
Mashupye Herbet Maserumule
Tshwane University of Technology, Soshaguve Campus, South Africa

Polly Mashigo
Tshwane University of Technology, Ga-Rankuwa Campus, South Africa

Abstract

This article examines economics and public administration as twin-sciences that [should] go together for rounded-knowledge and adopts a case study approach based on the curriculum development at the universities of technology in South Africa. Curriculum development in public administration is critically analyzed with the objective to determine the extent it recognizes economics in the production of the graduates to enable them to unravel the development conundrum of the country. The article contends that economics is underplayed in the current public administration curriculum development. It is strongly recommended that economics should be considered an “anchor subject” in the public administration instructional offerings to ensure that the graduates are equipped with rounded-knowledge to play an important role in furthering the developmental agenda of the country. Keywords: Public Administration, Economics, Curriculum Development, Developmental State, Universities of Technology
Introduction

Economics permeates each and every sector of human activity and interaction. It is about how limited resources are used to create wealth. In the contemporary world, public administration plays a critical role of providing direction in terms of how that wealth should be distributed, although its involvement in the economy differs from one country to another depending on a particular economic system at play. The public administrators are therefore faced with the challenges of taking decisions within the context of economic realities of their communities. They often make decisions in the face of limited resources. This is a fundamental economic challenge. A sound knowledge of the fundamentals of economics is, therefore, essential for all public administrators and policy makers in the business of government.

The fundamentals of economics include, among others, inflation, unemployment, poverty, national and international trades, fiscal and monetary policies, and the economic behavior of households and organizations in the private and public sectors. Knowledge of economics is important in understanding various phenomena that impact on the survival of human beings. Its teaching, particularly at the institutions of higher learning, is fundamentally important and should form an integral part of the curriculum of even those specialized instructional offerings that fall outside its formal purview as an academic discipline.

Engineers, lawyers, medical doctors, nurses, social workers and physicists, just to mention but few, also invariably need some degree of understanding of economics to efficiently carry out their specialized functions. Including economics as an “anchor subject” in all set of courses that are being pursued for various professional and academic qualifications in the social and natural sciences is a sound approach to curriculum development as it would ensure that institutions of higher learning produces the caliber of graduates that are well-rounded and could easily understand the economic dynamics that underpin human actions. This is, however, often disregarded in various curriculum development endeavors. In this article curriculum development in the field of public administration at the universities of technology in South Africa is critically analyzed to determine the extent of the recognition of economics as a twin-science that should go together with the science of public sector governance. For, as pointed out above, public administration plays a critical role of providing direction in terms of how wealth should be distributed.

Methodology

In engaging with the issue of whether public administration and economics should go together as twin-sciences for rounded-knowledge, this article adopts a case study approach. Welman and Kruger (1999) define a case study as a qualitative research method of empirical inquiry that examines a unit of analysis within its real-life context. A unit of analysis refers to a subject of empirical analysis, which, in this article, is curriculum development in the field of public administration and its contextual setting for analytical engagement is universities of technology in South Africa. A research question that informs this methodological approach that this article poses is: To what extent do curriculum development endeavors in the field of
public administration at the universities of technology in South Africa recognizes economics as a twin-science that is critically important for generating rounded-knowledge?

In examining this question, the article begins with a description of the context of empirical analysis, which, as already indicated above, refers to universities of technology in South Africa. This entails a brief reflection on the antecedents and development of the universities of technology. In this regard, the concept university of technology, due to its novelty in the parlance of higher education transformation discourse in South Africa, is untangled to acquire more insight into what it really entails; thereby also demonstrating the extent of its variation from a traditional university. This exercise is important as it provides a contextual framework for the examination of the question that this article posits. Curriculum development in the field of public administration is thereafter critically analyzed with the objective to determine the extent it recognizes economics as an “anchor science” critically important in the production of the caliber of graduates equipped with the quality of knowledge that would enable them to unravel the development conundrum of the country. From this intellectual exercise, significant conclusions about the subject of empirical analysis are made and the answer to the question that this article asks is provided.

Universities of Technology in South Africa

In the article published in the *African Journal of Public Administration and Management*, of which this part of the discourse is based on, Maserumule (2005), the co-author of this contribution, extensively examines the history of the universities of technology in South Africa. He writes that their origin, of which their direct pedigree are the technikons, could be traced to the latter part of the 19th century with the development of mines and railways that required the caliber of workforce equipped with technical skills. Consequently, training centers designated technical colleges were, in the early years of the 20th century, established to offer technical education to develop appropriate skills then required. As a result of the growing needs for highly skilled personnel in the commercial and industrial sectors, the educational programs of the technical colleges assumed an advanced level and their designations were, following the adoption of the Advanced Technical Education Act, 1967 (Act 40 of 1967), changed to the colleges for advanced technical education (CATE’s). For a variety of reasons, the designation “colleges for advanced technical education” did not, however, get that much public approval and was subsequently, following government adoption of the Advanced Technical Education Amendment Act, 1979(Act 43 of 1979 - hereafter referred to as only as the Amendment Act 43 of 1979), changed to Technikon (Committee of Technikon Principals 2003).

The concept technikon was coined by combining techni with kon. Techni originated from the Greek word techne, meaning ingenuity, dexterity or skill; whereas kon is an Afrikaans word, which its equivalent in English is could, an auxiliary verb implying the ability to do something. By joining these two words together a uniquely South African term was invented to define career-focused institutions of higher learning whose curriculum is of experiential and vocational nature with study programs designed in a manner aimed at producing graduates with the ability to readily put in practice their skills in the real world of work. Following the Amendment Act 43 of 1979, colleges for advanced technical education existing then henceforth became known as technikons and other new ones were also subsequently established according to separate legislations. Eventually the number of
The status of the technikons was greatly elevated with the promulgation of the Technikon Act, 1993 (Act 125 of 1993), which, in addition to their awarding of certificates and diplomas, made it possible for them to award degrees as well (Committee of Technikon Principals 2003).

As part of the broader higher education transformation agenda that the African National Congress (ANC) pursued after it assumed power in 1994, the number of technikons was, following the Ministry of Education’s announcement in 2003, reduced from fifteen to five. The designation technikon was also changed to university of technology. This was appreciatively well received particularly by the Committee for Technikon Principals, which lobbied for such name change during the higher education transformation process (see Committee of Technikon Principals 2003; Department of Education, South Africa 2003). As observed by the Committee of Technikon Principals (2003), the universities of technology in South Africa are the same as the universities of technology, technological universities, technical universities or institutes of technology in countries such as the United States of America, Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Hungary; the Hogescholen in Belgium and Netherlands; or the Fachhochshule in Germany.

The mergers and incorporations of institutions of higher learning as approved by government took place on 1 January 2004. They resulted in the establishment of Tshwane University of Technology, Central University of Technology and Vaal University of Technology. The Durban Institute of Technology came into being earlier in April 2002, following the mergers of Mangosuthu and M L Sultan Technikons. The merger approved for 1 January 2005 resulted in the establishment of Cape Peninsula University of Technology (Department of Education, South Africa 2003). The fundamental reason for changing the designation technikon and replacing it with university of technology seem to have been, inferring from the contemporary higher education transformation discourses and debates, primarily necessitated by a need to conform with the international trends and also to use concepts that are universally recognizable. South Africa was the only country in the world that, since 1979, used the concept technikon. This rationalization for the changing of the designation technikons to university of technology is however jettisoned as being meretricious and spurious. Its uncritical acceptance would amount to travesty of reason. Designating technikons universities of technology is much more than just mere name changes. It bring along a variety of implications and challenges, particularly in as far as the core responsibilities of institutions of higher learning are concerned, that need to be seriously considered and not just to continue with the business of the technikon as usual under the new designation. This brings the disquisition to the question: what is a university of technology?

**Concept of a university of technology**

In South Africa, the concept of university of technology has just permeated higher education transformation discourses and debates. Indeed, the institutions of higher learning have merged and incorporated to create the things called universities of technology, which surely must have certain fixed character. The question regarding the foregoing therefore is: what are those fixed characters of the universities of technology, particularly in terms of their distinction from the traditional universities? In an attempt to acquire an insight into what a university of technology is, it is important that the concepts “university” and “technology” should first be looked at separately.
Hornby (1994, 1397) defines a university as an “institution that teaches and examines students in many branches of advanced learning, awarding of degrees and providing facilities for academic research”. A university is therefore, in a nutshell, a repository for advanced knowledge. The concept “technology” is about the application of knowledge to carry out practical tasks in the real world of work. When the concept “university” is used with the qualification “technology” it implies a particular distinct focus with regard to the educational programs. The universities of technology are therefore, in the context of the foregoing exposition, distinct from the traditional universities in terms of their mission and focus of their educational programs.

The fundamental objective of the universities of technology is to provide and promote, in closer co-operation with the business and government sectors, quality career-focused and advanced technology education coupled with applied and development research to meet the developmental imperatives of a changing world. They are therefore mainly concerned with applied knowledge or sciences. This is in stark contrast with the traditional universities whose education focuses on academic disciplines and their research is mainly about expansion of knowledge through development of theories, what is called basic research (see Brynard & Hanekom 1997; Huysamen 1994; Ladriere et al 1974; Mouton 1996; Smit 1995; Wessels 1999).

The university of technology education, therefore, inferring from the above exposition, the mission and profiles of similar universities already established in other countries and the contemporary discourses and debates on the transformation of higher education sector, is characterized by a variety of fundamental aspects, which, inter alia, include the following:

- career orientated educational programs comprised of outcome-based and demand-driven curriculum with multi-disciplinary subject packages;
- development and generation of advanced knowledge and its integration with professional skills and technology;
- emphasis on application of knowledge and enhancement of professional expertise, competence and practice;
- emphasis on immediate and productive employability;
- focus on applied and development research;
- direct interaction with the labor market in designing the curriculum; and
- experiential learning, which is about putting students in the real world of business or work for vocational employment as an integral part of the course structure (see International Education Association of South Africa, South African Vice-Chancellors Association, Committee of Technikon Principals & Artwork Publishing 2003; Queensland University of Technology 2004; Swinburne University of Technology 2001).

In the context of the understanding developed above, it is now appropriate to examine the question about the extent curriculum development endeavors in the field of public administration at the universities of technology in South Africa recognizes economics as a twin-science that is critically important for generating rounded-knowledge. In dealing with this issue and for reasons of logic, the article considers some historical facts about the development of public administration as an academic discipline and the extent economics was or is recognized in its set of courses as an “anchor-subject” at the universities of technology in South Africa.
Development and status of Public Administration as an academic discipline at the universities of technology

Public administration has been part of the instructional programs of the technikons in South Africa and is still offered at the universities of technology. For many years after its inception as an academic discipline, the teaching of public administration in South Africa was influenced by Cloete’s analytical framework introduced in 1967. Cloete propagated that public administration comprises six generic administrative processes or functions: policy-making, organizing, financing, personnel provision and utilization, determination of work procedures and control. These generic administrative processes or functions became the centerpiece of the subject-matter or the focus of public administration education.

Learning materials and books in the field of public administration written since 1967 gyrated around Cloete’s generic administrative processes or functions. This is so because most professors and/or lecturers in public administration in South Africa are the former students of Cloete whose teaching, according to Marais (1988), had an “unbelievable long-lived influence” on them (p.170). The six generic administrative processes or functions approach to curriculum development ignored other dimensions of and approaches to public administration, notably the economic dimension of and approach to the field. Economics as an “anchor-subject” was ignored when public administration curriculum was developed and structured around the Cloete thesis. This was clearly underscored in the Mount Grace Resolution, which is referred to in detail below.

It was the critical Marais in 1979 and 1987 that, in the papers titled Die administratiewe proses: 'n kritiese ontleding and Public administration: paradigmatic status, seriously and fervently contested the Cloete approach to the study of public administration, which had then assumed ipse dixit proportions with regard to its influence on the teaching of the subject. The debate Marais rigorously pursued in contestation of Cloete’s generic administrative approach was reiterated in 1991 in the resolution of the conference of the New Public Administrative Initiative (NPAI) dubbed the “Mount Grace Resolution” quoted in its entirety below as it is still an important source of reference in designing and developing public administration and management curriculum. The “Mount Grace Resolution” stated that:
The current theory, teaching and practice of Public Administration in South Africa is in crisis in that:

- It is too descriptive: lacking sufficient analytical, explanatory and predictive techniques;
- It is reductionist: restricting and reifying Public Administration to one view of the administrative process only;
- It ignores other dimensions of and approaches to government;
- It is fragmentary: largely arbitrary boundaries exist within Public Administration and between Public Administration and Development Administration; and
- It suffers from racial and gender imbalances historically associated with apartheid.

It is therefore outdated in a rapidly transforming society such as South Africa. New approaches to the study, teaching and practice of Public Administration are necessary. These should entail:

- An explicit normative focus on inter alia:
  - promoting more democratic, inclusive and participatory government and public service at all levels of government;
  - a just, equitable and non-racial society with equal access for all people to societal resources;
  - providing better public services to people to enable them to improve their quality of life and become more self-reliant;
  - maintaining values such as efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, accountability, responsibility and responsiveness
- More rigorous scientific analysis, explanation and prediction of governmental and administrative phenomenon supplementing their mere description are necessary.
- An open and critical debate on explanatory models for this purpose must be encouraged.
- An explicit developmental focus instead of a control and regulation orientated one must be established. This should include rationalization between Public Administration and Development Administration.
- Developing proactive and usual international networks.

Following the Mount Grace Resolution, coupled with international trends towards managerial approach to public administration that permeated the whole Anglo-American world of public administration during 1980s and 1990s, various departments and schools of public administration at the institutions of higher learning amended their curriculum to befit the new thinking in the field. While other universities retained the designation Public Administration to describe their instructional programs, others changed to, or use the designations, Public Administration and Management, Public Administration and Developmental Studies or Public and Development Management. Most technikons changed the designation Public Administration to Public Management.
Designating new names to the instructional programs epitomized certain value positions and curriculum directions. Curriculum focus on public management at technikons indicates that their niche was on educating students to acquire a more profound understanding on how to effectively manage public services with the purpose of enhancing the quality of life of the citizens. The core curriculum of public administration programs at most institutions of higher learning are designed around the following critical aspects: planning, organizing, staffing, developing, controlling, operating, reporting and budgeting. These aspects are generally considered important for the development of the skills that are necessary for effective management of public services (see Thompson undated).

Curriculum development along the imperatives of public management approach to public administration also considered the importance of the economic values of efficiency, effectiveness and productivity in managing the public sector. Clearly, the intention in this regard was to put public administration on a strict business basis managed by officials skilled in business management and economics. In some technikons in South Africa, economics was also introduced as an “anchor-subject” in the broader public administration curriculum; whereas in other instances it was even made a major subject.

The public administration program as offered at the technikons was, in 2000, re-curriculated to supposedly maintain congruency with the contemporary trends in the ever-changing environment of the South African public administration. The re-curriculated public administration program comprising modules as transcribed in Table 1 below is the one currently being offered at the universities of technology in South Africa:

**Table 1: Re-curriculated Public Management Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Level</th>
<th>Second Year Level</th>
<th>Third Year Level</th>
<th>Fourth Year Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Services 1</td>
<td>Public Information Practices 11</td>
<td>Management of Information 111</td>
<td>Public Accountability IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Delivery 1</td>
<td>Project Management 11</td>
<td>Intersectoral Collaboration 111</td>
<td>Governmental Relations IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Decision-Making 1</td>
<td>Public Procurement and Logistics Management 11</td>
<td>Policy Studies 111</td>
<td>Public Policy Management IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Management</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Research 11</td>
<td>Programme Management 111</td>
<td>Research and Information Management IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical general overview of public administration curriculum and pedagogical practices

For being able to understand the logic of this article in the argument whether economics and public administration should go together as twin-sciences for rounded-knowledge, it is important to first provide a critical general overview of the public administration curriculum, as described above, and associated pedagogical practices. Public administration curriculum introduced in 2000 for the technikons, as compared to how it used to be structured before, is pruned of its theoretical component and is consequently largely skills-based. Economics as a subject in the broader public administration curriculum is dropped. The latter observation that relates to economics is, because of its importance in the central argument of the article, considered more specifically in a separate section below. The problem with this curriculum, which is instrumentalist in its approach to education, is that students learn skills in a theoretical vacuum. This is even exacerbated by the usage of “study-manuals” in some institutions.

Study-manuals are compilations of information from different sources into one booklet often prescribed for students to study in preparation for the examination. Compared to textbooks, the usage of study manuals is mainly confined to the institutions where they have been developed and their readership is limited to lecturers’ instructional interactions with the students in the lecture halls. Study-manuals do not get critical peer-review from the wider community of public administration and management scholarship, as is the case with the textbooks, which are easily accessible and available for everybody to read and study. Their appropriateness in generating and nurturing knowledge is highly dubious. The study-manual tuition system denies students an opportunity to dissect on their own as many sources of information as possible around issues that constitute the core syllabus of public administration programs and compile notes with their own interpretations and understandings of the literature. It inculcates the culture of dependency on one source among the students and research apathy among the lecturers. This is travesty of scholarship in the business of knowledge-generation and dissemination.

In most study-manuals developed in some technikons/universities of technology, government practices are just merely described without delving much deeper to unearth the theoretical bases and reasons for such practices, whether they are acceptable or not; and if not, what could be the better options. Study-manuals are mostly developed from a lack of contextual understanding of what is happening in the real world of public administration and their scientific validity and quality are often questionable. They engender the culture of routinization of learning characterized by mindless exercises given to students, which do not examine their level of knowledge and mastery of the subject matter but the ability to regurgitate information for examination purposes. Using Macedo’s (1993) words to characterize the current status of Public Management curriculum, its instrumentalist approach to education “set the stage for the anaesthetization of the mind”(p.188), as poet John Ashbery eloquently captures in “What is Poetry”:

In schools

All the thoughts got combed out:
What was left was like a field
The current public administration curriculum is illogical as, in the domain of logic; skills are developed on the basis of knowledge and not the other way round. The instrumentalist approach to education reduces students to mindless entities programmed like mechanical instruments to do things in a particular way without adequate knowledge of the reasons for those things to be done as such. Using Macedo’s (1993) words, this pedagogical approach obstructs “the development of critical thinking that enables one [students] to read the world critically and to understand reasons and linkages behind the facts” (p.183-205). In this mode of education students are taught to uncritically accept the status quo and this is very dangerous particularly in a developing country like South Africa, which is currently faced with a variety of public service delivery and development challenges. This is made even worse by the fact that economics as a subject is no longer being taught as part of public administration curriculum. Against the foregoing background, this article now critically analyzes the public administration curriculum with specific reference to economics to contextualize the argument whether these disciplines should go together as twin-sciences for rounded-knowledge.

Critical analysis of public administration curriculum with specific reference to economics

In the context of the current developmental challenges that South Africa faces, dropping economics in the public administration curriculum does not make any sense. What informed this curriculum direction in the field of public administration is misinformed about the development trajectory that South Africa is pursuing. The strategic focus of government at this epoch that dawns the second decade of democracy in South Africa is on building and consolidating a developmental state. The imperatives of a developmental state necessitate that the quality of life of the citizens must be enhanced through an improved service delivery of public services and the creation of appropriate environment to maximize the participation of the citizens in the mainstream economy particularly those that were previously marginalized by the apartheid system. Improving service delivery and creating a befitting climate for equitable citizen participation in the mainstream of economy are two-pronged challenges confronting the government (Maserumule & Mathole 2006). These challenges necessitate the caliber of government officials who do not only master the art and science of governance, but also of economics. Given the emergence of public expenditure concept as an integral component in the economic studies between the period 1960s and 1970s, the foregoing is even more important. The concept of public expenditure focuses on the demand for and supply of government goods and services as well as resource allocation in the public sector (see Economics and Public Administration, undated).

The knowledge of both public administration and economics is important in assisting government officials to improve, strengthen and reform their governance systems and administrative institutions; strengthen their policy making capacity; and improve overall efficiency of the government machinery. The societal problems are solved by public administration and economics explain choices. This means that public administration identifies normative rules that would lead decision-makers to make optimal decisions whereas economics identifies rules that decision makers are likely to follow (see Economics and Public Administration undated). Of more importance in this “public administration-economics nexus” is the ability of government officials to identify and effectively respond to
emerging global trends and challenges. The current global financial crisis threatens the economies of the countries of the world and impacts negatively on the efforts to realize the Millennium Development Goals. This needs the caliber of government officials with sound economic knowledge to make informed decisions, particularly in dealing with the challenges as brought about by the global economic meltdown.

Since the inception of the democratic dispensation in 1994, South Africa has committed itself to correcting structural injustices and improving the living standards of the people and recognises socio-economic rights (access to basic services such as housing, health and education) enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa as an integral component of developing the country. The government, therefore, embarked on a variety of development initiatives clearly expressed in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), developed back in 1993, Growth, Employment and Redistribution Strategy (GEAR), in 1996, and Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative (ASGISA), in 2006. All these development initiatives, with huge economic implications on the country, are aimed at addressing the socio-economic challenges such as poverty, unemployment, and unequal distribution of resources that face the country and public administration is expected to play a leading role in ensuring their successful implementation. In the context of South Africa, the knowledge of economics is even more essential for public administrators as it would provide a theoretical framework to understand these contemporary development initiatives.

RDP is an integrated policy framework for socio-economic renewal, transformation and empowerment to establish a systematic approach to the democratization and development of the South African society. Its central thrust is to reduce the poverty of the majority of South Africans and make services of an economic nature accessible to all. To give rise to ample employment opportunities and a redistribution of resources, GEAR was developed as a strategic intervention aimed at accelerating the pace of realizing the objective of RDP. As a result of an increase in unemployment (from 26% in 1994 to 30.5% in 2002), the 2004 government committed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) set in 2000 (Development Report 2005), which is to halve poverty and unemployment by 2014. The government introduced ASGISA as another intervention to accelerate the pace of development. ASGISA focuses, in particular, on fast job creating growth, ensure availability of the needed skills, create opportunities for those marginalised, and maintain policies that brought macroeconomic stability.

The theoretical antecedents of these development initiatives are embedded in the science of economics. Therefore, the “brightest and best servants” that the imperatives of a development state needs should not only be schooled in the science of governance but of economics as well. This would ensure that various programs of government, largely those that are aimed at eradicating poverty and unemployment, are properly managed by people with rounded-knowledge.

Economics is extremely important for governments and policy makers as it provides comprehensive and in-depth knowledge to analyze the economy in terms of these development initiatives which are very significant in the provision of quality public services. Economic decisions and actions are taken every day by economic agents such as individuals, governments and firms and economics is the study of these decisions and actions and of the way economic processes work. Economics therefore provides knowledge of regional and municipal development, public administration, and economics, and prepares graduates for
careers in local, municipal and central authorities of government administration, as well as various institutions.

In a developmental state, government establishes social and economic goals. Factors of production are privately owned but the government must always intervene and influence the direction and pace of economic and social development rather than leaving them to the dictates of the markets to ensure that the national interests are always realized. This needs a “strong state capacity”, which is achieved through the creation of inexpensive, efficient and effective public service staffed by the nation’s brightest and best servants functioning without constraints and capable of being innovative in addressing the social and economic needs of the citizens.

It is in this context that public administration and economics [should] go together as twin-sciences for rounded-knowledge. An omission of economics in the public administration curriculum at the universities of technology following the re-curriculation exercise of 2000 is therefore a gross mistake, which its effect is mass production of graduates whose knowledge profile do not adequately befit the orientation of a developmental state. Much of knowledge that the universities of technology create through the current public administration curriculum is skewed towards the science of governance and economic science is underplayed. In one of the modules called Public Resource Management in public administration curriculum, consideration of economics in public administration is only limited to normative values of efficiency, effectiveness and productivity in governance. The theories of economics, which constitute its scientific essence, are not covered. A concern is always being raised in government circles about the quality of graduates that the institutions of higher learning produce. This is an indictment on the quality of knowledge that the public administration educational programs produce through their curricula that are narrowly focused. Economics has recently emerged as public administration’s preeminent paradigm and is much more directly relevant to the concerns of public administration and to solve real life economic problems.

Conclusion

By adopting a case study approach, this article examined the issue of economics and public administration as twin-sciences that [should] go together for rounded-knowledge. Curriculum development in the field of public administration is critically analyzed with the objective to determine the extent it recognizes economics as an “anchor science” critically important in the production of the caliber of graduates equipped with the quality of knowledge that would enable them to unravel the development conundrum of the country. Economics as a science is underplayed in the current curricula development endeavors in the field of public administration at the universities of technology. The caliber of the graduates that come through the curriculum do not therefore posses a rounded-knowledge that appropriately befits the skills needs of a developmental state. The lack of rounded-knowledge is exacerbated when public administration curriculum is divorced from economics. Economics is a sphere in intimate connection with public administration and inextricably connected to public officials concerning quality public service delivery. Graduate should possess knowledge that will enable them to effectively carry out the country’s developmental state and deal with economic and social issues affecting the economy.
In view of this, the article strongly recommends that economics should be brought back as a subject in the public administration instructional offerings in order to ensure that the type of graduates produced are equipped with a rounded knowledge to play an important role in furthering the developmental agenda of the country. Economics and public administration are twin-sciences that [should] go together for rounded-knowledge.
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