sanctions for disobeying. Towards this end, social scientists would always remind themselves of the philosophy and history of science in their understanding and application of science and scientific indices. Management scientists on the other hand take a cosmetic and hagiographic view and approach to the understanding of science and in the application of its tools and techniques. Science is seen generally as the means to an end and not the desired end in itself. This obviously has its many problems. There is the tendency to be mindful of only the tools and techniques especially the accuracy of statistical data rather than in the purpose of the data. All measures for example in governmental accounting aimed at reducing and controlling leakages would only be meaningful to the extent to which the accrued savings assist in the amelioration of poverty, provision of jobs and in the empowerment of women, the youths and the vulnerable groups in the society.

In addition, the management sciences are characteristically modest in theoretical sophistication. Science, it is here particularly emphasized, has both its empirical and normative compliments. Empiricism has value only with respect to the extent to which through it we are able to validate our data and assumptions. This is however, good to the extent to which we can completely detach ourselves from the investigation. But can a scientist completely detach himself from his research and investigation? This is extremely doubtful given the fact that the choice of topic is in itself a demonstration of preference. The social scientists take a broad, panoramic and critical view and understanding of science and from this, develop an understanding that helps in the examination and analysis of the subject matter. Science, the conclusion can then be reached, serves the purpose of man and not man the purpose of science.

Important to the examination, discussion and analysis of the sophistication argument are two critical points. These are the arguments relating to the justification of data collection sources and analyses and the suitability and appropriateness of theoretical frameworks of analyses. Social science takes very

serious the basis and justification advanced in support of the adoption and use of statistical tools and techniques. It as well takes further serious the suitability and appropriateness of adopted/chosen theoretical frameworks of analyses for the purpose of research. Accepted that the purpose of a theory is to describe, explain and predict, but the description, explanation and prediction should be targeted at occurrences whose realities are known through carefully formulated concepts and ideas about our world. Limiting and restricting theoretical formulations to organizations rather than the larger society compound the extent, appreciation and understanding of what is being described, explained and predicted. Scholarship, it is here further argued in both social and management sciences should be such that seeks comprehensive knowledge and understanding of any subject matter and in particular, the many dimensions of its existence.

#### **4. Problems and Issues in Carving Separate Identities for Public Administration and Political Science**

What are the many issues and problems involved in carving separate identities for public administration and political science in the new arrangement of maintaining distinctions between social and management sciences? Going into the examination and analysis of the issues and problems requires first, undertaking a robust probe of the necessities and circumstances enveloping the idea. There is, to begin with, a necessity in which the whole idea is being expressed. There is, therefore and without debate, the emphasis on new public administration. The emphasis adds to public administration the idea of management to the extent that both now read public administration and management. What really has brought about this? The root of the new focus can be traced to the idea of secondary purpose of government. When government was formed immediately after the period of the Dark Ages and assigned with the primary responsibility of maintenance of law and order, the attendant improvements in communication and population further ignited within the emerging democracy the idea of entrusting to it the secondary responsibility expanded and interpreted to mean the provision of social amenities. Included further in the idea is how to permanently develop and formulate within the emerging institutional framework of government a systematic arrangement that would allow for the sustenance of the idea. Part of the basis for the Industrial Revolution stemmed from this need. The goodies of life, as it was then called, were accepted as critical to the new society that was then

developing. Consequently, the understanding of management became expanded in scope especially in its application to the art and science of public administration. The role of government especially following the Adjustment Programmes of the 1980s and 1990s called for refinement and redefinition. The reinvention of the state debate and argument became popular in literature to the extent that capitalism was assumed to have triumphed and Fukuyama predicted the end of history!

The first issue/problem involves determining clearly and appropriately which courses are indeed critical to contemporary political science and contemporary public administration curricular. Public policy analysis, cases in public policy analysis, local government, comparative local government, comparative public administration, inter-governmental relations, administrative and constitutional law, elements and organization of government, public administration, organizational theory and behaviour, among others, were once considered as traditional courses of the old political science programme accommodating the diversity and plurality in which the discipline was once described and characterized. What should now happen to these courses? Should they be deleted and eliminated from the political science curriculum or should they be left alone? Whichever choice that is taken has its consequences on the type of political science that is being envisaged. This is because if these courses are to be eliminated and deleted from the old political science programme, it raises further questions about the envisaged new political science and the anticipated new courses, especially about how they are to be designed and the underlying philosophy in which they are to be expressed. There are further questions with respect to the method to be employed in teaching these new courses. Method of teaching is no doubt critical to the establishment and sustenance of the identified new focus and objective of the discipline.

Complete demerge of political science and public administration creates further the problem of what future relationships that should be between the two disciplines. The old relationship was not completely divisive but with some unpalatable tastes especially in the handling and management of personnel and other public policy related consultancy assignments and responsibilities pushed to the department of political science under the old arrangement by government. Given the place of the two programmes in the implementation and execution of manpower planning and development functions in the developing world, can the separation of the two

disciplines be completely achieved without dire consequences and implications for the overall objective of uplifting human and societal conditions? In addition, the expansion in the scope of the discipline of political science as a result of the problems and opportunities provided by information and communication technology leading to the imperative need to, among others, study: cyber-attacks, the menace of terrorism and other complex wars and conflicts between and among nation-states, the increasing role of civil society groups and their influences in shaping the foreign policies of countries and the direction of regional and multi-lateral institutions, the renewed focus on how to improve the effectiveness of political institutions in relation to developing new approaches to tackle the increasing and sophisticated governance problems and issues, have jointly and individually, bring the discipline of political science to enviable height among the class of social and management sciences. How, it can now be asked, can the discipline of public administration contribute significantly to the advancement of knowledge and understanding of these new areas of political science given her newly acquired independence status? The new relationships that the discipline of public administrations has with the management sciences are capable of limiting her contributions to the enlargement of these new areas of political science. Given further the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of interdisciplinary relationships between the social and management sciences in the Third World, there is the possibility that the relevance of public administration is gradually being diminished and running into extinction.

There is the further problem of determining the extent to which the contents of instructions in public administration should still be allowed in the remaining political science curriculum. This raises additional problem of tolerance and accommodation. What is or should be the accepted/tolerable level in which the new public administration programme can afford to cede its defining attributes and parameters that are critical to the establishment and maintenance of its new identity? Within the context of helping to sustain the requirements for the upliftment of public bureaucracies, the discipline of public administration has continued to create and carve for itself some elements of recognition and importance. This most probably explains the interests of prospective postgraduate students in public administration rather than in political theory and comparative government and politics for instance. Beyond the issue of tolerance and accommodation, there is as well the problem of completely defining the new focus of

political science without retaining the public administration based courses. There is therefore the possibility of duplication of courses between the two disciplines. Courses on national political systems, the histories of their political growth and development, their conduct and aspirations in continental and world affairs, are no doubt political science based courses. The study of public administration however becomes shallow when these courses are not integrated into its programme. For instance, the knowledge of the practice of public administration of countries needs be situated in the overall knowledge of the histories of their political growth and development.

The new department of public administration equally has its problems and challenges. It needs to urgently define its new relationships with the other management sciences. Services and profits are two incompatible ideas. While recognizing the contemporary reality that government needs to review its foundation and philosophy in the face of financial constraints, there is the problem of accurately determining the extent and degree of privatization and commercialization for example. In Africa and other parts of the Third World, citizens still find themselves trapped in poverty and underdevelopment networks and remain completely disillusioned. Government is still expected to handle critical responsibilities that make life livable. In these societies, it is still doubtful that they have reached the level where government should be advised to limit herself to “the provision of enabling environment” for maximum competition between and among individuals in their private capacities as it is being currently suggested.

### **5. Inherent Promises and Hopes**

Notwithstanding the problems and issues earlier identified, discussed and examined, they are good hopes and prospects emanating from the separation of political science and public administration programmes. A new public administration is positioned strategically to benefit from the influence of other management sciences. A reconstruction of the idea of the state especially redefining its role in the contemporary organization of the society has more sense and meaning within the context of a new public administration. With the potential of the possible exposure of students to courses in governmental accounting, financial accounting, financial management, managerial economics, business principles and practices, among others, the discipline of public administration now has in it the opportunities of producing students skilled in the art and science of public resources management. Filling

the gap created as a result of full establishment of separate identities between political science and public administration, the discipline of political science equally has its good prospects. The political theory segment of the discipline will be left with no other option than thinking of how to creatively repackage itself beyond accepting the limitation offered by normative ideas and thoughts. Its empirical component especially with respect to researching into how to create the intellectual basis for the study of political behaviour will now be better enhanced. New courses will definitely spring-up integrating political science with computer and information and communication technology. A new political science discipline is no doubt in the pipeline with the development of improved tools and techniques of studying institutions and the relationship between the study of these institutions and law. Criminal justice administration and the relationship between it and the development of a new political order will no doubt form the focus of study of a new political science.

### **6. Conclusion**

The paper derives its relevance from contributing to an important area of intellectual focus on contemporary curriculum development of universities in the Third World. No doubt, distinctions and differences exist in the knowledge and understanding of social and management sciences. The knowledge of the differences and distinctions, as argued in the paper, is to provide basis for the reinvigoration of research into aspects and areas that are expected to make the disciplines of public administration and political science more responsive to the tasks and demands of further uplifting human and societal conditions. Distinct compartmentization of the two disciplines will ever remain a herculean task. Public administration teaching and research cannot escape completely from the concepts of power, authority, influence and legitimacy. These concepts ever form the basis for the organization of its new focus on management for its relevance to remain glued to the various efforts, initiatives and activities targeted at resolving and ameliorating the many problems of the human political societies. The discipline of political science, as the mother discipline, has the overall responsibility of imaginatively setting the agenda of public administration research and teaching. Financial management, governmental and public sector accounting, taxation, managerial and public sector economics, etc., as new courses of instruction in public administration, are critical and relevant to the extent to which they help public institutions to achieve efficiency, accountability and transparency in

governance through indepth study provided by political science framework of research into the problems and issues relating to legitimacy and social mobilization.

## References

- Appadorai, A. (2004). *The Substance of Politics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ayer, Alfred J. (1961). *The Foundations of Empirical Knowledge*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The Practice of Social Research* Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth
- Backhouse, Roger E. and Philippe, Fontaine (eds.) 2014. *A Historiography of the Modern Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ball, Alan R. (1983). *Modern Politics and Government* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas. (1973). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Blum, Alan F. (1974). *Theorizing*. London: Heinemann.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage
- Dewey, John and Bentley, Arthur F. (1948). *Knowing and the Known*. Beacon II, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. London: Harper and Row.
- Dunsire, Andrew. (1973). *Administration: The World and the Science*. London: Martin Robertson
- Dwivedi, O. P and Henderson, Keith, M.(eds.). 1990. *Public Administration in World Perspective*. Ames: Iowa State University Press
- Easton, David. (1965a). *A Framework of Political Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Easton, David. (1965b). *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Eneanya, Augustine N. (2012). *Research Methods in Political Science and Public Administration*. Lagos, Nigeria: University of Lagos Press.
- Farnham, David and Horton, Sylvia (eds.). 1996. *Managing the New Public Services* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Macmillan
- French, Derek and Saward, Heather. (1983). *Dictionary of Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Aldershot: Gower
- Gulick, L. (1965). "Management is a Science". *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.18, No.1, pp.7-13
- Harris, Peter B. (1979). *Foundations of Political Science*. London: Hutchinson.
- Herbert, R. Winter and Bellows, Thomas J. (1981). *People and Politics: An Introduction to Political Science* New York: John Wiley.
- Holt, David H. (1993). *Management*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Holt, David H. (1993). *Management: Principles and Practices*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hughes, Owen E. (1998). *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Kapur, A.C. (2006). *Principles of Political Science*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Ltd.
- Krimerman, L.I. (1969). *The Nature and Scope of Social Science: A Critical Anthology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts
- Kuper, A. and Kuper, J. (1985). *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lasswell, Harold. 1958. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: Meridian.
- Miller, J.R. and Feldman, H. (1983). "Management Science: Theory, Relevance and Practice in the 1980s", *Interfaces*, Vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 56-60
- Nwachukwu, C.C. (1988). *Management: Theory and Practice*. Onitsha, Nigeria: Africana-FEP Publishers Ltd.
- Pickels, Dorothy. (1972). *Introduction to Politics* London: Methuen and Co.
- Rosenbloom, David. (1986). *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector*. New York: Random House.
- Sarantakos, Sotiris. (2005). *Social Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smelster, Neil J. and Baltes, Paul B. (2001). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences* Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Stoner, J.A. and Wankel C. (1988). *Management* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), New Delhi: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Stoner, James A.F. (1995). *Management* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1989). A Merriam-Webster.
- Yalokwuwu, P.O. (2006). *Fundamentals of Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Lagos, Nigeria: African Centre for Management and Education.