An Analysis of Public Policy Implementation

Dr. S. B. M. Marume[1], Dr.Chipo Mutongi[2], N.C Madziyire[3]

[1]BA, Hons BA, Ma, Madmin, MSoc Sc, PhD
[2]BSc, MBA, DPhil
[3]BEd, MEd, DPhil [Candidate] Zimbabwe Open University

Abstract: *Research studies have it that public policy analysis is a specialised field that has traditionally tended to favour the study of the policy making process by concentrating on the participants and their interests; compromise through bargaining and negotiation; expertise in policy – making and the role of analysis. However, the observation is made that public policy making and its ramifications, notwithstanding the traditional emphasis, are not the only significant aspects of the public policy process but also the way policy is implemented. This constitutes therefore the subject of this article.*
Keywords*: public policy analysis, policy, policy making, specialised field, policy implementation.*

I.   Introduction

The point of departure of this article is that a lot of literature on public policy – making exists but very little on implementation. The immediate question that comes to mind is why? To answer this immediate important question and a host of other fundamental questions that emerge, it is prudent to acknowledge the scientific contributions of notable scientists, scholars and practitioners in order to facilitate the systematic analysis of public policy implementation with reference to African countries.

II.   The purpose of the article

The purpose of this article is to examine the processes, prospects and problems associated with public policy implementation with reference to developing countries of Africa.

In order to present a reasonably concise examination of public policy implementation with reference to African countries the following conceptual framework of analysis is adopted:

1.   Public policy implementation strategies comprising:
   a.   classical model of analysis and
   b.   integrationist model of analysis
2.   Pertinent factors influencing public policy implementation involving
   a.   relevant famous writers, scholars and practitioners and their notable contributions, and
   b.   selected conceptual framework of influencing factors regarding communications, resources and dispositions of policy implementers.

III.   Public policy implementation

2.1 General overview of the area of study

In real life –situations making a policy is as equally important as implementation of that policy. Source: S. B.M. Marume; Academic work No. 10 August 31, 1988

Research studies reveal that from an implementation viewpoint administration as an act of implementation may be found in forms such as administration of legislation, administration as an estate, administration of medicine [A. Viljoen, 1974:21], administration of schools, administration of transport, administration of police, administration of therapy, and administration of punishment [Marume:1988].

When we act to implement the decision, we enter the effective phase of a policy
Source David Easton, quoted in Nakamura and Smallwood:1980:3

Methodological questions

However, before we can analyse the effective process, that is, public policy implementation, it may be prudent as well as useful to pose a number of relevant methodological questions to provoke rational thinking as follows:

1.   What is public policy implementation?
2.   Why has public policy analysis traditionally favoured the public making process?
3.   Who are the relevant prominent scientists in the study of public policy implementation in our times?
4.   What are the two overriding policy implementation models of analysis?

5. What are the significant factors influencing public policy implementation?
6. What are the specific problems and challenges that decision – makers face in realising their intentions?
7. What are the major variables that influence efforts to implement programmes and which help improve their performance?
8. What is the selected three – fold conceptual framework of influencing factors proposed by the different academic authorities?
9. Why is public policy implementation sometimes referred to as the second phase?

Leading scientists relevant to studying policy implementation

The most famous scientists and scholars relevant to this subject include, amongst others:

J. J. N. Cloete	E. G. Bain	S. B. M. Marume	R. T. Nakamura	S. X.
Hanekom	G. C. Edwards	I. Sharkansky		R. W. Rowland
David Easton	S. J. Frawley	F. Smallwood	A. Viljoen	
R. Levitt	C. Thornhill	F. A. Nigro	T. P. Glynn	
Source S. B. M. Marume: Academic work 10 August, 1988				

According to S. J. Frawley [1971:1], the study of public policy has traditionally favoured the policy making process by:

a. focussing on the participants and their interests;
b. compromise through bargaining and negotiation;
c. the role of analysis; and
d. expertise in policy making.

The observation is, however, made that in the making of public policy and its ramifications, notwithstanding the traditional emphasis, are not the only significant aspects of the public policy process. Professor David Easton, for instance, maintains that political life concerns not only those varieties of activity that influence significantly the kind of authoritative policy adopted for society, but also the way policy is put into practice: "When we act to implement the decision, we enter the.... effective, phase of a policy" [Easton, quoted in Nakamura and Smallwood 1980:3].

Scientific resurgent interest in public policy implementation

Then, from the early 1970s there has been developed a scientific resurgent interest in studying what happens in this effective phase, that is, of public policy implementation, notably in the United States of America by famous authors such as Allison (1971); Destler (1974) and Halperim (1974) on policy implementation problems from an international point of view – and Williams (1971); Levine (1972); Derthick (1970,1972); Pressmann and Wildavsky (1973); Murphy (1974); Hargrove (1975); Binstock and Levin (1976); (Frawley 1977:1); Williams and Elmore (1976); Edwards and Sharkansky (1978); and Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) on the implementation process and its failures in the domestic social policy area.

In Great Britain a famous study on policy implementation is that of Dunsire (1978). A later publication then on the topic of implementing public policies, particularly pollution policy, is one by Levitt (1980). According to E.G. Bain (1993:36), a South African public administration scientist, as far as could be ascertained there is a dearth of publications on public policy implementation in Africa, most particularly in Southern Africa; as a matter of fact, only incidental reference is made to the public policy implementation process in textbooks published in Southern Africa and South Africa specifically. This poverty in publication might be one of the major reasons why after nearly 50 to 60 years of independence, there is not visible social and economic development in Africa.

3.3. Two overriding public policy implementation models of analysis

According to Nakamura and Smallwood (1980:7-19), various preconceptions about policy-making and policy implementation processes have facilitated shape various models of policy implementation. And a systematic synthesis of all the various contributions leads to the conclusion that two overriding models are (a) the classical and (b) the integrationist models of analysis. The two models are briefly treated as follows:

3.3.1 Classical models of analysis

The classical model rests on the following major preconceptions that:

1. policy-making and policy implementation are bounded, separate and sequential.
2. these boundaries exist because:
- there is a clear division of labour between policy makers [policy deciders] who set goals and policy implementers who carry out these goals into practical effect;
- policy makers are capable of stating policies definitively because they can agree on a priority among different goals;

- policy implementers possess the technical capability, the obedience and the will to carry out these policies [Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980:10].
3. the implementation process unfolds in a chronological fashion in which policy making always precedes policy implementation [ibid].
4. decisions of policy implementers are non-political and technical in nature [Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980:10].
5. the delusion that the legislature must have primacy in the whole process of policy formulation and that the executive should be an instrument rather than a brain [Cloete: 1977:94-5].

Critical comments and definite shortcomings

The classical model is also labelled the top-down approach – an approach which regards policy as given and seeks to explain what is right or wrong with the implementation process and with the institutions responsible for implementation rather than policy itself. It is biased and one sided. The top-down approach also assumes that it is a comparatively simple task to measure progress towards these goals.

But the classical model has definite limitations to top – down; of assuming simplicity in areas of sophisticated complexity, and of the delusion that, the legislature must have primacy in the whole process of policy conceptualisation and that the executive including the administrative should be an instrument tool than a brain. This is myopic thinking and does not reflect nor represent the true situation.

3.3.2   Integrationist model of public policy implementation

The emergence of the integrationist model, as its name suggests, moved away from the diverging trend of the classical model into a direction of a converging of interests between policy making and policy implementation as the two major sides of public policy. The major preconceptions of this model are:

a. The fine distinction between policy making and policy implementation often disappears entirely; for instance, legislation may have ambiguities or even contradictions and public officials must, in the process of interpreting, clarifying, advising, recommending, and programming the legislative intent, make some explicit choices about policy content.

b. Implementation is just as important as the decision itself since during the implementation stage contending views of various actors, including public officials, are carefully worked out. Subjects of dispute which could be have been postponed during the initial stages of policy making must now be resolved methodologically and practically.

c. Increasing emphasis on the qualities of the implementers as key actors in the public policy process, for example, the psychological and human factors that can influence the implementer's behaviour, a reciprocal process of mutual adaptation between policy makers and policy implementers, the roles that implementers can play to impede, frustrate and subvert policies, and political intrigue that can surround attempts to implement specific policies.

The integrationist model of analysis is also referred to as the bottom-up approach and horizontal – vertical approach of policy implementation – an approach in which what is actually done is accorded prominence, that is, how and why groups and individuals act the way they do. Policy may be one of the variety of factors that may influence group and individual behaviour in implementation, but it cannot be assumed that this will be so.

Drawing on the preconceptions of the integrationist model, policy-making and policy implementation can be considered to be inextricably linked. Also, the roles of public officials in the relationships between policy-making and policy implementation are different to those of the protagonists of the classical model. Public officials are no more mere instruments of implementation. No longer can public officials be likened to unwilling and unresponding feather beds or bowls of jelly. Public officials influence public policy making.

3.3.3   Complementary roles of policy – makers and public administrators in implementation

On the contrary, in the process of mutual communication which leads to decision and which, after decision, interprets the results and incubates new decisions, the public administrator as an official has a place no less important and responsible than that of the elected political office – bearer and representative [Pollitt, Lewis, Nigro and Pattern 1979:78]. Furthermore, public officials are granted an increasing degree of discretionary authority; they are active not only in the traditional executive branch of government but also in the legislative and judicial institutions. That greater discretionary authority to, inter alia, public officials is regarded to be of importance in Southern Africa, is emphasized as proclamations are being made to assign and involve the public service to ministers and public administrators, especially in southern Africa and Africa for example by proclamation No 88 of 1983 [promulgated in terms of section 5 A (1) of the South African Public Service Act, 1957 (Act 54 of 1957) as amended]. This whole argument is much consistent with and is lucidly, cleverly and

better explained by rationally following the insightful and educative definition: that, on an open – systems analysis basis, public administration may be defined as:

a. that open special societal sub – system of interrelated, institutions, dynamics, actions and processes
b. operating legally in a particular society, that is, the comprehensive social system, as environment
c. with the objective of competently and responsibly facilitating the formulation (conceptualisation) and adoption (deliberate choice of alternative available) of the appropriate and necessary governmental policy (ies);
d. economically, efficiently and effectively implementing the authoritatively adopted public policies;
e. the conscious control of public activities by officials [including of course meticulous evaluation of public policy results] (S. B. M. Marume: CUAS, October 1988)

IV.   Factors influencing public policy implementation

4.1 Famous writers and their notable contributions

The fact that public policies are sanctioned by legislations and promulgated in legislative acts of one or other kind, does not necessarily lead to their automatic implementation. Various factors exert an enormous influence on public policy implementation. Various authorities, writers and their notable contributions in this regard can be quoted and be dealt with briefly as follows:

4.1.1   Edwards and Sharkansky (1978:295-321): elaborate the following difficulties that decision-makers face in attempting to realize their intentions:
- communication: transmission, clarity and consistency;
- resources: staff, information and authority;
- disposition of implementers: bureaucratic politics, incentives and bypassing channels;
- sops [standard operations procedures; and
- follow-up.

4.1.2   Ruth Levitt (1980:200): lists 19 features of public policy implementation covering aspects such as:
- time-scale for introducing legal powers;
- public policy as function of public expenditure policy;
- opportunity costs of alternative priorities;
- value of outside pressure on implementing agencies;
- images as determinants in inter-organisational dealings;
- learning from enforcement experience; and
- Benefits of international policy-making.

4.1.3   Frawley (1977:22-7): identifies five sources of errors and slippage between public policy intent and execution, namely;
- interpretation and definition of goals;
- development of guidelines and regulations;
- delegation and communication;
- operations; and
- monitoring.

4.1.4   Halparin, noted by Frawley (1977:28): offers three (3) basic explanations for the failure of public policy implementation, that is:
- lack of knowledge;
- lack of ability and competence; and
- lack of desire.

4.1.5   Van Horn and Van Meter, noted by T. P. Hlynn (1977:81,82): identify eight (8) variables that influence efforts to implement programmes and which improve their performance; they are:
- the political environment;
- the economic and social conditions;
- policy standards: clarity, objectivity and tasks;
- policy resources: adequacy of funds and incentives;

- the characteristics of the implementing agency: quality of staff, organisational structure and relationships with other officials and units;
- the disposition of implementers: comprehension of policy standards,
- whether implementers are favoured favourably inclined or opposed to a policy and with what degree of intensity;
- communication: accuracy, clarity and consistency, and
- enforcement.

4.2 Selected framework of analysis of influencing factors

As can be seen from the above lists, which are by no means exhaustive, some of the critical factors proposed by the different authors and scholars are mutually inclusive. In selecting a workable conceptual framework for systematic exposition, an adapted version of the application by Edwards and Sharkansky has been decided upon because of its wider applicability, suitability and validity. This conceptual framework consists of the following general elements: communications; resources and disposition of implements.

4.2.1   Communication

Edwards and Sharkansky (1978:295) state "The first requirement for effective implementation is that those responsible for carrying out a decision must know what they are supposed to do. Orders to implement a policy must be....... consistent, clear and accurate in specifying the aims of the decision-makers."

Professor J.J.N. Cloete (1982:8) one of the leading Southern African public administration scientists, holds the same view in that laws, proclamations, regulations, official guidelines and other official documents should be so carefully worded that political office-bearers, public officials and lay members of the public can see at a glance what actions are envisaged or under way. Indeed, this means that official documents should be worded in such a precise manner that political office bearers and public officials will be able to quantify and qualify information to the extent that decisions made and actions taken are to be accountable in accordance with the prescriptions or the factual data.

The important and constant reference to communication as a factor which influences public policy implementation can be analysed from a three-pronged view, namely:

- transmission: the absence of a sound communication system and the blockage of information somewhere in the system result in ignorance of decisions, orders and guidelines;
- clarity: by which is meant that orders or instructions should not be vague about when, where or how implementation is to be carried out; vagueness can make changes in policy difficult and can result in changes far greater than those anticipated;
- consistency: because there is seldom just one order, implementation orders may be inconsistent as well as vague. inconsistency and vagueness of orders may even increase commensurate with the multiplication of directives throughout different branches and levels of institution or government.

  In addition to the above, a striking feature of policy statements is that reasons can be advanced for policy ambiguity, that is,
- many policies do not lend themselves to clear performance indicators or targets – particularly in broad, complex and for-reaching goals;
- ambiguity can be regarded as a built-in safety measure – a safeguard against imperfect understanding and against the lack of control;
- ambiguity may be seen as an instrument to leave room for manoeuvre, negotiation and renegotiation.

4.2.2   Resources

Lack of resources not only hinders policy-making, it also limits the effective policy implementation: " No matter how clear the implementation orders are, if the personnel responsible for carrying out policies lack resources to do an effective job, policy makers will be disappointed in the results." [Edwards and Shakansky 1978:12,303].

Without resources, the implementation of policy which has been referred to as the effective phase may become the ineffective phase. Moreover, policies cannot be declared as being effective in themselves, nor can they be implemented by their mere statement, that is, they are not self-executing, without staff, access to information, and authority.

Six manifold enabling functions

This observation re-enforces the statement that, is the administrative process as a framework consists of six manifold enabling functions, viz, policy, organisation, finance personnel (staff), procedures and control [POFPPC] J. J. N. Cloete 1985;1 – 4) then to these initial conditions which have to be met can be added the remaining enabling functions, that is, organising, financing, procedures and control and evaluation.

Control systems and procedures

It needs to be appreciated that control and procedures are also referred to as follow-up and SOPs [Standard Operating Procedures] respectively by Edwards and Shakansky (1978:313,317).

The old adage of "men, money and machinery" is, therefore, no less important in the implementation stage than it is in policy-making.

Not surprisingly, political office-bearers also support the importance of the enabling functions. Even after a policy has been made legitimate, much may still need to ne done to ensure its implementation. For example,

(a) organisational arrangements would be necessary;

(b) money may need to be made available through the annual estimates of expenditure.

(c) staff may need to be recruited, trained and utilised;

(d) work methods and procedures may have to be devised and this could require regulations and procedural manuals or codes; and

(e) control measures may have to be instituted so as to see that policy objectives are indeed being pursued, and policy results evaluated.

4.2.3   Disposition of implementers

It has been stated quite clearly that policies are not self – implementing. They require implementers. This is compatible with the contributions by cheminals, Bayat, Waldt and Fox [1998] who clearly maintain that:

The availability of finances, physical resources, infrastructure, equipment, buildings, technology and information of no consequences without a well – trained, efficient and effective workforce to provide the relevant service clients. This is particularly so in public service organisations where the rendering of public goods and services to the community or society at large takes place in the context of scarce resources and competing demands.

Therefore, well – trained, motivated public employees are a prerequisite for the effective and efficient rendering of service to our communities [op cit]].

> Those who are skilled and experienced in public personnel administration will always advise that the favourable disposition of implementers in indispensable to the successful public policy implementation.
> Source S. B. M. Marume, 1988

The natural tendency of behaviour of public officials is important because not only must they know and have the capacity to implement a specific policy, but they must also desire to carry it out if implementation is to proceed effectively efficiently and economically [Marume: 2015]. This is very important indeed.

Moreover, those who implement public policy are in many ways independent of their superiors who make the final policy decisions, and independence means discretion. The way in which public officials exercise their discretion will be influenced by how they see the policy in question and how they project its effect on the public's interest and their personal and organisational interests [Edwards and Shakansky 1978:308].

Administrative leaders

Add to this that behind the scenes administrative leaders exert much greater influence on governmental affairs than political office bearers would like to admit, and the importance of the disposition of implementers becomes evident. It has been suggested that the disposition of implementers can hamper policies in three (3) ways:

- selective perception and accepting of if policies are not in line with their own predisposition.
- the ensuring frustration in executing policies with which they do not agree;
- because implementers feel that they are important links in the implementation stage without whom public policies can never be set into motion, and that they know how best a policy area in question. ".....there is a strong likeliwood of purposive opposition to some policies." [Edwards and Shakansky 1978:308].

Summary on disposition of policy implementers

A clear knowledge of the disposition of public administrators and their immediate subordinates as implementers of policy is very important. Behind the scenes administrative leaders exert for much greater influence on governmental affairs than politicians and political office – bearers [parliamentarians, ministers, provincial and local councillors etc] would like to admit, and the importance of disposition of implementers becomes evident.

Admonition

Developing countries in particular African governments are advised against overlooking or understanding the role of public servants as officials in policy implementation.

4.3 General comments and observations on Africa's 30 to 50 years
4.3.1 No perceivable implementation and evaluation frameworks

According to research studies [P. Chamie and P. B. Mihyo, 2013], many scientists, academics and practitioners maintain that Africa is in a phase of continuous moments changes to try to solve many of its social, political, and economic problems; develop capacities; and align itself with global management and administrative performance standards. One of the central components of Africa's determination to catch up and line up is good governance that is, encompassing

a. policies and management and administration that effectively optimize sustainable long term social and economic development outcomes for the people;
b. the waves of public sector reforms in Africa over the past 30 to 40 years are part of this programme.

4.3.2 The ultimate objectives are clear. But the major question is:
- what should change?
- When should change take place?
- How to achieve the objective?

The answers must be sought through both
- a vision of the future and the wisdom of kind sight: why, after some 50/60 years of sovereign independence and with the putative (thinking) efforts of the western world trying to help, is so much still unimposing?
- having a handle on those reasons is pivotal to any solution.
- so, to put current public sector reforms programmes in perspectives and contexts, a rear – view mirror is necessary in the forms of public policy implementation plans and public policy methodologies.

4.3.3 From literature available on other countries, many governments have failed because of public officials. Particularly in the case of leading public officials, their preferences determine to a significant extent their approach to leadership and consequently to the implementation of government policies.

4.3.4 While it is acknowledge that there is more literature on public policy – making, there is, however, very scanty literature on implementation and much more critically and seriously scantier on African public policy implementation.

4.3.5 What this implies is that there is no knowledge on what actually happens in the world of public policy implementation process. To compound the complete problem there is not a clue on the evaluation methodology of public policy implementation.

4.3.6 African governments talk of social and economic developments of their countries yet when their policies are under implementation, there is not a visibly consistent implementation plan. Further, there is not a systematic evaluation methodology of policy results.

4.3.7 African public policy implementation and public policy results are left to chance to occur.

V. Summary

Public policy implementation may be referred to as the second or effective phase of a public policy and has no less importance than policy making. Since the early 1970s a revival of interest has developed in examining what happens in the implementation phase, notably in the United States of America. The main arguments of the protagonists of the public policy making/implementation dichotomy are upset by studies which have shown that the assumption that the making and implementation of public policy can be neatly severed is misleading. On the contrary, an ever increasing emphasis is being placed on the roles implementers have to play in governmental affairs. Political office – bearers and public officials have complementary roles of policy – makers on the one hand, and on the other hand, public administrators in implementation.

Factors which may influence the implementation of public policy [that is, in government institutions, meaning government ministries / departments] are communications, resources, and the disposition of implementers, each having a bearing on public policy implementation in the southern African and African contexts.

Bibliographical References

[1]. P. Chanie and P. B. Mihyo (ed): Thirty years of public sector reforms in Africa: selected country experiences: Organisation for Social Science Research in Eastern and 2013, Southern Africa [OSSREA], Fountain Publishers: Kampala, 2013
[2]. J.J.N. Cloete: South African Public Administration: selected readings: Pretoria: J.L.van Schaie, 1977.
[3]. J.J.N. Cloete: Introduction to Public Administration: Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik, 1986.
[4]. G.C. Edwards and I. Shakansky: The Policy Predicament: Making and Implementing Public Policy: San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1978.
[5]. S.J. Frawley: Bureaucratic Competition and Policy Implementation: published D.Phil dissertation, Faculty of of the Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Ann Arbor Michigan, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977.
[6]. T.P. Glynn: Implementation of Public Policy: the Role of Executive Leadership: Waltham, Brandeis University: published PhD. Thesis, 1977.
[7]. W. Fox and Ivan H. Meyer: Public Administration Dictionary: Juta and Company Limited, 1995.

[8]. S.X. Hanekom and C. Thornhill: Public Administration in contemporary society: A South African perspective: Johannesburg, Macmillan, 1983.
[9]. R. Levitt: Implementing Public Policy: London: Croom Helm, 1980.
[10]. S. B. M. Marume: SADCC administration of economic programmes with special reference to food and agricultural programmes: unpublished PhD. [Public Administration] thesis: California University for Advanced Studies: October 1988.
[11]. S. B. M. Marume: Advanced public policy analysis: unpublished PhD programme: Academic work No 10: California University for Advanced Studies: State of California: August 31, 1988.
[12]. C. Pollit, L. Lewis, J. Nigro and J. Pattern: Public policy in theory and practice: Bungay: Suffolk, The Chaucer Press, 1979.
[13]. Nakamura and F. Smallwood: The Politics of Policy Implementation: New York; St Martins Press, 1980.

Sandra Mabhiza

Samson Brown Muchineripi Marume: a former senior civil servant for over 37 years in various capacities and 10 years as deputy permanent secretary; ten years as a large commercial farmer; well travelled domestically within Zimbabwe, regionally [SADC countries: Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Mauritius, Swaziland, South Africa, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and DRC]; and Africa [Kenya, Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt, Nigeria, Ghana, Libya, Uganda]; and internationally [Washington, New York and California in USA; Dublin and Cork in Ireland; England in United Kingdom; Netherlands, Spain (Nice), France, Geneva in Switzerland, former Yugoslavia-Belgrade; Rome and Turin in Italy; Cyprus – Nicosia; Athens – Greece; Beijing and Great walls of China; Singapore; Hong Kong; Tokyo, Kyoto, Yokohama, Osaka, in Japan]; nine years as management consultant and part – time lecturer for BA/BSc and MA/MBA levels with Christ College- affiliate of Great Zimbabwe University, and PhD/DPhil research thesis supervisor, internal and external examiner; researcher with Christ University, Bangalore, India; currently senior lecturer and acting chairperson of Department of Public Administration in Faculty of Commerce and Law of Zimbabwe Open University; a negotiator; a prolific writer as he has published five books, thirteen modules in public administration and political science for undergraduate and prostgraduate students, and thirty four journal articles in international journals [IOSR, SICA, IJESR, MAESR, IJSER, IJBMI, IJHSS Hs and Quest Journals] on constitutional and administrative law, public administration, political science, philosophy, Africa in international politics, local government and administration, sociology and community development; vastly experienced public administrator; and a distinguished scholar with specialist qualifications from University of South Africa, and California University for Advanced Studies, United States of America: **BA** with majors in public administration and political science and subsidiaries in sociology, constitutional law and English; postgraduate special **Hons BA** [Public Administration], **MA** [Public Administration]; MAdmin magna cum laude in transport economics - as major, and minors in public management and communications; **MSoc Sc** cum laude in international politics as a major and minors in comparative government and law, war and strategic studies, sociology, and social science research methodologies; **PhD** summa cum laude in Public Administration .

Dr. Chipo Mutongi: Doctor of Philosophy in Information and Knowledge Management (ZOU); Master of Science in Library and Information Science – (NUST); Master of Business Administration (ZOU); Degree in Media Studies (ZOU); Higher National Diploma in Library and Information Science (Harare Polytechnic); Diploma in Library and Information Science (Bulawayo Polytechnic); Diploma in Education (UZ); Diploma in Personnel Management (IPMZ); Diploma in Salaries Administration (Stallone Consultancy); Certificate in Desk Top Publishing (CCOSA); Certificate in Web Designing (People's College); Certificate in Computer Repairs (People's College); part-time tutor and ZOU PhD/DPhil research thesis supervisor understudy.

N. C. Madziyire: current studies: DPhil (candidate); Master of Education (Educational Administration) (UZ); Bachelor of Education (Curriculum studies and Teacher Education) (UZ); Diploma in Teacher Education (Dip TE) (UZ); Primary Teachers' Higher Certificate (St Augustines); I am senior lecturer in the Faculty of Arts and Education at the Zimbabwe Open University; I serve as a Programme leader for The Bachelor of Education in Youth Development studies; I am also responsible for developing Distance materials for distance learners; I write, content review and edit modules in the Faculty.