

A3: Privatisation as a global phenomenon has major implications for Bureaucratic role and scope, especially in state-dominated political system. / Discuss, the Statement with or against arguments.

2. Introduction

Privatization, a global phenomenon, has significantly impacted the role and scope of bureaucracies, particularly in state-dominated political systems. This can be witnessed in some of the countries as well. Privatization have been proved conducive for the struggling economies to gain boom again.

2. Privatization

It is policy of transferring governments / public

assets or functions or shifting government management and service delivery, to the private sector. The goal is to make the economy more efficient and competitive, and to increase growth and productivity.

3, Arguments For

3a, Reduced Role in Service delivery:

Privatization transfers the delivery of public services from the state to the private entities, reducing the bureaucratic role in service provision.

3b, Shift from provider to regulator:

As privatisation increases, bureaucracies shift their focus from providing services to regulating and overseeing private sector activities.

3c, Increased Efficiency and Effectiveness:

Privatisation can lead to more efficient and effective service delivery, as private entities are driven by profit motives and competition.

3d, Reduced Bureaucratic Burden:

✓ Privatisation can alleviate the financial and administrative burden on bureaucracies, allowing them to focus on core functions.

3e, Package of Liberalization Policy:

Privatisation is introduced as part of a package of liberalizing policy changes that increase openness and competition, providing benefits to the government / bureaucracies.

3f. Economic Benefits:

Privatisation brings improved information to and incentives for the managers. It also keeps firm isolated from political interference, and increased flexibility to deal with labour and other cost concerns.

3g. Improved Organisational Structure:

Due to the improved organisational structure, a privatized firm may be doing better while the economy is doing worst. This happens because government brings deregulation and gives its monopoly power to the private firm.

There are issues with privatizing firms which create

challenges to the bureaucracies but these challenges are often overridden by positive aspects of privatization. The private sector may require continued bureaucratic involvement in areas such as regulation and contract management. It may also bring challenges, responsibilities like inequitable service delivery and ensuring private sector compliance with regulations and standards.

4. Privatization in state-dominated political system

China:

Privatisation of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) has reduced the bureaucratic role in service delivery, such as in the telecommunications and energy sectors.

India:

The privatization of

industries like aviation and telecommunications has to led to a decrease in bureaucratic involvement in service delivery.

Singapore:

Privatization of transportation companies and utility sectors has resulted in improved efficiency and effectiveness.

Pakistan:

Privatisation of Pakistan Telecommunication Company Limited and Pakistan International Airlines, has reduced the bureaucratic role in service delivery.

5, Conclusion: Privatisation has - significant implications for the role and scope of bureaucracies in state-dominated political systems. While it can lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness, reduced bureaucratic burden, and a shift from provider

to regulator, it also presents new challenges and responsibilities, potential inequalities in service delivery, and risks of capture and corruption. Ultimately, the impact of ~~privatization~~ on bureaucratic role and scope depends on the specific content and the ability of bureaucracies to adapt to changing circumstances.

satisfactory

but write complete 8 pages

and justify the statement of question

over all need improvement in the content

9/20

in a single file max 1q is checked

resubmit the rest

Q.2 Appropriate separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial branches ensure effective check and balance and hence accountable public administration. Discuss, the statement in the light of historic Watergate scandal which forced Nixon to resign as head of public bureaucracy.

2, Introduction

"The constitutional separation of powers, legislative, executive and judicial, is a political as well as a legal principle."

~ Nancy Kassop

The separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial branches is crucial for ensuring effective checks and balances, which in turn lead to accountable public

administration. This concept is particularly relevant when examining the historic Watergate Scandal, which ultimately led to the resignation of President Richard Nixon.

2, Separation of Powers

It refers to the allocation of constitutional authority to each of the three coordinate branches - legislative, executive & judicial - in a constitutionally governing state.

3, Checks and Balances

It occurs either by the shared authority of two branches of government for certain, designated constitutional functions (e.g., the legislative, appointment, impeachment, and the amendment processes) or

the in the monitoring of the actions of each branch by one or both of the others.

4. The Watergate Scandal: A Case Study

The Watergate Scandal, which occurred in the early 1970s, involved the Nixon administration's attempts to cover up its involvement in the break-in at the Democratic National Committee headquarters.

The scandal highlighted the importance of checks and balances in preventing the abuse of power.

As the scandal unfolded, the legislative branch (congress) played a crucial role in investigating the administration's wrongdoing. The Senate Watergate Committee, led by Senator Sam Ervin, held hearings and

gathered evidence, which ultimately led to the revelation of the administration's involvement in the scandal.

Meanwhile, the judicial branch (the supreme court) also played a critical role in ensuring that the administration did not abuse its power. In the landmark case of United States v. Nixon (1974), the Supreme Court ruled that the president was not above the law and that he must comply with subpoenas issued by the special prosecutor.

5. Separation of Power: A Key Factor in Accountability

The Watergate Scandal demonstrates the importance of separation of powers in ensuring accountability in public administration. The

Scandal showed that when one branch of government (the executive) abuses its power, the other branches (the legislative and judicial) can serve as checks on that power.

In this case, the legislative branch's investigation and the judicial branch's ruling helped to hold the executive branch accountable for its actions. This highlights the importance of maintaining a system of checks and balances, where each branch of government has some ability to limit the actions of the other branches.

6. Conclusion:

In conclusion, the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches is essential

for ensuring effective checks and balances and accountable public administration. The Watergate Scandal serves as a powerful reminder of the importance of maintaining this system of checks and balances, and the consequences that can occur when one branch of government abuses its power.

Q.5. Harnessing intrinsic motivation within the public servants is prelude to better public service delivery and effective curb on corruption. Discuss the statement in the light of public service motivation paradigm and its requisite ingredients enunciated by James L. Perry.

1. Introduction

Harnessing intrinsic motivation among public servants is indeed crucial for enhancing public service delivery and reducing corruption. The public service motivation (PSM) paradigm, particularly as articulated by scholars like James L. Perry, highlights the importance of intrinsic motivation in fostering a committed and effective public workforce.

2. Understanding Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable, rather than for some separable consequence.

"Motivation is a general term referring to behavior instigated by needs and directed towards goals." Morgan

In the context of public service, this motivation can manifest as a genuine desire to contribute to the public good, serve the community, and uphold ethical standards.

When public servants are intrinsically motivated, their work is driven by a sense of purpose and fulfillment, which can lead to superior job performance and better outcomes for citizens.

3, Public Service Motivation Paradigm

James L. Peery, along with his research colleagues, has contributed significantly to the PSM paradigm. They argue that public service motivation consists of various dimensions which include:

3a, Affective Commitment to the Public Interest:

This refers to the emotional connection and sense of duty that public servants feel towards serving the public. A strong affective commitment can lead to a higher quality of service and a proactive approach to addressing citizens' needs.

3b, Civic Duty:

Many public servants are motivated by a sense of civic responsibility, which drives their desire to contribute positively to society. Understanding this intrinsic motivation can help organisations develop policies and cultures that support and enhance these feelings.

3c, Compassion:

Public servants often display a deep empathy for the communities they serve.

When organizations foster environments that allow for compassionate engagement, they can better harness this motivation to improve service delivery.

3d, Self-Sacrifice:

Many public

employees are willing to put the needs of others before their own, which is a hallmark of intrinsic motivation. Recognizing and rewarding self-sacrificial behavior can further promote a culture of service and integrity.

4, Ingredients for Harnessing Intrinsic Motivation

To effectively tap into the intrinsic motivations of public servants, several key ingredients should be considered:

4a, Empowerment and Autonomy:

Providing employees with autonomy in their roles can enhance job satisfaction and commitment to the mission of public service. When employees

feel trusted to make decisions, they are more likely to engage deeply with their work.

4b) Supportive leadership:

Leaders play a critical role in fostering intrinsic motivation; supportive and transformational leadership can inspire employees by aligning organizational goals with personal values and the public good.

4c) Professional Development:

Offering opportunities for training and career advancement not only helps employees improve their skills but also reinforces the importance of their work, leading to higher motivation levels.

4d) Ethical Organizational Culture:

Cultivating a culture that prioritizes ethics, transparency, and accountability can significantly deter corrupt behavior. When employees feel that they are part of an organization committed to integrity, it bolsters their intrinsic motivation to act ethically.

4e) Recognition and Feedback:

Regularly acknowledging the efforts and contributions of public servants can reinforce their intrinsic motivations.

Feedback should also be constructive and geared toward personal and professional growth.

5. Conclusion:

Harnessing intrinsic motivation within public servants

is not only a theoretical aspiration but a practical necessity for improving public service delivery and combating corruption. By embracing the principles of the public service motivation paradigm articulated by James L. Perry, organisations can create environments that motivate employees intrinsically. This, in turn, leads to dedicated public servants who strive for excellence and ethical behavior, ultimately benefiting the public and enhancing trust in government institutions.

Three
- de-
tions
each
honesty
is
the
entire
n:
- time
the
the
p
forms
del
-
adv
Th
de
for
s
7:
-
n