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Abstract
This article is centered on the debate on politics-administration relations in democratic governments. The focus is on Ghana's local government and on the administrative side of the relationship. Its key objective is to investigate the dominant model of the relationship between appointed and elected members of the district assemblies (Ghana's local government system). The study reviewed three theoretical approaches to the relationship, namely the orthodox dichotomy, the modified dichotomy and the partnership model. While the orthodox dichotomy holds that politics and administration are two separate fields which must be removed from each other, the modified model sanctions administration veering into policy making but bars politics from venturing into the management side of government. The partnership model, on the other hand, advocates the interconnectedness of politics and administration. The study reveals that there are traces of all three models in Ghana's local government administration. Although the partnership model seems to be the most preferred model, there is the tendency of some administrators to hold on to the policy implementation function.
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Introduction
Scholars of the developing world have not been left out in the discussions on the relations between politics and administration in democratic governments. This discussion, popularly referred to as the politics-administration debate, is one of the most contentious issues in public administration discourse (Svara, 2008; Demir and Nyhan, 2008; Shaw, 2010). This debate among various politics and administration scholars is mostly about whether or not politics can be separated from public administration and what key factors affect the relationship between these two important fields. This article is divided into five main sections. The first section provides the background and problem analysis of the topic; this is followed by a brief review of literature on the theoretical approaches to the debate. The third section contains a brief overview of the structure of Ghana's local government. In the fourth section the data collection methods are discussed; this is followed by a summary of findings and conclusion in the fifth and final section.

Background and Problem Analysis
The politics-administration relationship has been an important question in public administration; to the extent that more than a century of debates has not stopped the question from being engaging and challenging to scholars and practitioners (Demir and Nyhan, 2008). In the opinion of Johnny Shaw, the relationship has been an unsettled issue in debate and affected the relationship between political authorities and administrative institutions to a great extent in world democracies (Shaw 2010). This debate is obviously as relevant today as it was in the days of early public administration scholars like Woodrow Wilson and Frank Goodnow. This is against the backdrop of the fact that politicians and administrators, in especially developing democracies, continue to struggle for supremacy within the governance system. This, in most cases, results in conflicts which obviously affect the overall performance of local authorities. Ghana is no exception. In Ghana, local governments have been empowered to champion the overall development of their areas of jurisdiction (AfariGyan 1999; 1992 Republican Constitution of Ghana; The Local Government Act, 1993, Act 462). This involves policy formulation and implementation processes which are the tasks of elected and appointed officials (i.e. politicians and bureaucrats) of the assembly. The searchlight therefore falls on politics and administration and for that matter, the interaction between elected members and career bureaucrats in this relationship. What makes the Ghanaian situation worth probing is the fact that the chief executive and even some councilors (assemblymen) are, by law, appointed by the President.
Although some studies have been conducted over the past two decades to assess the decentralization program in Ghana since 1988 (the latest being Ahwoi's (2010), Local Government and Decentralization in Ghana), what has apparently eluded academic enquiry into the effectiveness of the local government system is the relationship between elected and appointed officials of the assembly. This dimension needs to be looked at critically, and that is the main task of this article. The aim is to provide a deeper insight into how the relations between elected and appointed officials can either enhance or impede an assembly's mandate of effectively managing the total development of a district.

This study would be guided by the following research questions: Which of the three models of politics-administration dichotomy prevail in Ghana's district assembly system? Is there a preference for one model over the others, and why?

This study seeks to:

· explore whether public administrators perceive their relationship with assembly members in ways that conform to the politics-administration dichotomy models;
· investigate the dominant model of politics-administration relations practiced in district assemblies of Ghana;
· examine the positive impact of any preferred model on decision-making towards development.

Overview of the Theoretical Approaches to Politics-Administration Relations

Since Woodrow Wilson advanced the orthodox politics-administration dichotomy, critics of this model have taken pains to develop an alternative to the dichotomy which could stand the test of time. Two of such alternative models propounded by these public administration scholars to characterize the relationship between elected and appointed officials in democratic governments are the modified dichotomy and the partnership model (Montjoy and Watson, 1995). In the orthodox model, Wilson argued that politics and administration were two separate and distinct fields that must be separated from each other, and that political questions were different from administrative questions, for which reason there should be a clear line of distinction between the two (Wilson, 1887, in Shafritz et al, 2004). Goodnow, in solidarity with Wilson, contended that politics has to do with policies or the expressions of the state will while administration has to do with the execution of such policies or, of the state will (Shafritz et al, 2004).

Another generation of public administration scholars, however, disputed the strict separation of politics from administration as propounded by Wilson and rather advanced a partnership model of the relationship founded on complementarities and interconnectedness between politics and administration. In-between the orthodox and partnership models of the dichotomy, is the modified model which holds that the rather strict distinction between politics and administration, as advanced by Wilson, may apply to politics and administration but not to policy and administration (Montjoy and Watson, 1995). These models are discussed briefly below.

The Orthodox Model of Politics-Administration Dichotomy

The politics-administration debate has been traced by many scholars to Woodrow Wilson's 1887 scholarly essay titled “The Study of Administration”. In that publication, Wilson explicitly explained that there ought to be a clear distinction between politics and administration. In Wilson's opinion, “The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics” (Wilson, 1887: 209). He further asserted that administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics and that administration questions are not political questions. Besides, although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices. Wilson did not stop here but further went on to argue that the broad plans of governmental actions are not administrative but rather it is the detailed execution of such plans that is administrative. Woodrow Wilson was not alone in this line of thinking; Frank Goodnow later on identified two sides of public policy: expression and execution. Goodnow (1900) submitted that politics has to do with policies or the expression of the state will, while administration has to do with the execution of such policies.

Goodnow's position seems to echo that of Wilson who expressed the need to create a clear separation between political and administrative responsibilities with politicians acting as sovereign representatives of political values and interests and administrators acting as subordinate policy executers, whose major concern is efficiency (Carboni, 2010). According to Wilson, politics is about policy making while administration is an instrument used for translating formulated policies into concrete results through the application of bureaucratic
expertise founded on specialized knowledge and skills. Corson and Haris's (1963) view of public administration fits in here; when they proclaim public administration as the action part of government, the means by which the goals and purposes of government are realized. In the words of Wilson: Seeing every day new things which the state ought to do, the next thing is to see clearly how it ought to do them. This is why there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its dutifulness...... (Wilson, 1887, in Shafritz et al, 2004).

The Modified Dichotomy Model

Although Wilson's position on politics-administration relations dominated at the time of its postulation, many public administration scholars expressed doubts about the dichotomy model even during the height of its popularity (Dunn and Jeromes Jr. (2002). Notable among them were John Pfiffner and James Svara. Pfiffner (1935) for example submitted that it would be folly to suggest that administrative officers should have absolutely no hand in the formulation of policy. Svara (1998), for instance, basing his criticism on the 1952 International City Management Association Code of Ethics, argued that the city manager as a community leader submits policy proposals to the council and provides the council with facts and advice on matters of policy to give the council a good basis for making decisions geared towards satisfying community aspirations. This, no doubt, suggests the direct involvement of the manager who is an administrator in policy making. This is contrary to Wilson's view as propounded by the orthodox dichotomy. In his article 'The Publicness of Public Administration', Pesch (2011) quotes Appleby (1945/1967) as stating that:

Administration is treated as a term involving policy-making as well as execution. It is so treated because it is felt that a great deal of policy-making is implicit in what the executive branch does, and that it is important to recognize this policy-making function (of administration). Persisting in a rigid distinction between politics and administration obstructs an assessment of the political aspects of public organizations.

Aplebey's submission reemphasizes the point that administration is deeply involved in policy making, and that because administration occurs in a political environment it does not function in isolation, instead it is intertwined with politics in many ways.

This view is similar to the modified politics-administration dichotomy advanced by Montjoy and Watson (1995). Montjoy and Watson argued that although the orthodox dichotomy ideally prohibits local government managers from venturing into the policy-making, in reality these managers and other public administrators are active participants in the policy-making process. Accordingly they constructed a version of the dichotomy that endorsed the involvement of administrators in policy making but barred council members from interfering in the management of the government; that is in the implementation process.

In putting their view across, they developed a distinction between politics and administration on the one hand, and policy and administration on the other. These scholars argued that instead of just looking on to the politician to formulate policies, the manager is expected to exert policy leadership to the politician, thus breaking down the wall between politics and administration. As rightly noted by Aplebey above, persisting in a rigid distinction between politics and administration may obstruct an assessment of the political aspects of public organizations.

The opinion expressed by Montjoy and Watson is that the dichotomy model may hold for politics and administration but not for policy and administration. They advocate the provision of policy leadership by administrators to elected officials; on the other hand, elected officials should leave implementation and general management questions to career bureaucrats who are professional administrators.

The Partnership Model of the Relationship

The partnership model focuses on the interconnectedness between politics and administration. It holds that administrators can have great impact on policy making and that elected officials can have great impact on administration. Svara (1998) observed that a strict separation of politics and administration as propounded by the orthodox dichotomy was unproductive. Instead, politicians and administrators must complement each other. Thus, while the modified dichotomy model sanctions administrators venturing into policy making, the partnership
model not only sanctions that as well but also sanctions elected officials venturing into administration by being involved in implementing and executing laws and policies.

Shafritz et al (2004) report that Goodnow later observed that actual political necessity requires some level of harmony between the expression and execution of the state will, and that, lack of harmony between the law and its execution results in political paralysis. To him this harmony can be obtained by sacrificing the independence of either politics or administration. He further indicated that while the function of politics has to do primarily with the expression of the state will, it has to do secondarily with the execution of that will. This indicates that the separation between the two must somehow be bridged, even if the independence of one is to be sacrificed.

Svara (1999b; 2001) supported the partnership model with a construct which he termed the complementarity of politics and administration. Svara's model stresses interdependency, reciprocal influence, and extensive interaction between elected and appointed officials, but with the recognition of the need for distinct roles and political supremacy.

In this and the next sections we shall look at empirical evidence of the nature of the politics-administration interface in two African countries namely, South Africa and Tanzania.

Politics-Administration Relations in South Africa

Mafusina (2003) submits that politicization of the South African public service is historical. He traces this politicization to the coming into power in 1948 of the National Party (NP), at which time the National Party staffed senior positions in the public service with loyal party members who clearly understood the apartheid system and were willing to push the policies of discrimination to the letter. In that situation, it was difficult to separate the government-the-day and the public service; the two were virtually fused together. Cameron (2010) attests to Mafunisa's submission, even after the collapse of the apartheid system. He personally explains politicization as partisan control of the bureaucracy, when civil service practices are governed by political rather than administrative norms, and buttressed it with Peters and Pierre's (2004:2) definition of politicization as “the substitution of political criteria for merit-based criteria in the selection, retention, promotion, rewards, and disciplining of members of the service”. To Cameron, this practice is rife in South Africa's current governance system. In his study 'Redefining political-administrative relations in South Africa', Cameron (2003) tentatively concludes that political control over appointments of senior public servants has intensified under the post-apartheid African National Congress (ANC) government, as compared to the National Party's apartheid administration.

What this means is that even routine administrative functions like appointments, promotions, transfers and performance management are largely influenced by politics to the extent that at one stage ANC members, some of whom even lacked any management experience, were deployed to senior positions in the bureaucracy. Cameron quotes from a 2007 Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) study on political involvement in bureaucracies in the appointment, dismissal, promotion, transfer and performance assessment of public servants; published results indicate that South Africa was the third out of twelve countries studied that exhibited high political involvement in such administrative activities. This practice has considerably contributed to unsatisfactory service delivery Mafusina (2003). For instance Cameron (2010) has indicated that attempts to empower South Africa's public managers through New Public Management (NPM) reforms have been 'half-hearted' and hence frequently incompletely implemented. This has resulted in a high turnover of senior managers in South Africa's public organizations. In the light of this however, Cameron (2003) has argued that governments should have the right to appoint senior managers who not only share their ideological beliefs but also possess the managerial competence to perform effectively. This, in effect, partly corroborates Adamolekun's (2004) position that merit-based public service helps enhance the efficiency and productivity of any administrative system, and partly endorses South Africa's Presidential Review Commission's (of 1998) position that for the sake of possible sabotage by disloyal incumbents of previous regimes, there is the need for political appointments within the public service as a cushion against unsupportive public servants (Mafunisa, 2003).

Politics-Administration Relations in Tanzania

Jacobsen (1999) decided to take investigations into the politics-administration relations to another level, focusing on 'trust' between the two fields. In his paper: 'Trust in Political-Administrative Relations: The Case of Local Authorities in Norway and Tanzania', Jacobsen has made some interesting revelations. Starting from Wilson (1887), Goodnow (1900), and Weber (1946), Jacobsen summits that
these classical public administration scholars have stressed the need to separate politics from administration on the simple basis that politics is about values while administration is about facts. Accordingly, politics and administration should have different logics of action, different ways of validation and different tasks. This position has however been disputed by other renowned writers like Svara (1991), Rosenbloom (1989), and Jacobsen (1996). This latter generation of scholars maintains that in both developed and developing countries, politics and administration are intermingled in ways that tend to turn administrators into politicians and politicians into administrators, thus dislocating the supposed separation. The thesis of Jacobsen's work is that trust is crucial in the type of relationship that exists between politicians and public administrators. He suggests that whenever there is distrust between politicians and administrators the latter have the propensity to hold back vital information from the former, especially if such information is politically harmful to the administrator. In an atmosphere of trust, however, administrators may willingly disclose information to politicians even if such information seem detrimental to them, trusting that such disclosures will not be used against them (Jacobsen, 1999), immediately or in the future.

Results from this study indicate that: first, Tanzanian administrators exhibit a significantly lower degree of trust than their Norwegian counterparts; second, in Tanzania, public administrators discuss important and difficult decisions among themselves before seeking opinions from other groups like external specialists and organized interest groups; politicians do not feature much in such deliberations. This is at variance with the Norwegian practice in which the second most prominent discussion partners after bureaucratic colleagues are politicians when difficult decisions are about to be made. Thirdly, Tanzanian administrators regard their role in policy implementation as more decoupled from 'political signals' while Norwegian administrators are more inclined to implementing political decisions loyally even if they disagree with such decisions.

We may infer from these findings that in Tanzania the relationship between politics and administration is more skewed towards the orthodox dichotomy model than the complementarity model. On the other hand the Norwegian system is more of complementarily than any other model. Since trust plays an important role in creating and enhancing free-flow of information between politicians and administrators in decision-making (Jacobsen, 1999), political development requires that trust between politicians and administrators must be created and strengthened in any political system. This, according to Jacobsen is more feasible in mature democracies like Norway than in infant democracies like Tanzania.

An Overview of Ghana's Local Government System

After a long spell of what many have described as military dictatorial rule in Ghana where political and administrative discretion was the preserve of the military and a few privileged elites, the last military government, the Provisional National Defense Council (PNDC), initiated a process to broaden the boundaries of governance beyond the castle (central government) to the people. This mission was contained in a 1982 government document titled “PNDC Policy Guidelines” which explicitly conveyed the urgent need for participatory democracy to ensure that the bane of remote government that had afflicted Ghanaians since independence is done away with effectively, to render government truly responsive and accountable to the governed (Ahwoi, 2010).

This policy provided the foundation upon which the current local government system of Ghana was laid since this vision was translated into action with the promulgation of the Local Government Law, 1988, (PNDCL 207), albeit six long years after the expression of intent.

Four years after the enactment of this law, Ghana began its journey into the fourth republic as a democracy. The 1992 Fourth Republican Constitution then became the supreme law of the state. In chapter twenty of the Constitution, titled 'Decentralization and Local Government', Article 240 (1) states that “Ghana shall have a system of local government and administration which shall, as far as practicable, be decentralized.” The constitution then empowered Parliament to enact appropriate laws to ensure the transfer of functions, powers, responsibilities and resources from the central government to local government units (Article 240 (2)(a)). Furthermore, Parliament was enjoined to “provide for the taking of such measures as are necessary to enhance the capacity of local government authorities to plan, initiate, co-ordinate, manage and execute policies in respect of all matters affecting the people within their areas, with a view to ultimately achieving the localization of those activities” (Article 240 (2)(b). In pursuit of this task, Parliament proceeded to repeal the existing law, PNDCL 207, replacing it with the Local Government Act, 1993, Act 462. This legislation, just like its predecessor, spelt out the structure of Ghana’s local government system, with its duties and responsibilities. It conferred on local government (called district assemblies) the highest political authority in each district, with deliberative, legislative
and executive powers. Being the highest political authority in the district, an assembly's functions include formulating and implementing plans, programs and strategies for the effective mobilization of the resources necessary for the overall development of the district (Afari-Gyan, 1999).

It is this process of deciding and implementing plans and programs that brings to the fore the relations between decision makers and implementers at the local government level, thus rekindling this seemingly unending debate in public administration, in the Ghanaian context.

The Structure of Ghana's Local Government

By structure of the local government system, we mean the layers of authority and the relationship between the various parts of the local government system. The current local government system (of Ghana) is made up of a Regional Coordinating Council (RCC) and a four-tier Metropolitan and three-tier Municipal/District Assembly structure. The metropolitan assemblies have a four-tier structure comprising the metropolitan, sub-metropolitan district councils, town councils and unit committees. The municipal assemblies have a three tier layer comprising the municipals, zonal councils and unit committees. District assemblies also have a three tier layer comprising the district assemblies, urban/town/area councils and unit committees. These assemblies are administered by a combination of political appointees and career bureaucrats. Ghana's local government is under the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and is governed a number of legislations. Prominent among these are: Constitution of the Fourth Republic of Ghana (Promulgation Law, 1992 (P.N.D.C.L. 282); Local Government Act, 1993 (Act 462); National Development Planning (Systems) Act, 1994 (Act 479); National Development Planning Commission Act, 1994 (Act 480), Local Government Service Act, 2003 (Act 656), and District Assembly Common Fund, Act, 1993 (Act 455).

Data and Methods

Since the strengths and weaknesses of any scientific research are largely determined by methodical strategies and decisions, this section attempts to highlight the logical structures and procedures employed by this study. The primary aim of this research has been to gain exploratory understanding of how the relation between politics and administration at the local government level impacts decision-making.

The study adopted both theoretical and empirical approaches. The theoretical aspect entails discussion and examination of the politics-administration relations debate. Qualitative approach of generating relevant data was employed mainly. This approach is preferred because the phenomenon being studied is a social one which lends itself better to qualitative analysis. In qualitative research scientists must gain an empathic understanding of social phenomena, and they must recognize both the historical dimension of human behavior and the subjective aspects of human experience (Frankford-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996).

Data was obtained from two hundred and six (206) administrative personnel comprising 28 from metropolitan assemblies, 68 from municipal assemblies, 47 from district assemblies and 63 from sub-metropolitan district councils throughout Ghana. Research assistants (students of the political setting of administration class) were detailed to their home districts to administer questionnaire, and seek any relevant information concerning the relationship between elected officials (assemblymen) and appointed officials (career bureaucrats). Sampling was therefore largely purposive. Since the focus of this study was on the administrative side of the relationship, respondents included finance officers, planning officers, human resource officers, auditors, budget officers, district co-coordinating directors, directors and deputy directors. These respondents were briefed on the intent of the study, which was mainly to establish the model of politics-administration relations which dominates Ghana's local government system. Questionnaires designed to obtain responses from public administrators on their degree of involvement in policy formulation and policy implementation were administered to them. Additional comments outside the questionnaires but relevant to the study were also solicited. For each question, respondents were given a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree to choose from.

Findings of the study

On the question as to whether top appointed officials should fully partner elected officials in the policy formulating process, 113 out of the 206 respondents representing approximately 55% strongly agreed, 83 representing 40% agreed and 10 representing 5% disagreed.

On the flipside, the percentage of appointed officials who were of the view that elected and appointed officials should be full partners in policy implementation dropped markedly while those who shared a contrary
view appreciated. Specifically, approximately 35% strongly agreed and 45% agreed to the proposition that assemblymen should be full partners with appointed officials in policy implementation. Opposed to these are 27 respondents who disagreed and 14 who strongly disagreed. These 41, who share a similar view, constituted 20% of the total number of respondents.

Next, respondents were asked to comment on the statement that good policy decisions in government require a blending of expert knowledge with political preference. A whooping 102 strongly agreed and 92 agreed. These together represent about 96% of respondents. There were obviously discerning views but in this instance the 4% representation is relatively insignificant.

On sharing of responsibility in the policy process, 25 respondents strongly agreed that policy making should be the sole responsibility of elected officials while policy implementation should be the responsibility of appointed officials. 37 also agreed on this proposition. These constitute 12% and 18% respectively, totaling 30% of respondents who support this view. On the other hand, 90 officials disagreed and 54 strongly disagreed. Put together, 70% of respondents do not support a water-tight sharing of policy making and implementation responsibilities between elected officials and appointed officials of the assembly.

On the position that administration should be completely removed from politics, 50 of the appointed officials strongly agreed; this represents 24%. Another 44, representing 21% also agreed that this arrangement would lead to an efficient public administration system, especially when the implementation process is devoid of political interference. A greater number, however think differently. Those who strongly disagreed numbered 47 while 65 disagreed. In effect, 112 appointed officials approximately representing 55% do not share this notion of strict separation of politics and administration and by extension policy implementation from policy formulation.

Respondents unanimously acknowledged the expertise of career bureaucrats in shaping public policy. However they were not unanimous on how this expertise should be placed at the disposal of the politician. Seventy-one (71) respondents representing 34.5% strongly agreed and 72, representing 35% agreed with the view that appointed officials should offer the best expert advice to appointed officials and leave them to make the final decision based on their political discretion and values. In contrast, 50 officials representing 24.3% disagreed while 13 representing 6.2% strongly disagreed that appointed officials should be left to solely take up the decision making responsibility. Still on the balance between policy making and policy implementation, 107 appointed officials signifying 52% strongly agreed and 60 representing 29% agreed that policy making should be a combined effort of both appointed and elected officials but policy implementation should be the sole responsibility of appointed officials. Thirty-one (31) respondents representing 15% disagreed and 8 representing 4% strongly disagreed with this opinion.

As to whether elected officials should keep away from policy implementation, 74 respondents representing 36% strongly agreed and 51 representing 25% said yes, they agree that elected officials should leave the function of policy implementation to them. However, 56 representing 27% and 25 representing 12% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. On the subject of policy monitoring, 90 respondents making up 43.7% strongly agreed while 65 constituting about 33.6% agreed that elected officials should keep away from policy implementation and rather provide appointed officials feedback on how well policy is implemented to achieve set goals. Those who either disagree or strongly disagreed together constituted 22.7% of the respondents. A summary of responses is presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Survey Questions on Politics-Administration Relations in the Policy Process
(Strongly Agree & Agree = Agree; Disagree & Strongly Disagree = Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed officials should fully partner elected officials to formulate policy</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials should fully partner appointed officials to implement policy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good policy decisions in government require a blending of expert knowledge with political preference</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elected officials should be responsible for policy making while appointed officials take charge of policy implementation | 30 | 70
Administration should be completely removed from politics | 45 | 55
Appointed officials should fully put their expertise at the disposal of elected officials | 69.5 | 30.5
Policy making should be a combined effort of appointed and elected officials but implementation should be the sole responsibility of appointed officials | 81 | 19
Elected officials should keep away from policy implementation | 61 | 39
Elected officials should leave implementation to appointed officials but provide feedback on implementation to appointed official | 77 | 23

Statements adopted from Montjoy and Watson (1995) and modified by author

Discussion
As depicted in Table 1 above preference for the three models of politics-administration relations is not by consensus. For instance although most of the respondents opine that good policy decisions in government require a blending of expert knowledge with political preference for which reason appointed officials should take part in policy making and elected officials should be involved in policy implementation, others still believe that elected officials should be responsible for policy making while appointed officials take charge of policy implementation. These two positions fit into the partnership and the orthodox models respectively. The partnership model largely associated with James Svara stresses complementarity and interconnectedness between politics and administration and a harmonious relation that pulls resources and efforts of both fields together in the policy process. The dichotomy model on the other hand submits that policy making should be the responsibility of elected officials while appointed officials take up the responsibility of policy implementation. Some administrators however opted to holding on to the implementation process although they would like to feature prominently in policy formulation. The partnership is approach obviously is opposed to both the orthodox dichotomy as well as the modified dichotomy.

Conclusion
This paper is a simplified illustration of politics-administration relations in government. The study has reinforced the assertion that arriving at a consensus on the relationship between politics and administration at the local government level is a mirage for now; and that the debate on politics-administration relations is far from over. Going by the responses of appointed officials, there is preference for one model or the other. Although most local government administrators consider partnership between politics and administration in policy formulation and implementation as viable, quite a significant number see the active involvement of politicians in the implementation process as interference. The researcher will like to state however that since the study has been on only the administration side of the relationship, it would be prudent to delve into the politics side as well to engender a fair and balanced recommendation to local government administration. This is the next project of the researcher.
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