Chapter 1

Public Administration History & Theory

MPA Comprehensive Exam Study Guide

1.1 Key concepts in public administration

Accountability - Peters (2001, pg. 137) suggests that this is an element of 2nd wave of reforms. Earlier forms of accountability focused on exceptional failures with political embarrassment of the sitting government. There has been a shift in mechanisms of accountability to push toward a focus on average performance and a more complete assessment of organizational and programmatic performance. (Scorecards, Performance Improvement)

Bureaucracy - Weber (1946, pg. 50) in his landmark article, "Bureaucracy" lists 6 characteristics of a bureaucracy:

1. There is a principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are generally ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administration regulations,
2. The priniciples of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones,
3. The management of the modern office is based upon written documents ("the files"), which are preserved in their original or draught form,
4. Office management, at least all specialized office management—and such management is distinctly modern—usually presupposes thorough and expert training,
5. When the office is fully developed, official activity demands the full working capacity of the official, irrespective of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited,
6. The management of the office follows general rules, which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned.

He also comments on the position of the Official:

1. Office holding is a "vocation",
2. The personal position of the official is patterned in the following way:
   a. enjoys a distinct social esteem as compared with the governed,
   b. pure type of bureaucratic official is appointed by a superior authority
   c. normally, the position of the official is held for life

d. the official receives the regular pecuniary compensation of a normally fixed salary and the old age security provided by a pension. Salary is measured according to status, not wage.

e. The official is set for a "career" within the hierarchical order of the public service.

Citizen participation: how administrators relate to citizens

Frederickson attempted to describe the public administrator as a representative citizen attempting to bridge the chasm of self-interest that has been suggested since the founding of the country. In this model, public administrators are employed by their fellow citizens to carry out the work of citizenship on their behalf, and are the primary contact between the citizens and public organizations. When the contact is effectively carried out, the contract is reaffirmed and renewed. Frederickson offers the following model for citizen vs. administrative participation in government:

	HIGH CITIZENSHIP		
LOW ADMINISTRATION	*HIGH CITIZENSHIP* *LOW ADMINISTRATION* ANCIENT ATHENS	*HIGH CITIZENSHIP* *HIGH ADMINISTRATION* ANCIENT ROME	HIGH ADMINISTRATION
	MODERN AMERICA *LOW ADMINISTRATION* *LOW CITIZENSHIP*	ANCIENT EGYPT *HIGH ADMINISTRATION* *LOW CITIZENSHIP*	
	LOW CITIZENSHIP		

Table 1: Frederickson model for citizen vs. administrative participation in government

Frederickson concluded that public administrator's must take unapologetic leadership in making American public institutions more reflective of the communal values of

justice and equity that are our heritage. He cautioned that the problem is in balancing the needs and interests of individuals and groups on the one hand with the community on the other.

Complementarities: political-administrative relations

Svara stated that political superiors and administrators were commonly thought of as strictly separated, but there is considerable evidence that they interact extensively in a complementary relationship with each providing important contributions to the other. In nonprofit organizations, the interaction and shared involvement is widely recognized. This model is in contradiction to the classic politics-administrative dichotomy. Svara and Brunet list 3 characteristics that demonstrate complementarities:

1. political superiors and administrators maintain distinct perspectives based upon unique values and differences in formal positions,
2. officials have partially overlapping functions as political superiors provide political oversight of administration and administrators are involved in policy making, and
3. there is interdependency and reciprocal influence between political superiors and administrators; each impacts the other.

The balance between the two sets of officials depends upon administrators meeting certain obligations including:

1. should support the law, respect political supremacy, and acknowledge the need for accountability. They should be loyal to the mission of their organization,
2. since administrators serve the broadest of public interests, it may bring them into conflict with political superiors and segments of the public,
3. take responsibility for their actions,
4. should be independent with a commitment to professional values and competence,
5. should be honest in their dealings with elected officials and deal ethically,
6. should encourage political superiors to fulfill their responsibilities.

Democracy

Raadschelders said that democracy as rule (in Greek, krateoo) by the people (in Greek, demos) is institutionalized as a particular division of labor between public and private institutions as well as a division of labor between public servants and citizens. The first division of labor refers to the balance between government intervention and self-governance. The second concerns the balance between direct citizen participation and indirect citizen participation. A representative democracy requires the voluntary support of all its citizens. The citizenry is the largest possible clientele a government can have and thus the challenge is meeting its varying needs. In contrast, a dictatorship or government by a few (aristocracy, oligarchy), only concerns itself with the group of people that are considered to be relevant to the government's legitimacy.

The politics-administration dichotomy

Wilson first advanced the politics-administrative dichotomy. The reform movement argued that public appointments should be based upon fitness and merit, rather than partisanship, necessitating that "politics" was out of place in public service. Wilson's other main themes was that public administration should be premised on a science of management (productivity and efficiency) and separate from traditional politics.

Goodnow suggested that modern administration presented a number of dilemmas involving political and administrative functions that had supplanted the traditional concern with the separation of powers among the various branches of government. Politics and administration could be distinguished, he argued, as "the expression of the will of the state and the execution of that will." He admitted that when the function of political decision making and administration was legally separated, there developed a "tendency for the necessary control to develop extra-legally through the political party system."

Internalized/External control: complexities of accountability

Jensen and Meckling defined an agency relationship under which one or more persons (the principal(s) engage another person (the agent) to perform some service on their behalf which involves delegating some decision-making authority to the agent. If both parties to the relationship are utility maximizers there is good reason to believe that the agent will not always act in the best interests of the principal. The principal can limit divergences from his interest by establishing appropriate incentives for the agent

and by incurring monitoring costs designed to limit the aberrant activities of the agent. In addition, he may pay the agent to expend resources to guarantee that he will not take certain actions that would harm the principal or to ensure compensation if he is harmed. "Residual loss" is the dollar reduction in welfare experience by the principal due to divergence of interests.

Governance

Frederickson said that many scholars use the term governance as a companion or surrogate for public administration. Salamon made the distinction that traditional public administration focuses on management and control of government agencies while the newer forms of public action involve elaborate partnership arrangements with nongovernmental actors. Where traditional public administration stressed hierarchical lines of authority and the mechanisms of command and control, the new forms of action utilize decentralized modes of operation and the techniques of bargaining and persuasion.

New Public Administration (NPM)

New public administration emerged from the Minnowbrook Conference on New Public Administration. Frederickson stated that new public administration added social equity to the classic objectives and rationale for public administration of efficient, economical, and coordinated management of education, police, public health, fire departments, welfare, diplomacy, the military, etc. The movement flowered briefly during the late 1960s and early 1970s distinct from new public management. Hood pointed that NPM was an international trend in public administration that began in about 1975. NPM's rise was linked to four other megatrends:

1. attempts to slow down or reverse government growth,
2. the shift to privatization and quasi-privatization,
3. the development of automation, particularly information technology, and
4. the development of a more international agenda.

Hood stated that NPM is a loose term but there are seven doctrinal components of new public management :

1. Hands-on professional management
2. Explicit standards of and measures of performance

3. Greater emphasis on output controls
4. Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector
5. Shift to greater competition in the public sector
6. Stress on private-sector styles of management practice
7. Stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use.

NPM efforts were mainly in the direction of cutting costs and doing more for less as a result of better-quality management and different structural design.

Professionalism

Frederickson suggested a model that relates citizenship to professionalism in public administration:

High Citizenship	High C ←——————→ High P	High Professionalism
Characterized by living with sensitivity to the consequences of interactions with others **Civic friendship**		Characterized by living with sensitivity to professional standard exempt from public and community standards **Trusteeship**
Low Citizenship	Low C ←——————→ Low P	Low Professionalism
Characterized by the pursuit of self-interest and competitive individualism **Entrepreneurship**		Characterized by living with less regard for professional standards **Technocracy**

Table2: Frederickson model - citizenship to professionalism in public administration

Rational actor

[theory of decision-making in government, that the foundation of a democracy is that of an informed citizenry that makes decisions based upon rational logic]

Simon said that there is a triangle of limits that bounds the area of rationality ("bounded rationality") of an individual in making decisions. The individual is limited by:

1. skills, habits and reflexes which are no longer in the realm of conscious (may be limited by speed of mental processes, elementary arithmetic, etc.),
2. values and those conceptions of purpose which influence him in making decisions, and
3. extent of his knowledge of things relevant to his job (both fundamental knowledge and the ability to apply it to any given situation).

References

Frederickson, H.G. (1971). Toward a new public administration. Excerpted from Toward a new public administration: The meadowbrook perspective by Frank E. Marini. Chandler Publishing Company.

Frederickson, H.G. (1997). The spirit of public administration. San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass.

Frederickson, H.G. & K. B. Smith (2003). The public administration theory primer. Boulder, CO:Westview Press.

Goodnow, F. J. (1900). Politics and administration:A study in Government. NY:Russell & Russell. Reprinted in Classics in Public Administration.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? The rise of new public management (NPM). Public Administration (69). (pg. 503 of Classics of Public Administration)

Peters, B.G. (2001). The future of governing. Lawrence, KS:Univ Press of Kansas.

Raadschelders, J.N. (2003). Government: A public administration perspective. Armonk, NJ:M.E. Sharpe.

Salamon, L. M. (1989). Beyond privatization: The tools of government action. Washington, D.C: Urban Institute Press as quoted in Frederickson: The spirit of public administration.

Svara, J. (2007). Ethics primer for public administrators in government and nonprofit organizations. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Weber, M. (1946). Bureaucracy. In From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. Oxford University Press. In Classics of Public Administration.

Wilson, W. (1887). The Study of Administration. Political Science Quarterly 2 (June) as reprinted in Classics of Public Administration.

1.2 History of world's public admin in a jiffy

1491 B.C. Moses: During the exodus from Egypt Moses followed the recommendation of Jethro, his father-in-law, that he delegate authority over the tribes of Israel along hierarchical lines.

400 B.C. Plato: Recognized management as a separate art; promoted principles of specialization.

325 B.C. Alexander the Great: Applied the principle of line and staff to help conquer most of the known world.

284 A.D. Diocletian: First Roman emperor to rule through genuine delegation of authority and chain of command. He divided the empire into 101 provinces, grouped into 13 dioceses; the dioceses, in turn, were organized into four major geographic divisions.

1494 Pacioli: Invented double-entry bookkeeping.

1525 Machiavelli: Recognized the need for consent and cohesiveness in an effective organization and tried to identify leadership traits.

1776 Adam Smith: Began his great economic work, *Wealth of Nations*, by discussing the principle of specialization.

1789 George Washington: Began what evolved into veterans preference by selecting many of those who had served in the Revolutionary War to fill civil service positions in the new government.

1801 Thomas Jefferson: Began the spoils system in U.S. Government employment.

1810 Robert Owe: Recognized need for training workers and other personnel practices.

1829 Andrew Jackson: Extended the spoils system in U.S. Government employment.

1850 John Stuart Mill: Explained concepts such as span of control, unity of command, and wage incentives.

1856 Daniel C. McCallum: On October 5, 1841 two American passenger trains collided head-on, making it clear that one boss could not watch everything. A well-defined organizational structure was needed, and McCallum developed the organization chart to show that structure.

1883 Pendleton Act: Curbed the spoils system and established the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

1887 Woodrow Wilson: While still a practicing political scientist, Wilson called for public administration to focus on effectiveness and efficiency - not just personnel reform.

1900 Frederic Taylor: The "Father of Scientific Management" recognized the need for labor-management cooperation, for controlling costs, and analyzing work methods.

1919 Boston Police Strike

1921 Budget and Accounting Act: Was passed by Congress, creating the Bureau of the Budget (now Office of Management and Budget) and the General Accounting Office.

1922 Max Weber: The German sociologist articulated the classical definition of the bureaucratic form of organization. (Was not translated and published in the United States until after World War II.)

1923 Classification Act: Began the rationalization of position classification in the federal service.

1927 Elton Mayo: Began the famous management study at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company near Chicago which examined the relationship between work environment and productivity. These studies were the genesis of the human relations school of management thought.

1930 Mary Parker Follet: Developed a management philosophy based on individual motivation and group problem solving - a forerunner of the participatory management idea.

1937 Brownlow Committee: Otherwise known as the President's 1937 Committee on Administrative Management and composed of Louis Brownlow, Charles Merriam, and Luther Gulick, made sweeping recommendations for the reorganization of the executive branch of the U.S. Government.

1937 Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick: Provided the definitive statement of the "principles" approach to management: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (in short, POSDCORB).

1938 Chester I. Barnard: Viewed organizations as cooperative systems in which the "functions of the executive" (title of his classic work) were to maintain a balance between the needs of the organization and the needs of the individual and to establish effective communication.

1939 American Society for Public Administration (ASPA): A national professional organization "to advance the science, processes, and art of public administration" was organized.

1940 Robert K. Merton: Proclaimed that bureaucracy, which Weber (1922) had defined so systematically, had a number of dysfunctions (that is, characteristics that lead to inefficiency).

1943 Abraham H. Maslow: Developed a theory of human motivation in which men and women moved up or down a needs hierarchy, as each level was satisfied or threatened.

1946 Paul Appeleby: Asserted that processes in government organizations are political - at least more than those in business organizations. Philip Selznick, Norton Long, and other writers of the late 1940's were to add theoretical and empirical support to Appeleby's most un-Wilsonian (1887) thesis.

1947 Herbert A. Simon: In his classic *Administrative Behavior*, Simon, like Merton (1940), attacked the "principles" approach to management as often being inconsistent and inapplicable. Like Barnard (1938) and influenced by him, Simon advocated a systems approach to administration and the study of decision making.

1949 Norbert Wiener, Claude Shannon and P.M.S. Blackett: Emphasized systems analysis, operations research, and information theory in management.

1955 Herbert Kaufman, Fred W. Riggs and Walter R. Sharp: First course on comparative administration introduced at Yale University. This movement, which represented a broadening of public administration to other cultures, began to wane in later years as American foreign aid programs were scaled back.

1957 Chris Argyris and Douglas McGregor: Placed emphasis on social psychology and research in human relations in achieving a better fit between the personality of a mature adult and the requirements of a modern organization. Argyris developed an open-system theory of organization, while McGregor poplarized a humanistic managerial philosophy.

1959 Charles A. Lindblom: In his influential essay, "The Science of Muddling Through," Lindblom attacked the rational models of decision making in government. In reality, the model did not work; decision makers, therefore, depend heavily on small, incremental decisions.

1961 Aaron Wildavsky: In an article, "The Political Implications of Budgetary Reform," Wildavsky developed the concept of budgetary incrementalism and its political nature that led to his landmark work, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process.* (1964).

1962 President Kennedy: Issued Executive Order 10988 which permitted unionization and collective bargaining in the federal service.

1964 Civil Rights Act of 1964: Title VII prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin in private-sector employment (would be applied to the public sector in 1972).

1964 Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton: Proposed that every leader could be categorized in terms of two variables: concern for task and concern for people. Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid was perhaps the best known of dozens of adaptations of this idea, which could be traced back to the Ohio State University leadership studies of the 1940's.

1965 Charles J. Hitch and Roland N. McKean: In the same year that President Johnson ordered Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems (PPBS) adopted government wide, the "bible" of government systems analysis appeared: *The Economics of Defense in the Nuclear Age.*

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Coleman Report applied the methods of the social sciences to the analysis and evaluation of government programs.

1967 Anthony Downs: Applied economic principles to develop propositions to aid in predicting behavior of bureaus and bureaucrats. A forerunner of the "public choice" approach to decision making.

1967 Yehezkel Dror: Pioneered in the development of policy sciences (that is, the analysis of the anticipated effects of a public policy and the design of better policymaking institutions in government).

1967-73 The New Jersey Graduated Work Incentive Experiment: First large-scale social experiment ever conducted in the U.S. This experiment spanned 6 1/2 years (1967-1973) and cost eight million dollars.

1968 Dwight Waldo: Under the patronage of Waldo, some young scholars gathered to critique American public administration for ignoring values and social equity and accepting too readily the status quo. This movement was known as the "New Public Administration".

1971-72 Alice Rivlin and Carol Weiss: Provided a comprehensive analysis of the methodologies and difficulties of evaluating public programs in a dynamic political environment. Since that time, the importance of evaluation has grown rapidly.

1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act: Amended and applied Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to the public sector and authorized the use of "affirmative action" to remedy the results of past dsicrimination.

1972 *Griggs v. Duke Power:* In this landmark opinion based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the United States Supreme Court ruled that any factor used in an employment decision must be a **bona fide occupational qualification** (BFOQ) related to the actual performance of the work.

1976 Peter F. Drucker: Addressed the problems of using management-by-objectives - a process of mutual goalsetting between employee and supervisor for purposes of planning and evaluation - in the public sector.

1978 Civil Service Reform Act: Significantly reorganized the Federal Civil Service.

1978 Proposition 13: Was adopted by California's voters by referendum; limited that state's ability to levy property taxes and began what has come to be called the "taxpayers' revolt."

1978 Regents *v. Bakke*: In its first major decision on affirmative action, the United States Supreme Court ruled that race could be **a** factor but not **the** factor in university admissions policies. This principle was later extended to employment and gender.

1980s A good way to characterize the study of public administration in the U.S. today is in terms of three impulses: politics, management,   and   public   policy. University programs emphasizing politics tend to be found in departments of political science or separate schools of public administration (e.g., Syracuse).   Programs emphasizing management tend to be found in schools of business (e.g., Stanford) or administration (e.g., Yale and Cornell). And programs emphasizing public policy tend to be found in schools of public affairs (e.g., Harvard and Texas). One should not view any of these three impulses as a panacea to replace faded predecessors.   To understand better how public agencies do and should operate, one should try to blend insights from all three approaches.

1990 Americans with Disabilities Act: Extended anti-discrimination protection to persons with disabilities.

1991 Civil Rights Act of 1991: Attempted, *inter alia*, to clarify and limit certain recent decisions of the Supreme Court that were interpreted as hostile to affirmative action.

1993 Osborne and Gaebler publish *Reinventing Government* in an attempt to "empower government officials to bring business technologies to public service."

1997 The fourth edition of Simon's classic *Administrative Behavior* is published on the 50th anniversary of the first.

STUDENTS: Remember what a "highlight" is. *What appears above is, by no means, all you need to know; it is merely a starting place.*

1.3 Different theories and their time frame

Classical Organization Theory

- Dominated thought into the 1930s

- Structuralists--focused attention on structure or design of orgs

- Rational and closed systems pursuing the goal of efficiency

- Adam Smith, Henri Fayol, Daniel McCallum, FW Taylor, Max Weber, Gulick &Urwick

- Organizations should work like machines, using people and capital as their parts

- Daniel McCallum, 1856, first modern organization chart for the NY and Erie RR Company

- Fayol's organizational principles: technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, managerial (greatest emphasis on managerial)

- Taylor's "one best way"

- Gulick & Urwick's POSDCORB; organize work by purpose; process; persons or place

- Often viewed as narrow and simplistic; however, laid a foundation for all future scholars

Neoclassical Organization Theory

- Transitional theory that revised Classical Theory by adding human element, 1950

- An organization cannot exist outside of its environment

- James March, Philip Selznick, Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon

- Barnard: individuals are what hold the organization together; thus, they must be reduced to cooperate for success to be achieved (persuasion principle)

- Simon: openly and vehemently attacked Classical Theory, said G&U's principles were merely proverbs, offered idea of satisfice

- Selznick: idea of cooptation

- Cyert and March: alliance-forming and coalitions

"Modern" Structural Organization Theory

- Second half of 20th Century

- Hierarchy, formal rules in place to attain goals

- Sought a return to the Structural Element, retaining the human aspects of Neoclassicism

- "Modern" in quotations b/c it is used simply to refer to the time period--there is little substantive difference between the Structuralists in Classical Theory and this one, other than time frame

- Organization efficiency is the essence of organizational rationality, and the goal of rationality is to increase the production of wealth in terms of real goods and services

- Peter Blau and Richard Scott: all orgs consist of a formal and an informal element and it is impossible to understand an org. without knowing each element

- Buzz words: differentiation, specialization and integration

- Elliott Jaques: remains a lonely defender of the bureaucratic-hierarchy models

Systems Theory

- Rose to dominance in the late 1960s

- Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn: organizations are open systems

- Apply Ludwig Burtalanffy's general systems theory to organizations and use quantitative tools and techniques to understand complex relationships among organizational and environmental variables

- (remember input→output / blackbox diagram)

- search for order in complex systems, cause-and-effect oriented

- seeks optimal solutions (not "one best way")

- computers, experts, etc. are the tools necessary

- draw heavily from Neoclassicals---bounded rationality and satisficing (Simon) and cognitive limits (Cyert and March)

- Richard Scott – rational, natural and open systems theories

Power and Politics Organization Theory

- organizations are viewed as complex systems of individuals and coalitions

- conflict in inevitable and influence is the primary weapon

- organizational goals change with shifts in the balance of power

- John Kotter: differentiate between power resulting from authority and power resulting from being able to get job done

- Power is aimed in all directions, not just down the hierarchy

- Jeffrey Pfeffer: power and politics are fundamental concepts in defining an org

Organizational Culture

- Late 1960s--thru 70s and 80s

- Organizational culture assumes many organizational behaviors and decisions are in effect predetermined by the patterns of basic assumptions that are held by the members of the org.

- An org's behavior, cannot be understood and predicted by studying structural or systemic elements but by studying its organizational culture

  - Meaning (reality) is established by and among the people in organizations (the org, culture)

  - Things are not real, perceptions of them are

  - People will distort the perceptions of symbols according to the need for what is symbolized

- In the 80s, organizational culture began appearing in notable works (incl. Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, John Corbelly, Vijay Sathe, and Gareth Morgan)

- TQM and "Reinventing Government" further thrust this movement onto front pages in the 1980s and 90s

Postmodernism

- Technology and information networks have led to uncertainty and chaos is this postmodern era

- Just as information is readily available, so is misinformation

- We are frequently seeing that we do not understand cause-effect relationships despite abundance of information; thus, managers are abandoning their "modern era" reliance on technical systems, turning instead to information technology to help them into the postmodern era

- Karl Weick

    o Technical system: specific set of hardware and software systems that produce a desired outcome, products of the "modern era," designed to accomplish desired purposes using known information and existing technologies

    o Technology: refers to the knowledge of cause-and-effect relationships embedded in machines and methods

- Old, familiar machine analogies no longer apply. Berquist (1993), McWhinney (1997) and Prigogine and Stengers (1984) suggest fire is most appropriate analogy for postmodern organizations

    1. fire is a second-order change process that is irreversible

    2. fire is ephemeral

- Organizations must wrestle with dilemmas about how much to participate in the information age

    o Centralize or decentralize

    o Outsource or produce internally

    o "Regular" employees or "stringers"

- o Sell products or deliver services through established networks or through the web

- o How to maintain what boundaries

Human Relations School (also, Organizational Behavior)

- People are considered to be as important, or more so, than the org itself

- Bolman & Deal (1997): organizations exist to serve humans (not the other way around)

- Ott: themes are motivation, group behavior, leadership, empowerment

- Hawthorne Effect, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, McGregor's Theory X & Y, Janis' Groupthink

- Most optimistic of all schools - under right circumstances, people and organizations will grow and prosper together

Theory	Classical Org.	Neoclassical	"Modern"	Systems	Power & Politics	Org. Culture	Postmodemism	Human Relations
Time frame	Thru 1930	1930s-1950s	1950s on	Late 1960s	1980s	60s thru 80s	1980s on	
Paradigm	Positivist	Pos/post-pos	Positivist	Positivist	Post-Modem & Conflict	Interpretavist	Post-Modem	Interpretavist
Ontology	Rational Structural	Rational Structural	Rational Structural	Rational	Critical Realist	Relativist	Critical Realist	Relativist
Epistemology	Objective	Objective	Objective	Modified Objectivist	Objective	Subjective	Subjective	Subjective
Methodology	Experimental/ Manipulative	Modified/ Experimental	Experimental/ Manipulative	Experimental	Dialogic / Elitist Defined	Dialogic / Elitist Defined	Dialogic / Transformative	Hermeneutic / dialectic
System Type	Closed	Semi-open	Closed	Open	Open	Open	Open	Open
Authors	Smith, Fayol, Taylor, Weber, G&U	March, Selznick, Bamard, Simon	Blau, Scott, Jaques	Katz, Kahn, Burtalanffy	Kotter, Pfeffer	Peters, Corbelly, Waterman, Sathe, Morgan	Weick, Berquist, McWhinney, Prigogine, Stengers	McGregor, Maslow, Mayo
Notes	simplistic	Transition, reactionary	Return to Classical	Drew from Neoclass.	power	TQM	Technical revolution	Janis, Hawthome, Theory X/Y

Table3: **Different theories** summary

1.4 Names and theories in public administration in chronological order

Jefferson, Thomas   Weak executive – bottom-up structure

Hamilton, Alexander   Strong Executive branch – top-down structure

1887 Wilson, Woodrow   Hierarchical-admin matters and politics shouldn't interfere – political neutrality and professionalism

Progressive Era   Progressive reform movement

1900 Goodnow, Frank   Politics and administration – expression of will of the state and the execution of that will

1911 Taylor, Frederick   Principles of Scientific Mgmt.

Methods to manage & measure individual work elements

Study to ensure optimal placement of workers

Obtain cooperation of workers

Establish logical division between workers & mgmt.

1918 Willoughby, Wm   Legislative admin school – Constitution gave admin power to legislative branch – movement for Bud reform

1922 Weber, Max   Structural definition of bureaucracy – "ideal type"

1926 White, Leonard   Defined PA as mgmt of men & materials in the accomplishment of the proposes of the state

First textbook – Admin is a art but worthy of being transformed

Into a science – admin is legitimized by law but is action

1926 Follett, Mary P

Participatory mgmt – power with not over

Circular behavior – feedback to sender to resolve problems

1937 Brownlow, Louis

President needs help to perform duties

- Expand White House staff

- Develop arms – budget, research, personnel & planning

- Merit system revamped

- Centralize power under few large departments

- Revise fiscal system

1937 Gulick, Luther

Principles approach to managing orgs – POSDCORB

Looked at role of upper level mgmt.

1938 Barnard, Chester

Informal orgs & their relation to formal orgs

Function of executives to maintain equilibrium between needs of org & needs of employee

Functions of informal orgs, communication, cohesiveness & p integrity

1943 Maslow, Abraham

Theory of Human Motivation – Hierarchy of needs

1947 Simon, Herbert

Logical positivism (logical reasoning & empirical experience) –

Decision-making at true heart of admin

Bounded rationality – Humans not optimal

1947 Dahl, Robert   Behavioralist in Pol Science – for PA be accepted as a science need to:

- Recognize the complexities of human behavior

- Deal with normative values in admin situations

- Be comparative to the social setting

1948 Waldo, Dwight   The Admin State-Economy and efficiency are ultimate admin values

Critiqued principles of admin & the dichotomy

Headed Minnowbrook conference – PA not a science-a profession

Populist concerned with values of democracy & the Philpot of PA

PA is politics – partisan politics in PA is good

1949 Selznick, Philip   The Cooptative Mechanism – org brings in new elements into policymaking process in order to prevent them from becoming a threat to the org or its mission.

1957 Merton, Robert   Bureaucratic structure & personality – a formal rationally organized social structure involves clearly defined patterns of activity in which every series of actions functionally related to the purposes of the org

1957 McGregor, Douglas   Human Side of Enterprise – Mgmt assumptions about employees – become self-fulfilling prophecies

Theory X – humans dislike work- will avoid – must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened

Theory Y – humans do not inherently dislike work – source of satisfaction, seek and accept responsibility

1966 Katz & Kahn	Organizations & the Systems Concept– systems framework for how organizations operate
	Open systems = modern organizational environments
	Closed systems = traditional fixed bureaucracies
1967 Downs, Anthony	Public Choice Theory – application of market logic to PA
	Life cycles of bureaus – difficult to kill a bureaucracy
1969 Kaufman, Herbert	Administration decentralization & political power
	power to people not best if interference with pursuit of national mandates for economic & social equity
1971 Allison, Graham	PA is Bureaucratic politics – pluralism – Differences in public & private mgmt
	pub=planning related to political expediency
	private=longer time perspective
1972 Cleveland, Harlan	More governance needed – nonprofit contracting, voluntary & other orgs used to deliver govt. services
1973 Ostrom, Vincent	Intellectual crisis in PA- growing gulf between theory & practice

	Public choice theory or application of market logic to PA
	Org dynamics understood by analyzing functional process
1977 Meyer & Rowan	Institutional Theory – emphasize cultural & institutional environmental influences – socially constructed practices/norms
	provide framework for creation of formal orgs
1978 Pfeffer & Salancik	Resource Dependency Theory – All orgs exchange resources with environ to survive
1979 Mintzberg, Henry	Five basic parts of org – Mgmt. Policy Theory =model of org w/ 5
	interdependent parts: strategic apex, middle line, operating core, techno-structure & support staff
1983 – Power	Game & Players – influencers (external & internally coalitions) that attempt to control org decisions – must know who are to understand org behavior
1980 Lipsky, Michael	Street level bureaucrat – delivery of services has great impact
1981 Ouchi, Wm.	Z Org. – Orgs proceed smoothly only w/intimacy, subtlety & trust foster close interchange between work & social life
1983 Rosenbloom, David	Compared managerial, political & legal approaches to PA and showed how each has separate values, origins & structures
	Collapse of admin powers in modern admin state

1987 Moe, Ronald	Limits of privatization: - public admin intellectual roots in public law
	tradition not in free market economy causes problems w/definitions
	For example: FADA – private in direction but public in rights
	Concept of sovereignty must be considered –present legal perspective
1992 Osbourne & Gaebler	Reinventing Government – dichotomies of entrepreneurial & bureaucratic approaches to PA – Entrepreneurial=Governance
1993 Kettl	Managing vs Governing – govt.'s roles of supervisors of proxies
	Public-private partnerships, contracts replacing hierarchy
1993 Schein, Edgar	Defining Org Culture – process of socializing employees into existing org culture – dominant attitude and accepted ways of actions
1993 Denhardt, Robert	Critical Theory of PA
1995 Holzer, Mark	TQM – innovative repackaging of several decades of public sector productivity improvement – draws on decades of industrial quality improvement in private sector
1995 March & Olsen	Democratic Governance – two perspectives on governance
	1. Exchange perspective – rational actor

assumptions, competition, markets, bargains, winning coalitions, changed policy Pareto-

2. improving criteria=at least one person better off & no one worse off

| 1996 | **Frederickson, George** | Spirit of PA linked to New Public Mgmt. – New PA calls for second generational behaviorism – admin more responsive to public, more proscriptive, more client-oriented-boundary exchange, more normative, still scientific – Social equity necessary – rep democracy too slow |

1.5   Rethinking the identity of public administration

The world of government and public administration has traveled far since the early days of its struggle for disciplinary independence. Lately, there has been talk of the advent of a new spirit in the public sector, or at least expectations of its coming. Some say that such a spirit is already here. Others aver we are witnessing only the tip of change. The world wide globalization process supported by stronger orientations towards open markets, open highways of information, growing levels of organizational learning and interdisciplinary in the social sciences have also made their impact on the study of our bureaucracies. Yet by all definitions public administration in the beginning of the 2000s still lacks the sense of identity that other fields of the social sciences have long since obtained. In other words, the field is looking back and down into its individuality, searching for orientations and signs that can direct it on its way forward. Today, public administration is already very different from what it used to be forty, thirty, and even twenty or ten years ago. In the coming years it is going to be even more different.

This paper is based on a previous work by the author (Vigoda, 2002). It tries to portrait the uncertain identity of public administration and possible developments waiting ahead. Rethinking this identity we should be interested in two main questions: Which scholarly ground are we stepping on when we talk about public administration? What is the legacy of the field in its current phase and what are its ambitions for the future? Naturally, these questions raise many others, for example, how to improve governments actions; how to revitalize public administrations services; whether bureaucracies are responding to economical/ social/ political challenges and changes ahead, and with what tools; what is the impact of a high-technology environment and the information age on our public agencies; how to attain the (im)possible goal of effective integration between citizens and governments in an ultra-dynamic society; and what are the implications of such transitions for democratic governments, their stability, and legitimization in the eyes of citizens. I argue that in order to resolve these questions one should seek better scholarly identity, which may be acquired through interdisciplinary analysis.

Practically, such an analysis needs to be presented gradually. Hence, I first suggest a theoretical entry and rationality for the mixture of analytic levels, methods, and viewpoints that are proposed by the various mother-disciplines of public administration. More specifically I focus on the roots and foundations of public administration in both

American and Non-American cultures that furnish the background and terminology for the discipline in its basic frame, as well as in its more advanced composition. Next, three academic origins are discussed, namely (1) policy, politics, and political economy, (2) sociology, culture, and community and (3) management and organizational studies. Each represents a separate layer of investigation. The closing section suggests a synthesis and looks to the future. It attempts to portray areas and orientations for the new generation of public administration and for its way forward.

The dilemma of independence and interdisciplinary in public administration

For many years public administration has struggled for its independent position in the social sciences. While in its early years it was part of the more conservative fields of Law, Politics, and Economy, it has been developed today to a unique field, independent in many ways but still enjoying mutual contributions of other disciplines in the social sciences. Moreover, in the last century it has developed a theoretical but also an impressive practical agenda that created remarkable achievements in different ways. The public sector, both as a science and as a profession is responsible for much of these achievements.

At the dawn of the new millennium, however, various new social problems still await the consideration and attention of the state and its administrative system. The question of independency of public administration as a science seems today less important than in the past. Instead, there are many calls to take advantage of multi disciplinary orientations in the social sciences and to find better ways to integrate them in the current ethos of public administration. It is also suggested that such interdisciplinary ideas, tools, and methods can help to overcome social problems and create effective remedies for the new type of state maladies. Interdisciplinarity is also translated into is cooperation, collaboration, and a share of information and knowledge. The multi-level, multi-method, and multi-system analysis with a look towards the future is the main frontiers of modern public administration.

The interdisciplinary view endeavors to provide an insight into the complexity of the field by combining different levels of analysis into an integral whole, which better accords with reality. This knowledge may well serve our understanding of how the state, and its executive branches, is managed and of the obstacles to better public performance. An important task is to illuminate cross-disciplinary principles for

greater effectiveness and efficiency of public management in future generations, when environmental pressures will grow, together with an increase in citizens' demands and needs. An interdisciplinary approach to public administration may thus be of merit for a contentious field in a state of rapid change. It may stimulate new and viable thinking that can lead to additional positive innovation in the old type of bureaucracies.

The central assumption of this essay is that slowly and gradually, but constantly and extensively, a change is being nurtured in public systems and in the attitudes of public managers, politicians, and citizens to the conservative role of public institutions. These transformations carry many challenges, as well as risks, that citizens, governments, administrators of the future will have to confront and address. They all represent new alternatives for the evolution of public administration as an art, perhaps also as a science and as a profession (Lynn, 1996). Our task, as stemming from such a perspective, is to understand better the changes ahead, which have the potential of building bridges into the future of modern democracies. A core assumption, as will be developed here, is that this goal can be achieved only through cooperation among the public, private, and third sector organizations that collaborate through mutual efforts and combined knowledge available in all the relevant social sciences.

Public administration in transition: the evolutionary process

The foundations of modern public administration can be discerned thousands of years ago, across cultures, and in various nations around the globe. The Bible mentions a variety of hierarchical and managerial structures that served as prototypes for governance of growing populations. Ancient methods of public labor distribution were expanded by the Greeks and the Romans to control vast conquered lands and many peoples. The Persian and Ottoman empires in the Middle East, like India and imperial China in the Far East, and the Mesoamerica cultures paved the way for public administration in the modern age, wherein European Christians, and later Christians of the New World, were in the ascendant.

All these, as well as other cultures, used a remarkably similar set of concepts, ideas, and methods for governing and administrating public goods, resources, and interests. They all employed professionals and experts from a variety of social fields. They all used authority and power as the cheapest control system for individuals,

governmental institutions, and processes. All of them faced administrative problems close in type and in nature to problems of our own times: how to achieve better efficiency, effectiveness, and economy in government, how to satisfy the needs of the people, and how to sustain stable political hegemony despite the divergent demands and needs of sectarian groups. Not surprisingly, all the above cultures and nations also used similar managerial tools and methods to solve problems of this sort. They all used, fairly effectively, division of work, professionalism, centralization and decentralization mechanisms, accumulation of knowledge, coordination of jobs, complex staffing processes of employees, long-range planning, controlling for performance, and so on. Intuitively, one feels that nothing has really changed in the managerial and administrative process of public organizations for centuries, possibly millennia. But this feeling is of course exaggerated. Some major changes have taken place in recent centuries to create a totally different environment and new rules, to which rulers and citizens must adhere and by which they must adjust their operation. In fact, a new kind of governing game has taken shape, in which public administration plays a central role.

Despite basic similarities, the public administration of our times is entirely different from public services in the past. These differences can be summarized in 7 key points:

(1) It is *larger* than ever before, and it still expanding;

(2) It is more *complex* than in the past, and becoming increasingly so by the day;

(3) It has many more *responsibilities* to citizens, and it still has to cope with increasing demands of the people.

(4) It is acquiring more *eligibilities*, but must restrain its operation and adhere to standards of equity, justice, social fairness, transparency and accountability.

(5) Modern public administration is considered a social *science*, a classification that carries high esteem but also firm obligations and rigid constraints.

(6) For many individuals who decide to become public servants it is also a *profession and occupation* to which they dedicate their lives and careers.

(7) Public administration is one of the highly *powerful institutions* in modern democracies.

Thus, it is evident that public administration of our time wields considerable power and influence in policy framing, policy making, and policy implementation. Hence it is subject to growing pressures of political players, social actors, managerial professionals, and the overall economic market.

An eclectic science

Public administration is an eclectic science. It was born towards the end of the 19th century when the business of the state started to attract social-academic attention. The revolution turning public administration into an independent science and profession is traditionally related to the influential work and vision of Woodrow Wilson (1887) and Frank J. Goodnow (1900). These scholars were among the first who advocated the autonomy of the field as a unique area of science that drew substance from several sources. In the first years, law, political theory of the state, and several "hard sciences" such as engineering and industrial relations were the most fundamental and influential mother disciplines. Over time, these fields strongly influenced the formation and transition of public administration but the extent and direction of the influence were not linear or consistent.

Kettl and Milward (1996:7) argued that traditional public administration, as advocated by the progenitors of the discipline, consisted in the power of law. Representatives of the people make the law and delegate responsibility to professional bureaucrats to execute it properly. Highly qualified bureaucrats, supported by the best tools and resources, are then expected to discharge the law to the highest professional standards, which in return produces good and accountable managerial results that best serve the people. According to Rosenbloom (1998), the legal approach views public administration "as applying and enforcing the law in concrete circumstances" and is "infused with legal and adjudicatory concerns" (p.33). This approach is derived from three major interrelated sources: (1) administrative law, which is the body of law and regulations that control generic administrative processes; (2) the judicialization of public administration, which is the tendency for administrative processes to resemble courtroom procedures; and (3) constitutional law, which redefines a variety of citizens' rights and liberties. Several legal definitions argue that public administration is law in action and mainly a regulative system, which is "government telling citizens and businesses what they may and may not do" (Shafritz & Russell, 1997:14). However,

with the years it has become obvious that law in itself does not maintain satisfactory conditions for quality public sector performances to emerge. Constitutional systems furnish platforms for healthy performance of public administration, but do not account for its effectiveness or efficiency. Put differently, good laws are necessary but not sufficient conditions for creating a well-performing public service. They only highlight the significance of other scholarly contributions.

One such important contribution came from the classic "hard sciences" of engineering and industrial relations. In its very early stages public administration was heavily influenced by dramatic social forces and long-range developments in the western world. The ongoing industrial revolution in the early 1900s, which was accompanied by political reforms, higher democratization, and more concern for the people's welfare, needed highly qualified navigators. These were engineers, industrial entrepreneurs, and technical professionals who guided both markets and governments along the elusive paths to economic and social prosperity. Various fields of engineering, the subsequent evoking area of industrial studies, and other linked disciplines such as statistical methods became popular and crucial for the development of management science in general, and were also gradually found useful for public arenas. The link between general management and public administration has its roots in the understanding of complex organizations and bureaucracies, which have many shared features. Here, much contribution was made in non-American societies such Germany, France, and Britain. In fact, early American public administration was influenced by the works of various European. Thus, the current state of public administration can not be covered without adequate understanding of the seminal works by Max Weber (1947), Henry Fayol (1925), Lindel Urwick (1928), and others. Their ideas and theoretical development of the field are considered today as core-stones for the emergence of modern public administration and management.

With time, dramatic changes occurred in the nature and orientation of general organizational theory, and in its application to public administration of modern societies. A major transition resulted from the exploration by the Hawthorn studies in the 1920s and 1930s, conducted by a well known industrial psychologist from Chicago University, Alton Mayo. A behavioral apparatus was used to drive a second revolution, beyond the revolution of its original emergence, which swept the young science into its

first stages of maturity. Today, trends and developments in the public sector cannot be fully understood without adequate attention to behavioral, social, and cultural issues. These aspects conjoin with questions of policy making and policy evaluation, as well as with managerial, economic, and organizational contents, better to illuminate public systems. The human and social side of public organizations became central and critical to all seekers of greater knowledge and comprehension of the state's operation. People and groups were placed at the heart of the discussion on organizational development and managerial methods. The human side of organizations was made an organic part of the art of administration. Still today it is an indispensable facet of the craft of bureaucracy. All who are interested in the healthy future and sound progress of public organizations and services both as a science and as a profession have to incorporate humanistic views well in their basic managerial ideology.

However, major transitions still lay ahead. International conflicts during the 1930s and the 1940s wrought immense changes in national ideology and democratic perspectives in many western societies. Consequently, public administration and public policy had to be transformed as well. During the Second World War theoretical ideas were massively supported by advanced technology and higher standards of industrialization. These were pioneered by professional managers and accompanied by new managerial theories. Ironically, the two world wars served as facilitators of managerial change as well as accelerators and agents of future developments and reforms in the public sector. The political leaders and social movements of the victorious democracies were convinced that the time had come for extensive reforms in the management of western states. The assumed correlation of social and economic conditions with political stability and order propelled some of the more massive economic programs in which the state took an active part. The rehabilitation of war-ravaged Europe involved governmental efforts and international aid, most of it from the United States. Major attention was dedicated to the creation of better services for the people, long-range planning, and high-performance public institutions capable of delivering quality public goods to growing numbers of citizens. To build better societies was the goal. A larger and more productive public sector was the tool.

In many respects the utopian vision of a better society generated by the post-war politicians and administrators in the 1940s and 1950s inexorably crumbled and fell

during the 1960s and 1970s. A sizable number of governments in the western world could not deliver to the people many of the social promises they had made. The challenge of creating a new society, free of crime and poverty, highly educated and morally superior, healthier and safer than ever before, remained an unreachable goal. So during the 1970s and 1980s, citizens' trust and confidence in government, and in public administration as a professional agent of government, suffered a significant decline. The public no longer believed that governments and public services could bring relief to those who needed help, and that no public planning was good enough to compete with natural social and market forces. The promises of modern administration, running an effective public policy, seemed like a broken dream. Political changes took place in most western states, largely stemming from deep frustration by the public and disapproval of government policies. By the end of the 20th century the crises in public organizations and mistrust of administrators were viewed both as a policy and managerial failure (Rainey, 1990). In addition, this practical uncertainty and disappointment with governments and their public administration authorities naturally diffused into the academic community. Theoretical ideas for policy reforms in various social fields that once seemed the key to remedying illnesses in democracies have proven unsuccessful. Within the last decade the search for new ideas and solutions for such problems has reached its peak, as premises originally rooted in business management have become increasingly adjusted and applied to the public sector. Among these ventures are re-engineering bureaucracies (Hammer and Champy, 1994), applying benchmarking strategy to public services (Camp, 1998), re-inventing government (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992), and the most influential movement of New Public Management (NPM: Lynn, 1998; Stewart and Ranson, 1994). These are receiving growing attention accompanied by large measures of skepticism and criticism.

Transformations in the academic realm

Throughout those years public administration as an academic field was also in transition. Today, many examples exist in universities of independent public administration units; some operate as schools and some as free-standing faculties. But in at least an equal number of universities, public administration programs on all levels are only part of larger units such as Political Science departments, Business

and Management schools, or even Public Affairs schools. This disciplinary schizophrenia certainly yields a science that is more complex and heterogeneous, but also more challenging and full of promise.

The scientific background and identity of public administration in the late 1990s and early 2000s is still not stable and has not overcome its childhood ailments. On the contrary identity conflicts have only intensified with the years. Some 30 years ago, Waldo (1968) noted that ongoing transformations in public administration reflected an identity crisis of a science in formation. During the last three decades Waldo's diagnostics on public administration as a science struggling with a pernicious identity problem has not changed much. The evolution of alternative sub-disciplines inside and around the field (e.g., policy studies, public personnel management, information management, etc.) carried promises but also risks for its position and role as a central field of social study. As recently noted by Peters (1996), modern public administration greatly reflects lack of self-confidence both as a science and as a profession. This lack is expressed in many ways, the most significant being incapacity to guide governments through a safe circuit of public policy change. Much of the accumulated wisdom in the science of public administration has been obtained through social experiments, the commission of policy errors, and sometimes even learning from them about better ways to serve the people. But mistakes cost money, much money, money from all of us, the taxpayers. Like good customers in a neighborhood supermarket, citizens should and have become aware of the services they deserve, of the high prices they are asked to pay, and of governmental actions that should be taken to produce useful changes. Demands for better operation are generally aimed at governments, but they should be, and are, also targeted at the science and at academia. Science has the potential of exploring new knowledge, generating better explanations for relevant administrative problems, applying sophisticated and useful professional methods, and most importantly directing all available resources to produce successful and practical recommendations for professionals. Its prime goal is to design a comprehensive theoretical view of public systems that is clear, highly efficient, effective, thrifty, and socially oriented at the same time. This cannot be achieved without extensive understanding of the diversity, complexity, and interdisciplinarity of the science of public administration.

The contribution of an interdisciplinary view to public administration identity

In many ways the persistent public mistrust of governmental services and institutions, together with the marked instability of public administration as a science, inspired us in the present venture. The fragile status of the theory of public administration is a port of departure for a different kind of discussion, which is broader and multi-perceptional. Our core argument is that one can find many ways to depict the administrative system, its functionality, and its relationship with the public. But the identity crisis of public administration cannot be solved until many approaches are combined and coalesce to explain the very basic constructs that modern societies encounter at the start of the new century. A foremost assumption of this paper is that only mutual efforts and quality combination of critical knowledge from a variety of social disciplines and methods can yield a real opportunity for overcoming public administration's post-childhood problems. Such a crisis of identity, which has existed for more than a century now, carries risks, but also promises, which must be well isolated, assessed, analyzed, and only then fulfilled. The translation of science into operative acts by government must rely on such wisdom, which can be sufficiently accumulated from various social branches.

Interdisciplinary heredity

The desired comprehensive understanding of public administration, as portrayed earlier, should rely on the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of its sister disciplines (and not necessarily the conventional mother disciplines) in the social sciences. Unfortunately, so far most writing on public systems has adopted a uni-dimensional viewpoint. Public administration was frequently understood through the eyes of policy analysts or political scientists. Alternatively it was considered a specific field of management science or as an organizational studies domain. While the roots of the administrative process are definitely, and with much justification, identified with political science, policy studies, and managerial constructs of public institutions, it would be greatly in error to point solely to these arenas in portraying the domain and nature of public administration. An integrative approach has much merit and potential in this case, and it must be well developed to conform to the complex reality of serving the public.

More specifically I argue that the administrative science is a discipline in transition

that involves politics, but not only politics. It deals with policy, but reaches much farther and deeper than policy questions. It incorporates sociological and cultural aspects that change rapidly in a mass communicative global world, but it goes even beyond these issues. It deals with people as workers, as citizens, as clients, and as consumers, as leaders and managers, as well as with a variety of other human constructs that fuse into a unique branch of knowledge. A multi-disciplinary approach is evidently required to explain better what every scholar already knows from his or her personal perspective: that the truth about public administration has many faces and no monopoly exists any longer on the discipline's status and orientations.

In light of the above we can identify three main disciplines that serve today as core sources of knowledge in the study of public administration.

(1) *Policy analysis, Political science, and Political Economy;*

(2) *Sociology, Cultural studies, and Community studies;*

(3) *Management and Organizational studies*;

Policy, Politics, and Political Economy

The political approach to public administration was depicted by Rosenbloom (1998) as stressing the values of representativeness, political responsiveness, and accountability to the citizenry through elected officials. These values are considered necessary requirements of democracy, and they must be incorporated into all aspects of government and administration. Wallace (1978) argued that ultimately public administration is a problem in political theory. It deals with the responsiveness of administrative agencies and bureaucracies to the elected officials, and through them, to the citizens themselves. Shafritz and Russell (1997) provide several politics-oriented definitions of public administration: it is what government does (or does not do), it is a phase in the policymaking cycle, it is a prime tool for implementing the public interest, and it does collectively what cannot be done so well individually (pp. 6-13). Hence it is impossible to conduct a politics-free discussion of public administration. This political debate in public administration is also heavily influenced by the sub-field of political economy. Questions of budgeting and financing the public sector (Wildavsky, 1984) as well as bringing more economical rationality to decision making processes usually conflict with political considerations (Jackson & Mcleod, 1982). However they also put

them under economical restraints and enhance "checks and balances" to a system mostly monitored and controlled by politicians, political parties, and other federal or national institutions, rather than professionals and practitioners.

Yet, politics is definitely the heart of public administration processes. Politics focuses on citizens as members of groups or on highly institutionalized organizations that sound the public's voice before political officials and civil servants. The politics approach to public administration involves strategies of negotiating and maneuvering among political parties, public opinion, and bureaucracies. It involves an incremental change in society, which relies on open debate, a legitimate power struggle, distribution and redistribution of national resources and budgets, and a heavy body of legislation and law to regulate these processes. Perhaps the most obvious linkage between politics and public administration stems from policy making and policy implementation processes. It is naive to distinguish political systems from professional administration systems in regard to public policy. As Rosenbloom (1998:13) suggested, "public administrators' involvement in the public policy cycle makes politics far more salient in the public sector than in private enterprise. Public administrators are perforce required to build and maintain political support for the policies and programs they implement. They must try to convince members of the legislature, chief executives, political appointees, interest groups, private individuals, and the public at large that their activities and policies are desirable and responsive".

The theoretical contribution of political science to the study of public administration is therefore multi-faceted. It invokes better understanding of the power relations and influence dynamics that take place inside and among bureaucracies (Pfeffer, 1992) and determine their operative function as well as outcomes. It also employs a rather vast knowledge from economics and rational thinking. Party politics acknowledges that the investigation of pressure and interest groups, and the better understanding of conflict relationships among various players of the state, are used to build models of decision making and policy determination that are rational and realistic. In addition, political psychology is implemented more thoroughly to explore personality traits of political leaders as well as public servants. For the same reasons, budgetary studies and policy analysis methods are an integral facet of the political approach, which assumes limited rationality as well as high constraints of time and resources on the administrative process.

From a somewhat different perspective, Ellwood (1996: p.51) argued that political science has simultaneously everything and little to offer public management scholars, hence also public administration scholars. Everything, because both fields deal with political behavior, processes, and institutions. Little, because political science deals only with the constraints forced on the administrative process with no practical contribution to the managerial improvement of public systems. Ellwood further concurs that both fields rely on other academic disciplines, employing techniques of anthropology, economics, game theory, historiography, psychology, and social psychology, as well as sociology. In line with this it would be only natural to conclude that the relationship between political science and public administration is described as an on-again, off-again romance. Kettl (1993, p.409) suggested that "the importance of administration lay at the very core of the creation of the American Political Science Association...when five of the first eleven presidents of the association came from public administration" and played a major role in framing the discipline. As Ellwood puts it, with the years, public administration became public but also administration. It shifted its focus to a more practical and client-service orientation, which necessarily incorporated knowledge from other social disciplines like personnel management, organizational behavior, accounting, budgeting, and so forth. The methodological contribution of a political approach to public administration studies is also meaningful. Here a macro analysis is necessary if one seeks an understanding of the operation of large bureaucracies and their coexistence with political players. A political approach delivers these goods by means of comparative studies, policy evaluation methods, rational choice models, and simulations, as well as content-analysis techniques and other tools useful for observation of the political sphere.

Sociology, Culture, and Community

Studying public administration is also a social issue. Thus, another approach that is highly relevant to the understanding of public administration bodies and processes rests on a sociological apparatus. It has a very close relationship with the political approach, so it is sometimes defined as a socio-political view of public systems or as a study of political culture (Shafritz & Russell, 1997:76). Yet its core prospects are beyond the political context. The voice of society has a special role in the study of

public administration arenas not only for democratic and political reasons but also because of its fundamental impact on informal constructs of reality such as tradition, social norms and values, ethics, life style, work standards, and other human-cultural interactions that are not necessarily political.

The theoretical contribution of a sociological and cultural approach to public administration consists of several elements. An essential distinction must be drawn between inside and outside cultural environments. An outside cultural sphere incorporates informal activities and behaviors of small groups as well as of larger social units which interact with the administrative system. Included in this category are customers' groups, private organizations, not-for-profit volunteering organizations, and citizens at large. Considerable attention has been turned to communities and to the idea of communitarianism (Etzioni 1994; 1995) as well as to the emergence of the third sector as rapidly changing conventional structures and beliefs in modern societies (Gidron, Kramer, and Salamon, 1992). An inside cultural environment is related to internal organizational dynamics and to the behaviors of people as work groups. Thus, it is sometimes termed organizational culture, or organizational climate (Schein, 1985). Like the outside organizational environment, it has some observable constructs but it mostly expresses many covert phases. In many ways, "culture is to the organization what personality is to the individual – a hidden, yet unifying theme that provides meaning, direction and mobilization" (Kilmann et al., 1985). It includes basic assumptions as to what is right and what is wrong for a certain organizational community, norms and beliefs of employees, unseen social rules and accepted codes of behavior, as well as tradition, language, dress, and ceremonies with common meaning to all organizational members. All these distinguish "us" from "them", promote group cohesiveness, and improve common interests.

Several sociological sources can be effective in analyzing public administration dynamics. First is group theory, which is also closely related to the study of leaders and leadership. Second are ethnic studies, which concentrate on minorities and race questions such as equity, fair distribution of public goods, and integration in productive public activity. Third is communication and the technological information revolution, which have had a radical effect on society, public policy, and public administration units and structure. Information networks and communication have

become an imminent feature of the cultural investigation of bureaucracies. For many years a plausible approach in management science and in the study of public administration called for the formulation of a universal theory in the field, one that is culture-free and applicable across all nations. With the passage of time and with giant technological developments this perception became ever more anachronistic.

Today, the goal of a universal administrative paradigm is hardly achievable. An alternative viewpoint is more balanced and contingent. It argues that basic similarities do exist between public organizations and public administration mechanisms, but at the same time intra-organizational and extra-organizational culture fulfills a major mediating role. Culture in its broad context constantly affects the operation of bureaucracies as well as political systems that interact with them. Examples like Theory Z of W. Ouchi (1981) and lessons from a more recent Chinese and east European experiences stimulated the scientific community and initiated culture-oriented ventures in general management inquiry (Hofstede, 1980). They especially promoted the investigation of work values and culture-oriented management in private but also in public arenas. Many scholars became convinced of the necessity of incorporating social and cultural variables as core elements in the administrative analysis of public arenas. A sociological and cultural approach to public administration also made an important methodological contribution. It initiated culture-focused surveys of individuals and groups who work in the public sector or of citizens who receive services and goods. Culture-focused observations and analyses possess the merit of being sensitive to people's (as citizens or employees) norms, values, traditions, and dispositions, and sometimes they overlap other politics and policy-oriented studies the better to explore dynamics in public organizations.

Finally, several ethical considerations should be included under any sociological understanding of the public sector. Ethical dilemmas are frequent in public administration and relate to cultural aspects, to norms, and most importantly to the individual behaviour of public servants. For example, hand-in-hand with governmental operation, questions of ethical standards, integrity, fair and equal treatment to clients, or appropriate criteria for rewards to public servants become more relevant. Today, public services in Europe are wider than ever before (Gladstone, 1995; De-Leon, 1996). As a result, public servants are taking care of growing budgets. They control the transference of more capital to and from the state treasury. This

exposes many of them to ethical dilemmas as to how to properly manage, distribute and redistribute economical wealth. Other ethical difficulties arise as a result of the instability between business and social requirements in the public environment. For example, when the cost of certain medicine is too high for citizens to purchase, should the state take responsibility and help them? When state prisons are full of convicted prisoners, should the state release some of them to create more places for others? Responding to such moral issues is difficult. However, public policy which neglects considerations of ethics, equal treatment of the public, or basic justice and fairness among its members is initiating a self-destructive process which may damage its functioning in the long run (Wilenski, 1980).

Management and Organization studies

The third core-stone of public administration is based on knowledge from management and organizational sciences. A managerial definition of public administration proclaims that it is the executive function in government or a management specialty applied in public systems (Shafritz and Russell, 1997:19-23). Although public sector management is distinguished from private sector management, in many ways the two systems share a surprisingly broad area of similarities (Rainey, 1990). For many years, differences stemmed from the nature of services each sector customarily provided, from diverse structures and functions, but mainly from discrepancies in the environment. However, when the environment started rapidly to change, organizations had to change as well. Modern societies have become more complex, flexible, and dynamic. Cultural, industrial, technological, economic, and political environments of organizations have undergone rapid transformations that are still in progress today. On the one hand, public and private organizations have to adjust and comply with similar changes in the environment to safeguard their interests and existence. But on the other hand, the starting point of public organizations is far inferior and urgently calls for rethinking and reinventing (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992).

Conventional wisdom accepted a classic assumption regarding the relatively stable and unshakable structure of public organizations. Drawing on the Weberian approach, hardly anyone disputed the need for large bureaucracies in modern democracies. Moreover, the advantages and disadvantages of large bureaucracies were well known among academics and practitioners. A weighty bureaucracy was considered an axiom

of public administration. Only with the emergence of new management trends in old bureaucracy were these basic assumptions questioned. For example, Kettl and Milward (1996) stated that management in the public sector matters. It matters because citizens' demands increase and because the standards of performance expected from governments are higher than ever before. Performance is related in the minds of people and in scientific studies to quality of management, quality of managers, and the administrative process between them. Accordingly, it has much to do with the human aspects of administration. Perhaps this perception has led to some recent developments in public administration, making it client-oriented and more businesslike. Scholars frequently define these shifts as the principal change in public administration and its transition into a revised field of study named public management.

Current trends: A public managerial reform?

What is the future of modern public administration and what new frontiers are awaiting ahead? The wisdom of managing states and communities in the 21st century relies on manifold disciplines and multiple sources of knowledge. The information era and the immense technological advancement with which our nations struggle necessarily create higher levels of accessibility, availability, and transparency to the public. The emergence of e-government is no more a fantastic dream but blatant reality. Public administration in America and in the world is moving through reforms and changes that are aimed at downsizing, privatization, de-bureaucratization, higher professional managerialsim, and above all strict dedication and aspirations to become a better "science" by improving measurement tools and adhering with positivism and empiricism.

 Since the early 1980s much work has been conducted in public administration theory and practice that claimed to go beyond the conservative approach in the field. This "liberalization" of public administration is recognized today as the "New Public Management" (NPM) trend. The self-identity problem of public administration was greatly aggravated by the launching of the idea of NPM. As noted by Kettl and Milward (1996: vii), "public management is neither traditional public administration nor policy analysis since it borrows heavily from a variety of disciplines and methodological approaches". Mainly drawing on the experience of the business/industrial/private sector, scholars have suggested taking a more demanding attitude to the dynamics, activity, and

productivity of public organizations. However, "competing academic disciplines dueled to establish bridgeheads or, worse, virtually ignored each other as they developed parallel tracks on related problems" (p. 5). Consequently, a cross-fertilization, which could have accelerated learning and improved performance of public systems, was delayed.

What are the roots of NPM, and in what way is it actually a *new* arena in the study of the public sector? Several theoretical foundations, as well as practical factors, can answer these questions. The first, and probably the deepest source of NPM emerges from the distinction between two proximate terms or fields of research: administration and management. As noted earlier, since the late 1880s the monopoly on the term administration has been held by political scientists. Scholars like Goodnow and Wilson were those who perceived public administration as a separate and unique discipline that should consist of independent theory, practical skills, and methods. However, the term management referred to a more general arena, used by all social scientists and mainly by those who practice and advance theory in organizational psychology and business studies. Consequently, conservative administration science tends to analyze the operation of large bureaucratic systems as well as other governmental processes aimed at policy implementation. Management, on the other hand, refers to the general practice of empowering people and groups in various social environments and in handling multiple organizational resources to maximize efficiency and effectiveness in the process of producing goods or services.

NPM has indeed become extremely popular in the theory and practice of contemporary public administration. Still, it is not clear if we can define it as a long-range revolution in public administration theory. Some will say that NPM has only revived an old spirit of managerialism and applied it in the public sector. Others will argue that this in itself has been a momentous contribution to public administration as a discipline in decline. Relying on an extensive survey of public management research in America, Garson and Overman (1983:275) argued that this increasing popularity was due to the more virile connotation of the term management than administration. Over the years, a growing number of political scientists came to perceive public administration as an *old* and declining discipline. It was unable to provide the public with adequate practical answers to its demands, and moreover it left the theoreticians with epidemic social dilemmas awaiting exploration. Interesting evidence of this process could be

found in many schools of public administration that during the 1980s and 1990s decided to become schools of public management. Looking for alternative ideas, management theory was proposed as the source for a new and refreshing perspective. It was suggested that public management rather than public administration could contribute to a new understanding of how to run the government more efficiently, hence to surmount some of its pandemic ailments.

Thus, Perry and Kraemer (1983) stated that a greater impact of new ideas and methods from the field of public management on the administrative science was essential and natural. It reflected a special focus of modern public administration that was not to be ignored. Rainey (1990:157) claimed that this process was a result of the growing unpopularity of government during the 1960s and 1970s. Ott, Hyde, and Shafritz (1991:1) also stated that public management was a major segment of the broader field of public administration since it focused on the profession and on the public manager as a practitioner of that profession. Furthermore, it emphasized well-accepted managerial tools, techniques, knowledge, and skills that could be used to turn ideas and policy into a (successful) program of action.

During the last two decades many definitions have been suggested for NPM. Yet nothing seems wrong with the relatively old perception of Garson and Overman (1983:278), who defined it as "*an interdisciplinary study of the generic aspects of administration...a blend of the planning, organizing, and controlling functions of management with the management of human, financial, physical, information and political resources*". As further discussed by other scholars (e.g., Lynn, 1996:38-39), six differences exist between public administration and public management that make the former a new field of study and practice. These are (1) the inclusion of general management functions such as planning, organizing, control, and evaluation in lieu of discussion of social values and conflicts of bureaucracy and democracy; (2) an instrumental orientation favoring criteria of economy and efficiency in lieu of equity, responsiveness, or political salience; (3) a pragmatic focus on mid-level managers in lieu of the perspective of political or policy elites; (4) a tendency to consider management as generic, or at least to minimize the differences between public and private sectors in lieu of accentuating them; (5) a singular focus on the organization, with external relations treated in the same rational manner as internal operations in

lieu of a focus on laws, institutions, and political bureaucratic processes; (6) a strong philosophical link with the scientific management tradition in lieu of close ties to political science or sociology.

While the emergence of NPM is frequently related to the increasing impact of positivist behavioral science on the study of politics and government (e.g., Lynn, 1996:5-6), the practical aspect of this process should also be considered. Practical public managers (Golembiewski, 1995), as well as political scientists, will refer to the difficulties in policy making and policy implementation which faced many western societies in Europe, America, and elsewhere during the 1970s. These practical difficulties are viewed today as an important trigger for the evolution of NPM. Reviewing two recent books on NPM (Aucoin, 1995; Boston, Martin, Pallot, and Walsh, 1996), Khademian (1998:269) argues that American and Westminster advocates of the field find common ground in explaining why such reforms are necessary. The problem of an inflexible bureaucracy that often could not respond efficiently and promptly to the public needs conflicted with some basic democratic principles and values in these countries. Peter Aucoin elegantly summarizes a "trinity" of broadly based challenges with which western democracies have struggled, and will probably continue to struggle in the future, partly through management reform. These are (1) growing demands for restraint in public sector spending, (2) increasing cynicism regarding government bureaucracies' responsiveness to citizens' concerns and political authority and dissatisfaction with program effectiveness, and (3) an international, market driven economy that does not defer to domestic policy efforts. These challenges have apparently led many western governments, in America, Britain, New Zealand, Canada, and elsewhere, to the recognition that firm reforms and changes in the public service should be made.

There is no doubt that at least some of the accumulated wisdom of the private sector in many countries is transferable to the public sector (Pollitt, 1988; Smith, 1993). In an attempt to liberate the public sector from its old conservative image and tedious practice NPM was advanced as a relevant and promising alternative. NPM literature has tried to recognize and define new criteria that may help in determining the extent to which public agencies succeed in meeting the growing needs of the public. NPM has continuously advocated the implementation of specific Performance Indicators (PIs) used in private organizations to create a performance-based culture and matching

compensatory strategies in these systems. It has recommended that these indicators be applied in the public sector (e.g., Smith, 1993; Carter, 1989) since they can function as milestones on the way to better efficiency and effectiveness of public agencies. Moreover, citizens' awareness of the performance of public services was suggested as a core element of NPM since it can increase the political pressure placed on elected and appointed public servants, thereby enhancing both managerial and allocative efficiency in the public sector. Scholars who advocate NPM liken this process of public accountability to stakeholders/citizens to the role adopted by financial reporting in the private/corporate sector (Smith, 1993). As in that sector, increasing exterior-related outcomes can have a profound impact on internal control mechanisms, as managers and public servants become more sensitive to their duties and highly committed to serve their public customers.

Thus, Lynn (1998:231) suggested that the NPM of the late 1990s had three constructive legacies for the field of public administration and for democratic theory and practice. These were (1) a stronger emphasis on performance-motivated administration and inclusion in the administrative canon of performance-oriented institutional arrangements, structural forms, and managerial doctrines fitted to particular context, in other words, advances in the state of the public management art; (2) an international dialogue on and a stronger comparative dimension to the study of state design and administrative reform; and (3) the integrated use of economic, sociological, social-psychological, and other advanced conceptual models and heuristics in the study of public institutions and management, with the potential to strengthen the field's scholarship and the possibilities for theory-grounded practice. While the first two "legacies" are widely discussed in contemporary literature, the third is much understudied and needs further theoretical development, empirically guided research, and practical implementation.

Moreover, Kettl and Milward (1996) argue that one of NPM's most significant contributions to public administration as a discipline in transition is the focus on the performance of governmental organizations. According to their analysis, this scientific orientation needs to draw on "a wide variety of academic disciplines for the full and richly textured picture required to improve the way government works. Only through interdisciplinary cross-fertilization will the picture be rich enough to capture the

enormous variety and complexity of true public management (and administration) puzzles" (p.6).

The journey continues

This paper has relied on previous works to describe public administration as a discipline in transition. In many ways it has always been in continuous movement, but not always in the same direction. Contrary to the heavy, formal, and inflexible image of bureaucracies, public sector bodies in America, Europe, and elsewhere have been in rapidly intensifying transition since the early 1990s. During the last century public administration has undergone gone significant changes resulting from crises, as well as breakthroughs in an ultra-dynamic environment. Generally speaking, Waldo's (1968) assertion that these ongoing transformations reflected an identity crisis of a science in formation is also relevant today, albeit with some amendments. Whereas in the past these crises signaled a struggle for the recognition and legitimacy of public administration as a scholarly academic field, today the identity problem leads to other dilemmas, which are beyond simple existence and legitimacy.

In recent decades the struggle over the nature and uniqueness of public administration has continued, some say even intensified. From the very early days of the discipline to the present its boundaries have been in a state of ongoing debate. To talk of the "Public", of "Administration", and of the integration of the two constructs into a useful terrain for study holds out promise as well as involving difficulties. But consensus does exist on at least one issue: the public needs a better bureaucracy, more flexible, working efficiently and effectively, moving quickly toward objectives, and at the same time responding to the needs of the people without delays and with maximum social sensitivity, responsibility, and morality. The public also expects good and skillful administrators, versed in the mysteries of quality services and effective management. Only they can produce better "public goods" and deliver them to all sectors of society in minimum time and at minimum cost. These goals are undoubtedly ambitious but they have the potential of safeguarding the structure of democratic societies. This is a revised version of the ideal type of public administration systems applicable to modern times.

However, reality seems far more complex. There is growing concern among scholars today that these goals are way beyond reach. Modern states across the world face serious problems of adhering to the public's needs. Achieving one target is usually accompanied by painful compromises on others, and limited resources are frequently cited as the main reason for failure in the provision of services. Moreover, fundamental changes are taking place in people's lifestyles, as in their beliefs and ideologies. They are multiplied through high technology, communication systems, new distribution of capital, and the rise of new civic values that never existed before. All these lead citizens to perceive government and public administration systems differently. The role of the state and its relationship with bureaucracy and with citizens is undergoing a substantial transformation not only in the minds of the people but also in scientific thinking. In a rapidly changing environment, public administration has a major function and new aims that must be clearly recognized. It remains the best tool democracy can use to create fruitful reciprocal relationships with citizens, but on a higher and better level. To uncover the major tasks and challenges facing the new generation of public administration we require a cross-disciplinary strategy and improved integration of all available knowledge in the social sciences aimed at redefining the boundaries of public administration systems in its new era.

Today, at the beginning of the 21st century, the formation of public administration as an interdisciplinary academic field seems certain. Still, it is unfinished business due to the need and demand to make it more of a "harder social science", one which is closer to management science, economics, or even psychology. Hence, the state of the field is in dispute among academics and practitioners from across the world who seek higher and more extensive scientific recognition, by applying a higher level of empirical-based paradigm. It is argued that such inputs may produce a more accurate self-definition and better applicability of the field to rapid changes in modern life. This process presents new challenges for public administration. Perhaps the most important is to integrate more widely existing knowledge of the social sciences with efficient public action and with quality governmental operation. In the coming years public administration will be evaluated by higher standards of theory cohesiveness and by more comprehensive performance indicators rooted in a variety of scientific fields. The exploration of new interdisciplinary horizons for public administration is thus essential, and inevitable for the successful passage of the field into the third

millennium. Somewhat contrary to the concerns of Waldo (1968), the identity crises in its new form may carry a positive, not endangering, interdisciplinary merit. The interdisciplinary orientations have the potential of pulling public administration out of its perplexing-stagnating status and lead it towards a more solid scientific position.

In light of the above a consensus exists today among scholars and practitioners that modern public administration decidedly benefits, and will continue to benefit, from the seminal inputs of social and cultural motives and mainly from the impact of managerial and organizational theory. In keeping with these, modern societies question the current obligations of public personnel toward citizens, and urge them to put people and social values first. These tasks can be achieved by treating citizens as customers or clients but also through building a different value of administrative spirit (Vigoda and Golembiewski, 2001). Yet managerial tendencies draw fire from those who argue that a client orientation of the public sector breeds citizen passivity and lack of individual responsibility toward the state and its agencies. It is further assumed that today these obligations and commitments are not clearly decoded, manifested, or satisfactory implied. Consequently they yield an identity problem of the field and strive for redefinition of its unwritten contract with the people. Scholars are divided over the best way to obtain missions of good-management together with good cultural order. Still, they agree that much more can be done to improve responsiveness to citizens' needs and demands without forgoing the active role of citizens in the administrative process.

Moreover, the information revolution is expected to create a growing impact on public administration of the future both as a science and as a profession. In referring to the modern public sector Caldwell (2002) suggested that "Our task for linking information, social issues, politics, policy and management is a challenge yet to be accomplished. The enthusiasm for public planning, notably in the 1930s, did not survive the Second World War. The so-called "reinvention" of government based on a market-driven model appears to be essentially contemporaneous and superficial in relation to the multiple challenges to be confronted in the 21st century" (p73-174) Thus, Caldwell continues to argue that "governments and their administrators (in our time) characteristically focus on immediate situations and pressing problems. There are few political rewards for anticipating the long – range future. However, the advancement of science and an

apparent growth of public acceptance, however slow, of science-based forecasts may enlarge the "educating" role of public administration. We are hardly at the end of the expansion of knowledge and information, and there is growing although limited recognition that we also face formidable challenges to a sustainable future. And so it is more realistic to see the "New Public Administration" as an evolving process continuing to become "new" as it is adapted to meeting the needs of the ever-receding future".

Finally, in this paper I proposed that the application of multi-disciplinary approaches (political, social, and managerial-based) to the public service is essential for somehow resolving the identity conflict of the field. An agreement over self-identity is required before any further development can be achieved. It is argued that some tenets of administrative culture and democratic values need to be explored before higher levels of social theory synthesis and integration can be reached. These may also be the milestones on the way to better linkage, partnership, and cooperation between rulers and citizens in modern societies. Here lies the main challenge of public administration in the coming years: the invention of a new vitalized administrative generation that is interdisciplinary in nature and tightly bounded together with modern participatory democracy. The contribution of this paper is its effort to bring these views together and to produce a multi-faceted analysis of modern public administration.

1.6 Theory and practice of public administration

In *To Run a Constitution*, John A. Rohr seeks to legitimize the administrative state in accordance with the fundamental principles established by the United States Constitution. To do so, he focuses on the nation's heritage and tradition, rather than the text of the constitution. Drawing upon the writings and debates of our nation's founders, including the debates between the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists, Rohr finds support for his central thesis: The administrative state was contemplated by our founders and is implicitly recognized in the framing of the Constitution. This methodology feeds Rohr's secondary purpose of educating public administrators on constitutional law and history. According to Rohr, an in-depth understanding of our founding principles is critical for administrators who must discharge their duties in accordance with an oath to uphold the Constitution.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part emphasizes the founding of the nation. Rohr argues that the administrative state can be justified under the Constitution based upon three main contentions. First, the combination of executive, legislative, and judicial powers within the administrative state does not violated the doctrine of separation of powers. Second, the career civil service fulfills the constitutional design of the framers by performing a balancing executive function originally assigned to the Senate. Finally, in general, the career civil service heals the defect of inadequate representation by reducing the ratio between the citizenry and government officials.

In the second part of the book, Rohr turns his attention to the founding of the administrative state "in word." After discussing Woodrow Wilson and Frank J. Goodnow, Rohr focuses his attention on Judge Thomas Cooley. To Rohr, Wilson and Goodnow were not loyal to the nation's constitutional heritage. Wilson disapproved of the doctrine of separation of powers; Goodnow did not like the notion of popular sovereignty. Cooley, on the other hand, provided a true example of an administrator and constitutional scholar who was loyal in all respects to the founding principles of the country. In 1887, Cooley, who was widely regarded as the foremost scholar of constitutional law at the time, was tapped to lead the Interstate Commerce Commission when it became an independent agency. Rohr believes that Cooley's reputation as a constitutional scholar may have led the judiciary to accept the

legitimacy of the administrative agency and redefine the requirements of due process. Additionally, Rohr surmises that Cooley's leadership may have inspired acceptance of the agency in the minds of the general public: The ICC under Cooley's leadership provides the extraordinary example of a vigorous administrative agency explaining to Congress its failure to use certain explicit statutory powers on the grounds that the exercise of such powers might be in violation of the Constitution" (p. 110). He views this "self-denying action" as an indication that the ICC considered itself accountable to the Constitution rather than the executive or legislative branch.

The third part discusses the founding of the modern administrative state "in deeds." As a practical matter, the modern administrative state was founded during the New Deal Era. This is where Rohr turns to discover a constitution-based argument to justify the existence of the administrative state. During the New Deal Era, the United States Supreme Court reinterpreted the Commerce Clause and the Fourteenth Amendment in a manner that permitted more federal regulations to be adopted and more federal agencies to be created. Rohr views this development a victory for the administrative state that should be developed further. He suggests a that broad interpretations of the Commerce Clause, the General Welfare Clause, and the Necessary and Proper Clause could serve as a means of legitimizing the administrative state.

Finally, in the Conclusion, Rohr discusses the importance of the administrator's oath of office. Rohr explains the profound moral significance of the administrator's oath as a binding commitment, a justification for administrative autonomy, and a guide for administrative action. Succinctly stated, if administrators are going to actively seek justification in the constitution, then certainly administrators must take their oaths seriously. The oath represents a covenant between the administrator and society that requires the administrator to act in accordance with constitutional commands. Moreover, Rohr maintains that the exercise of discretion in accordance with the oath requires a thorough understanding of the constitutional principles that undergird the nation. In other words, public administrators should be considered, and should consider themselves, constitutional officers.

To Run a Constitution is part of the New Public Administration movement that seeks to advance the dialogue concerning Public Administration and replace the

conventional wisdom of bureaucrat bashing with a positive understanding of the administrative state's role in society. In general, this movement calls for the pursuit of academic and legal justification for the administrative state and a redefining of the role of the public administrator as a constitutional officer. For his part, Rohr pursues legal justification of the administrative state. And he provides a very compelling argument. Rohr draws upon the words of our founding fathers to explicate constitutional provisions in a manner favorable to public administration. He makes a compelling case that administration was always envisioned as a part of the constitutional order and, as proof, he cites the Commerce Clause, the General Welfare Clause, and the Necessary and Proper Clause, and the arguments surrounding their meaning at the time the constitution was drafted.

However, Rohr's work is not without its faults. With his contention that administrative legitimacy may be found by characterizing the administrative state as filling the role originally envisioned for the Senate, Rohr commits essentially the same mistake for which he criticized Wilson and Goodnow: The contention is a very conspicuous departure from the text of the Constitution as well as the history and traditions that inspired the constitution. Despite the similarities that Rohr documents, it remains that the Senate is a constitutionally-defined, representative body within the legislative branch. Constitutionally speaking, the administrative state is, at most, its doppelganger. Rohr's argument that the administrative state corrects the problems of representation befalls a similar fate. The Constitution prescribes a system of representation through the President, the Representative, and the Senators. Administrators cannot simply glom on to a representative role. Furthermore, and most notably, Rohr's thesis fails to define the critics and criticisms to which it apparently responds, and, as a result, it deals with the subject from a very general perspective. Consequently, Rohr seems to miss the point of so much of the criticism of the administrative state played out in the judicial system and the court of public opinion. Many critics of the administrative state disclaim the New Deal decisions of the Supreme Court as ill-conceived. Hence, it seems unlikely that relying upon those opinions as the bellwether of the legitimacy of the administrative state is unlikely to win new friends.

Despite these drawbacks, with *To Run a Constitution* Rohr has made an important contribution to the public administration literature. He is correct in noting that the

administrative state is clearly contemplated by the text and tradition of the Constitution. This point is lost on many of the administrative state's critics. Moreover, his focus on the historical tradition of this country is indeed a step in the right direction. Scholars and public administrators alike will learn much from Rohr's account of the founding of the nation. And Rohr is quite correct in suggesting that a more in depth knowledge of our nation's history will serve the profession and the academic discipline well. This is most apropos when it comes to the administrator's oath of office. Administrators will be less likely to take their oaths of office for granted when they truly understand their role as stewards of the Constitution.

1.7 Public choice theory

Public choice in economic theory is the use of modern economic tools to study problems that are traditionally in the province of political science. (A more general term is 'political economy', an earlier name for 'economics' that evokes its practical and theoretical origins but should not be mistaken for the Marxian use of the same term.)

In particular, it studies the behavior of voters, politicians, and government officials as (mostly) self-interested agents and their interactions in the social system either as such or under alternative constitutional rules. These can be represented a number of ways, including standard constrained utility maximization, game theory, or decision theory. Public choice analysis has roots in positive analysis ("what is") but is often used for normative purposes ("what ought to be"), to identify a problem or suggest how a system could be improved by changes in constitutional rules. A key formulation of public choice theory is in terms of rational choice, the agent-based proportioning of scarce means to given ends. An overlapping formulation with a different focus is positive political theory. Another related field is social choice theory.

Origins and formation

The modern literature in Public Choice began with Duncan Black, who in 1948 identified the underlying concepts of what would become median voter theory. He also wrote *The Theory of Committees and Elections* in 1958. Gordon Tullock refers to him as the "father of public choice theory".

Special Interests

Public choice theory is often referred to when discussing how individual political decision-making results in policy that conflict with the overall desires of the general public. For example, many special interest and pork barrel projects are not the desire of the overall democracy. However, it makes sense for politicians to support these projects. It may benefit them psychologically as they feel powerful and important. It can also benefit them financially as it may open the door to future wealth as lobbyists (after they retire). The project may be of interest to the politician's local constituency, increasing district votes or campaign contributions. The politician pays little to no cost

to gain these benefits, as they are spending public tax money. Special interest lobbyists are also behaving rationally. They can gain government favors worth millions or billions for relatively small investments. They face a risk of losing out to their competitors if they don't seek these favors. The taxpayer is also behaving rationally. The cost of defeating any one government give-away is very high, while the benefits to the individual taxpayer are very small. Each citizen pays only a few pennies or a few dollars for any given government favor, while the costs of ending that favor would be many times higher. Everyone involved has rational incentives to do exactly what they're doing, even though the desire of the general constituency is opposite. (It is notable that the political system considered here is very much that of the United States, with "pork" a main aim of individual legislators; in countries such as Britain with strong party systems the issues would differ somewhat.)

Decision making processes and the State

One way to organize the subject matter studied by Public Choice theorists is to begin with the foundations of the state itself. According to this procedure, the most fundamental subject is the origin of government. Although some work has been done on anarchy, autocracy, revolution, and even war, the bulk of the study in this area has concerned the fundamental problem of collectively choosing constitutional rules. This work assumes a group of individuals who aim to form a government. Then it focuses on the problem of hiring the agents required to carry out government functions agreed upon by the members.

The main questions are: (1) how to hire competent and trustworthy individuals to whom day-to-day decision-making can be delegated and (2) how to set up an effective system of oversight and sanctions for such individuals. To answer these questions it is necessary to assess the effects of creating different loci of power and decision-making within a government; to examine voting and the various means of selecting candidates and choosing winners in elections; to assess various behavioral rules that might be established to influence the behavior of elected and appointed government officials; and to evaluate alternative constitutional and legal rights that could be reserved for citizens, especially rights relating to citizen oversight and the avoidance of harm due to the coercive power of government agents.

These are difficult assessments to make. In practice, most work in the field of Public Choice has dealt with more limited issues. Extensive work has been done on different voting systems and, more generally, on how to transform what voters are assumed to want into a coherent "collective preference". Of some interest has been the discovery that a general collective preference function cannot be derived from even seemingly mild conditions. This is often called Arrow's impossibility theorem. The theorem, an economic generalization of the voting paradox, suggests that voters have no reason to expect that, short of dictatorship, even the best rules for making collective decisions will lead to the kind of consistency attributed to individual choice.

Much work has been done on the loose connection between decisions that we can imagine being made by a full contingent of citizens with zero collective decision-making costs and those made by legislators representing different voting constituencies. Of special concern has been logrolling and other negotiations carried out by legislators in exercising their law-making powers. Important factors in such legislative decisions are political parties and pressure groups. Accordingly, Public Choicers have studied these institutions extensively. The study of how legislatures make decisions and how various constitutional rules can constrain legislative decisions is a major sub-field in Public Choice.

Bureaucracy

Another major sub-field is the study of bureaucracy. The usual model depicts the top bureaucrats as being chosen by the chief executive and legislature, depending on whether the democratic system is presidential or parliamentary. (See also presidential system and parliamentary system.) The typical image of a bureau chief is a person on a fixed salary who is concerned with pleasing those who appointed him. The latter have the power to hire and fire him more or less at will. The bulk of the bureaucrats, however, are civil servants whose jobs and pay are protected by a civil service system against major changes by their appointed bureau chiefs. This image is often compared with that of a business owner whose profit varies with the success of production and sales, who aims to maximize profit, and who can hire and fire employees at will.

Rent-Seeking

A field that is closely related to public choice is "rent-seeking." This field combines the study of a market economy with that of government. Thus, one might regard it as a "new political economy." Its basic thesis is that when both a market economy and government are present, government agents are a source of numerous special market privileges. Both the government agents and self-interested market participants seek these privileges in order to partake in the monopoly rent that they provide. When such privileges are granted, they reduce the efficiency of the economic system. In addition, the rent-seekers use resources that could otherwise be used to produce goods that are valued by consumers.

Rent-seeking is broader than Public Choice in that it applies to autocracies as well as democracies and, therefore, is not directly concerned with collective decision-making. However, the obvious pressures it exerts on legislators, executives, bureaucrats, and even judges are factors that Public Choicers must account for in their effort to understand and assess collective decision-making rules and institutions. Moreover, the members of a collective who are planning a government would be wise to take prospective rent-seeking into account.

1.8 The development of American administration

Frederick Taylor, "Scientific Management"

1. "Scientific Management" school, 1880; factual, analytical approaches in place of rule-of-thumb or intuitive methods; organization of rules, procedures, methods at managerial level; integrating scientific principles into the workforce to bring together workers and managers; advocate of "close, personal cooperation" in tasks, or equal division of work; careful selection, and training of personnel; friendly cooperation between management and employees, human resource development. Application of behavioral/human relations principles as they were then understood. Taylor's philosophy and methods began to attract attention in 1910s, extensively applied in new agencies in 1930s.

2. Initiative and incentive versus one best way

3. Scientific management = practically with absolute regularity

4. Principles of Scientific Management

   a. Traditional knowledge – rules, laws, formulas; development of science organizing traditional knowledge; science to the details in aspects of administration (one best way).

   b. Scientific selection and progressive development of workers shortcomings and possibilities; physical aspects, measurement; control of workplace.

   c. Bringing of the science and the scientifically selected and trained workers together; organizing people; once science of management developed, conflict will be illuminated.

   d. Division of work between management and workers; managers in control, workers happy (people who do work do not understand work); managers implement results of science.

5. Ideas are essentially wrong, but nonetheless influential

Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam, and Luther Gulick, "Report of the resident's Committee on Administrative Management"

1. Head of FDR's Committee on Administrative Management, created to improve federal civil service; committee asked to report back to FDR on modernizing management in the executive. Favored strong executive leadership of civil service; strong presidency grounded in reform tradition. Constitutional role of Congress was not to nickel and dime executive agencies, but to provide legislative oversight of whole through auditing. Resulted in creation of Executive Office.

2. Equipping democracy for action – through the office of the President

3. Efficiency = consent of the governed and good management

4. Requires the establishment of "a responsible and effective chief executive as the center of energy, direction, and administrative management; the systematic organization of all activities in the hands of a qualified personnel under the direction of the chief executive; and to aid him in this, the establishment of appropriate managerial and staff agencies."

5. "Administrative management concerns itself in a democracy with the executive and his duties, with managerial and staff aides, with organization, with personnel, and with the fiscal system because these are the indispensable means of making good the popular will in a people's government."

6. Modern managerial tools needed to "make democracy work today in our national government; that is, to make our government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the nation." – Public interest.

7. The White House Staff – "the president needs help"
   a. executive assistants – division of labor and specialization
   b. carry over to the departments these managerial practices

8. Compelling argument (no executive office at time of report).
   a. Control over process of administration
   b. President as CEO of bureaucracy

David H. Rosenbloom, "Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers"

1. Public administrators need "constitutional competence"
2. Problem with identify crisis in PA is problem of our three-branch system of government: hard to retrofit PA into constitutional separation of powers, disturbs our three-dimensional thinking.
3. No accident that theoretical perspectives on PA role reflect each branch of government: "managerial" role/executive; "pluralist, political" roles/legislative, "judicialization of agencies"/legal.
4. Managerial approach: from civil service reform in late 19th century.
   a. Maximization of effectiveness, efficiency and economy.
   b. Hierarchy, impersonal view of the individual.
5. Political approach: "apparent empirical reality"
   a. Representativeness, political responsiveness, and accountability.
   b. Representative bureaucracy, citizen participation.
   c. Political pluralism; individual as part of aggregate group.
6. Legal approach: administrative law, "judicialization" and individual rights through legal procedure; constitutional law; judges as partners in the administrative process.
   a. procedural due process, individual substantive rights (Bill of Rights, 14th amendment)
   b. Adversary procedure (e.g., in public personnel management the application of EEO and labor relations).
   c. Individual as a "unique person in a unique set of circumstances."

H. George Frederickson, "Toward a New Public Administration"

1. New PA was a reaction to political turbulence of the 1960s. Argument: Given assumption of values in public administration decision-making and inability of public administrator to achieve political neutrality, why not require public administrator to take positive role by improving social conditions? Moral imperative. Values important (e.g., social equity, fairness, justice in public services). Will still achieve efficiency and effectiveness imagined by earlier theorists, just a different version.

2. What's New PA?
    a. Classical argument: efficient, economical, and coordinated management; New PA adds social equity.
3. Classical argument: (1) How can we offer more or better services with available resources (efficiency)? (2) How can we maintain our level of services while spending less money (economy)? New PA: Does this service enhance social equity?
4. A public administration that works for changes which try to redress the deprivation of minorities. Social equity includes activities designed to enhance the political power and economic well-being of minorities.
5. Modified bureaucratic forms: decentralization, devolution, projects, contracts, sensitivity training, organization development, responsibility, expansion, confrontation, and client involvement
6. Throwing money at social issues does not solve the problem; refocus energy on institutional arrangements to combat problem.
7. "Second generation behaviorism" (p. 318) "The Public Administrator accepts the importance of understanding as scientifically as possible how and why organizations behave as they do but he/she tends to be rather more interested in the impact of that organization on its clientele and vice versa."
8. The second generation behaviorist is less "generic" and more
    a. "public" than his forebear, less "descriptive" and more "prescriptive,"
    b. less "institution oriented" and more "client-impact oriented," less
    c. "neutral" and more "normative," and it is hoped no less scientific.
9. Organization Theory and New PA: distributive process, integrative process, boundary-exchange process, and the socio-emotional process.

1.9 Paradigms

What is a paradigm?

Denhardt – A paradigm is a schema upon which to hang theory.

Guba & Lincoln – A paradigm is the basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigator ontologically, epistemologically and methodologically.

What is a Theory?

Putnam – Theories are partially interpreted calculi in which only the observation terms are directly interpreted.

Stanley, French, Spears 2005 – A theory is inadequate as a paradigmatic choice because it is a partial aspect of reality.

Kuhn – Definition of Paradigm:

1. "The entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community".
2. "One element in that constellation, the concrete puzzle-solutions which, employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of normal science."

Thomas Kuhn, one of the best-known [and most influential] historians and philosophers of science in the 20th century, made the following summarized major arguments (Land and Anders, 2000):

1. The field of science progress by paradigm shift – a reconstruction of prior theory and knowledge.
2. Paradigms are criteria for indentifying legitimate problems and methods of inquiry for a research field. It includes a worldwide (constructed theory about how facts should be related) and two basic criteria – it attracts an enduring group of adherents away from competing modes of scientific activity and it is sufficiently open-ended to leave all sorts of problems for the followers to resolve.
3. Paradigms do not have to entirely inclusive. Competing paradigms can exist within one discipline. Also, not all legitimate research activities within one discipline have to be governed by paradigms.

4. The concept of paradigm is different from the concept of rule. Researchers working under the guidance of a shared paradigm do not have to always agree with one another on the set of rules that govern their research. Lack of a standard interpretation or of an agreed reduction to rules will not prevent a paradigm from guiding research (Kuhn, 1970).

There are three basic components to any legitimate paradigm, each one assuming a different characteristic: the (1) ontological, (2) epistemological, and (3) methodological arguments.

The nature of reality (the ontological argument) suggests that certain realities exist that we can ultimately know, but there are certain things we never comprehend. It is up to the researcher to find this reality (epistemological argument) through recognized methods of theory development (methodological argument) that objectively or subjectively measure partial aspects of social phenomena to determine this reality (French, et al, 2005).

Every paradigm has ASSUMPTIONS: Ontological, Epistemological and Methodological.

ONTOLOGY – **The Nature of Reality – The Nature of that reality we are studying. What we can know**. What can be known about it? Ontological assumptions are those which concern the very essence of the phenomena under investigation. Suggests that certain realities exist that we can ultimately know, but there are certain things we can never comprehend. Those questions that do not relate to matters of "real" existence or "real" action fall outside the realm of legitimate scientific inquiry.

EPISTEMOLOGY – **What Can We Know? The Philosophy of Knowledge – How and where do we collect the data? Multiple methods and ways of thinking**. What is the relationship between the knower and what can be known? The Epistemological assumption are assumptions about the grounds of knowledge – about how one might begin to understand the world and communicate this as knowledge to fellow human beings. These assumptions entail ideas about what forms of knowledge can be obtained, and how one can sort out what is "true" from what is "false". How do we know what we know?

METHODOLOGY – The System of Inquiry – How can we perform examination? How can the inquirer go about finding out whatever he believes can be known?

Five Social Science Paradigms:

POSITIVISM	Popper
POST-POSITIVISM	Simon
CONFLICT THEORY	Feyerabend
INTERPRETIVISM	Charles Taylor
CONSTRUCTIVISM	Denzin & Lincoln

What is the difference between Interpretivist and Constructivist?

Interpretivists approach a study WITHOUT ANY PRECONCEPTIONS about what they will find – simply interpret what you find.

Constructivists come into a study with a PRECONCEIVED NOTION of the particular social constructions he might find.

GIDDENS – STRUCTURATION - The process whereby governments attempt to make the functioning of the reproduction circuits of the state compatible with their political objectives is called the structuration (see Giddens 1990, 64) of public administration. The mastering of this process is the main objective of the public administration discipline.

The structuration of public administration is not entirely determined by a government's will. Governments have to confront the various systemic forces that condition the nature and the role of public administration. These forces both constrain and enable the agents in control of the administrative state in their efforts to institutionalize patterns of social relations across historical time and territorial space.

- The relationship between social systems within a societal totality does not follow any rigidly determined pattern. From this perspective, the functioning of

the reproduction circuits of the administrative state, and consequently a government's capacity to structure them, is conditioned by the interplay of the government system, the political system, the economic system, and the internal dynamic of the administrative state.

- The functioning of the government system, the political system, the economic system, and the reproduction circuits of the administrative state also is conditioned by international and transnational forces; thus, the study of the process of structuration of public administration must take into account the process of global interpenetration within which public administration operates today.

Gregory A. DANEKE

Gregory Daneke's article is an answer to Harland Cleveland and others scholars who feel that "it is time to put behind us the idea that the politics and administration of human endeavors are some kind of science." Daneke feels that much of the scholarly work that has been done in public administration in the recent past has not contributed to advancing a new paradigm for public administration, but instead have centered on critiques of positivism and/or neoclassical economic theory. Daneke argues that scholars in the discipline should channel their energies into reforming the system's basic unifying paradigm and to advance it in the direction of a "comprehensive design approach", capable of enhancing the processes of adaptive learning and institutional evolution.

Daneke then presents a new prospective paradigm called "Advanced Systems Theory". This emerging paradigm builds on general systems theory and contemporary economics, while integrating a number of unique ingredients derived from advances in the physical, biological, and cognitive sciences. By incorporating new knowledge from works in diverse areas such as chaos theory and quantum logic, the social sciences (and public administration in particular) may be able to overcome their current lack of progress in paradigm development.

PA IDENTITY CRISIS

Denhardt argues that PA has been limited in the past by two important positions deeply rooted in the history of the discipline:

1. A view of moral and political accountability conceived in hierarchical terms, in terms of responsiveness of agencies to elected officials; and
2. A transposition of business values or at least managerial values into the conduct of public agencies.

"The proper moral and political basis for public organizations can no longer be encapsulated in the hierarchical relationship between agencies and legislatures."

"We should call into question the wholesale adoption by public agencies of the values of private organizations. Indeed, I would propose that just the opposite should occur."

PA theory draws its greatest strength and its most serious limitation from its diversity. This diversity often means that the field lacks a sense of identity.

ROSENBLOOM (1983) – 3 Approaches to PA Theory: Managerial, Political & Legal. "PA administrators have the unenviable position of having to balance the various interests represented by these three approaches.

HART & SCOTT (1982) – American PA has been taken over by the values of American Business Management. These values are "inappropriate" to the conduct of public affairs. Hart & Scott argue that the conduct of public affairs should be guided by the natural-law values of our constitutional foundation.

OSTROM (1980) – The study of PA should not be treated as strictly natural phenomena. The methods of the natural sciences are not fully appropriate to the study of PA. Instead, we need to look upon administrative tasks and administrative arrangements as works of art or as artifacts.

Robert DENHARDT – In support of CRITICAL THEORY.

Denhardt begins by stating the problem: "We are in a situation in which we seem to be somewhat unsure of the historical and philosophical grounding of our work." Denhardt recognizes that we can trace the roots of our heritage in many directions, but as we do, we discover that there are "serious conflicts among our ancestors." (Denhardt, 1981)

In short, the problem he identifies is that our concern for making public administration an object of "scientific" study has often been at odds with our interest

in extending the normative principles we associate with democratic governance. The purpose of the article is to examine recent works in **"critical" theory**, while addressing implications for developing a comprehensive theory of public organization. Denhardt notes that the critical approach is suggestive of alternative conceptions of the role of public organizations in a democratic society, as well as changing patterns of relationships within the bureaucracy.

"It reminds us that the theory and practice of public administration is integral to the development of the state and its allocation of values in society and therefore must encompass far more than technical concerns".

Following a brief review of the development of critical theory, Denhardt focuses on the work of **Jurgen Habermas,** who is perhaps the best known contemporary scholar of the critical approach.

Jurgen Habermas

The critical perspective proffered by Habermas includes the following aspects:

It examines:

1. The critique of instrumental reason
2. The scientization of political life and the reduction of the public sphere, and
3. The relationship between knowledge and human interests.

Habermas, a member of the "Frankfurt School" of thought, describes the "public sphere" as that arena in which the various interests in society engage in discourse related to the establishment of the normative agenda for society. "In recent times, the public sphere has been considerably narrowed, to the point that the interests being voiced tend to be those of hierarchical superiors in business, labor, and the professions, mediated or administered by the mass media." (Denhardt,1981). Habermas seeks a "critical" approach that would aim at revealing the "false consciousness" which binds us, thus permitting movement toward emancipation. "Since what appear to us as causal relationships are manifestations of our particular historical circumstance (rather than natural and unalterable "laws"), they are subject to alteration by autonomous and responsible action on our part, and that process is initiated in the act of critique."

Francis X. Neumann, Jr.

Neumann criticizes a recent essay by Robert Behn (1995), entitled "The Big Questions of Public Management". He agrees with Behn's assertion that "any field of science is defined by the big questions it asks". However, he feels that Behn incorrectly identifies the "big questions".

Behn proposed the following "big" questions:

1. How can public managers break the micromanagement cycle?
2. How can public managers motivate people?
3. How can public managers measure achievement?

Neumann says that these questions are not incorrect or irrelevant, but they are at the wrong *level*. Neumann argues that Behn's questions are not "big" questions at all, but are for an argument at a much lower level. His three questions are questions of application, not probes into the origins or basic nature of a discipline.

Neumann proposes his own "big questions" for Public Administration:

1. What is the nature of an organization? Of a "public" organization?
2. How is the public organization related to its environment?
3. What does it mean to manage or to administer the public organization?

Neumann acknowledges that the questions appear to address basic organizational theory, and that much work has already been done in these areas to answer similar questions. However, he feels that among the scientific disciplines, "The big questions are never really completely answered. The big questions, by their very nature, are multifaceted and extend into dimensions of which we are never fully cognizant at any one time." Neumann cautions us that although it may seem that all the major questions have been put to rest, "in truth we have only produced the answers that our existing vision has enabled us to find." What is needed is a paradigm shift in public administration.

Neumann concludes by suggesting a new paradigm based on non-linear systems theory. He feels that this world view appears to have great implications not only for the physical world, but for the social world as well. He adds: "the new paradigm is that of the nonlinear system. Nonlinear systems theory, "complexity" or "chaos"

theory is providing researchers with a new view of both physical and social systems."
Some of the characteristics of these systems might be considered to be of important
for application to public administration and public management. Neumann gives
guidelines for the development of a new paradigm based on reasons why the older
understanding of organizations may now be inadequate:

- Complex problems require complex mechanisms of solution.
- Attention to the parts of the problem may not solve the whole of the problem.
- Nonlinear systems do not necessarily tend toward equilibrium.
- Mechanisms of positive feedback are widespread and may cause unforeseen deviation amplification.
- Complexity may develop spontaneously in a system.
- Natural complex systems contain a balance of both random and deterministic elements.
- Accurate forecasts for future states of the nonlinear system may not be attainable.

Related COMPS QUESTIONS:

- What is the definition of Public Administration?

- Does Public Administration have a Paradigm?

- Take a paradigmatic stance and make the case on what kind of social scientist you are. Make a convincing argument.

- Describe in detail the "Identity Crisis" in PA.

1.10 PA theory and paradigm and identity Crisis

THE CLASSICAL APPROACH: (Dominant in the U.S. before 1940). The combination of Wilson's definition of the field and the Scientific Management and Departmentalist prescriptions for organizational management and structure (heavily relying on hierarchy as a primary mechanism for control and coordination) constituted the core of the Classical approach to PA.

WEBER – Argued that domination is exerted through administration and that legal domination requires bureaucracy for its exercise.

- Equal application of the law is translated into the equal (and impersonal) application of the rule in bureaucracy.
- Weber argued that the bureaucrat should stay out of politics and limit himself to the "impartial administration of his office," and that he should subordinate his personal opinion on matters of policy to his sense of duty.
- Called for bureaucrats to be the neutral servants of their political masters. (like Wilson's call that administrators should be responsible only for the efficient execution of the law.)
- Called for the construction of a value-free social science.
- Believed that capitalism represents the highest stage of rationality in economic behavior.
- Obedience is dependent on the perception of legitimacy. 3 sources of legitimacy for domination based on authority: charisma, tradition, and legality.
- Weber identifies bureaucracy as the dominant organizational form in a legal-rational society. Complexity breeds bureaucracy.
- Weber's "ideal-type" bureaucracy: Administration is carried out on a continuous basis, not simply at the pleasure of the leader. Tasks are divided into functionally-distinct areas, each with the requisite authority and sanctions. Offices are arranged in a hierarchy. Resources of the bureaucratic org are distinct from those of the members as private individuals. The officeholder does not own the office, cannot be sold or passed-on, etc. Administration is based on written documents. Control is based on impersonally-applied rules.
- Weber believes bureaucracy to be the most rational and efficient organizational form devised by man.

- Warned that bureaucracy can become an "Iron Cage": a "scaffolding for thought" that limits individual freedom and choices for action, is oppressive, and determines how action is pursued or conducted.

WILSON (1887) *The Study of Administration* – Discussed the necessary separation or dichotomy between politics and administration. Called for the serious study of the new field of public administration.

Wilson Excerpts

- "It is getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one."
- Wilson insisted that "administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics" and that "general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration". He likens administration to a machine that functions independent of the changing mood of its leaders.
- "It is harder for democracy to organize administration than for a monarchy. The very fact that we have realized popular rule in its fullness [sic] has made the task of organizing that rule just so much more difficult....the people cannot agree on something simple; advance must be made through compromise, by a compounding of differences by a trimming of plans and a suppression of too straightforward principles."
- "The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon the foundations laid deep in stable principle.....civil service reform is thus but a moral preparation for what is to follow....administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions." (18)
- "A clear view of the difference between the province of constitutional law and the province of administrative function leave no room for misconception. Public administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration. The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative."
- "Monarchies and democracies, radically different as they are in other respects, have in reality much the same business to look to.....we can borrow the science of administration with safety and profit only if we read all fundamental

differences of condition into its essential tenet. We can never learn either our weaknesses or our virtues by comparing ourselves with ourselves.

- We study administration as a means of making what is democratically politic toward all administratively possible toward each...we can learn without error what foreign systems have to teach us."
- "Our duty is to supply the best possible life to a federal organization, to systems within systems, to make town, city, county, state and federal governments live with a like strength and equally assured healthfulness."

Frank GOODNOW (1900) *Politics and Administration*: Goodnow argues that there are "two distinct functions of government": Politics – has to do with policies or expressions of the state will. Administration – has to do with the execution of these policies.

Frederick TAYLOR (1919) Father of the Scientific Management Movement: Efficiency and finding the "ONE BEST WAY" through empirical analysis and time & motion studies.

- Taylor identifies the basic social problem of his day as inefficiency. His objective is to increase efficiency by capitalizing on the difference between what can be done by a "first-class" man and by an ordinary worker.
- Taylor's principles of Scientific Management: 1) The development of a science of management; 2) The selection and training of the workman; 3) Bringing science and the workman together; 4) An equal division of work and responsibility between management and worker.
- Under Scientific Management, science would replace rules of thumb.
- Taylor sought ONE BEST WAY.
- Core of Scientific Management: Time & Motion studies; Wage-Incentive systems, and Functional Organization.

Leonard WHITE (1926) *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration:* FIRST TEXTBOOK DEVOTED IN TOTO TO THE FIELD.

White argued that politics should not intrude on administration; management lends itself to scientific study; public administration is capable of becoming a "value-free"

science in its own right; the mission of administration is economy and efficiency, period.

The net result of these early authors was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy.

WILLOUGHBY (1927) *Principles of Public Administration*: SECOND TEXTBOOK DEVOTED IN TOTO TO THE FIELD.

Argued that certain scientific principles of administration were "there", that they could be discovered, and that administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these principles.

Luther GULICK - The "Dean of Public Administration".

- Adopts Wilson's theme that a science of administration should be constructed, and that it should be founded on basic principles applicable to both the public and private sectors.   Common objective – to achieve greater efficiency in public sector operations.
- Gulick's strongest emphasis is on the enhancement of executive power – both within orgs and in the executive branch agencies.   A strong executive is required because neither the public nor the legislature is capable of the planning needed by an effective govt.
- On Federalism: National legislators often enact policies that ignore the needs of state and local governments.   Since it is not possible to achieve a clear separation of functions in the federal system, he argues for "pragmatic solutions" in which functions are divided into their local, state and federal "aspects" and responsibilities assigned accordingly.
- In relations between branches of govt., the executive should plan, propose, and implement public policies and the legislative should be restricted to review and approval.
- On Science of Admin: He aspires to the application of scientific methods to administrative matters.   Instead of suggesting that PA or the social sciences adopt the research standards of the natural sciences, he advocates vigorously for the application of Scientific Management.

- Gulick's objective is to discover the "principles" or "immutable laws of administration", which can be distilled and simplified for practical application to administrative matters.
- On Professionalism – Gulick is aware of the dangers of scientific "expertise" and technocracy. The answer is a sense of professionalism that imposes responsible self-discipline and recognizes that final action cannot be taken by experts.
- Private administration and Public Administration both belong to a broad science despite their different objectives and emphases.
- Span of control – Gulick warns that effective span of control is limited at each level of the org by the knowledge, time, and energy of the supervisor. The span of control can be extended where work is routine, repetitive, measurable, and homogeneous in character.
- DICHOTOMY - Gulick breaks from the Classical authors re: the Politics/Administration Dichotomy. Gulick believes that a separation if impractical, impossible and undesirable. Instead, we should develop a system that allows the fullest use of the expertise of the public administrator, including expertise in policy matters. Administration involve the determination of major policy (and POSDCORB)
- POSDCORB – The executive organizations should be structured around these functions, and none should be performed outside the executive office. Gulick attaches special importance to the Planning component (purpose translates into programs).
- The administrator's role is to understand and coordinate public policy and to interpret policy directives to the operating services, but with unquestioned loyalty to the decisions of elected officials.
- ADMIN MGMT – Discretion is vital to public officials. Discretion decreases as one move from the elected official to the technician. The successful administrator must understand, and be able to deal with, the strategic dimensions of the system in which he must operate.
- Gulick felt that public and private sectors should become partners in a cooperative enterprise serving the common good.
- The role of the state should be limited because of uncertainty about the future.

- Gulick's emphasis on unity of command and efficiency as two of the core principles of organization sprang from a deep-felt desire to develop a science of administration.

GULICK & URWICK (1937) *Papers on the Science of Administration***:** Considered the "High-Noon of Orthodoxy" in PA. Called for separation of politics and administration. **POSDCORB** – applicable to any type of enterprise. Gulick & Urwick developed POSDCORB based on the 14 Principles of Management by **FAYOL**. Advocated for **"one best way"** to do this or that.

Urwick and Gulick edited a 1937 publication titled Papers on the Science of Administration, which included articles on organization theory and public administration. Gulick isolated the responsibilities of the chief executive and enumerated them according to the acronym POSDCORB, which stands for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. One of his main points was that well-managed, self-contained organizations or departments are nearly always headed by a single top manager such as a CEO. For his part, Urwick believed that the activities necessary to achieve organizational goals should be grouped and assigned to individuals in an impersonal way, echoing the impartial detachment of Max Weber's bureaucracy.

Urwick also wrote about the problems of managing large numbers of employees, identified multiple levels of supervisory management, and used a formula to determine the minimum and maximum number of subordinates a manager can effectively supervise. His work was an important step in synthesizing the principles of scientific management with the thinking of Weber and Fayol.

(Wilson, Goodnow, Taylor, White, Willoughby, Gulick & Urwick)

Allof these authors called for the separation of politics and administration. As a result, PA established itself as a distinct discipline premised on the **PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION (POSDCORB).**

First real hint at conceptual challenge:

Chester BARNARD(1938)The Functions of the Executive. He was an EMPIRICIST, not a logical positivist.

- **DESCRIBED ORGANIZATION AS A SYSTEM OF EXCHANGE between the org and each of its participants.** The relationship between the individual and the organization constitutes a free contractual arrangement.

- **DISCUSSED DECISION MAKING IN ORGS. AUTHORITY IS CUMULATIVE IN NATURE.**

- **AUTHORITY IS EXERCISED NOT ON THE GIVING OF AN ORDER, BUT WHEN IT IS ACCEPTED. (BOTTOM-UP APPROACH TO AUTHORITY IN ORGS.) Authority resides not in a position but in a relationship between a superior and subordinate.**

- **Spoke about BALANCING MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE NEEDS.**

- **Barnard's ideas fit perfectly with Mayo & Roethlisberger, such as the assertion that group identity and social recognition are more important than power and money.**

- **Barnard describes society as a "complex of informal organizations in which a network of formal organizations is embedded."**

- **IMPORTANCE OF INFORMAL ORGANIZATION:** Informal orgs serve an important function by establishing general understandings, customs, habits, and institutions, thus creating conditions favorable to the rise of formal organizations.

- 5 Characteristics of Complex Formal Organizations: They are systems; they are depersonalized, they are specialized, they contain informal organizations, and they make use of an environment-oriented decision process.

- When discussing the development of executives, **Barnard de-emphasizes intellectual ability and academic training and emphasizes intuition, know-how, hunches** and other Experiential characteristics. He had a considerable effect on SIMON when he wrote his devastating critique of the field, *Administrative Behavior.* Barnard planted the seeds of the **logical positivist perspective**. He questioned the basic tenets (principles) propounded by Gulick & Urwick and Wilson. **Barnard argued that complex formal orgs evolve from and consist of simple formal orgs.**

- **Leadership –** Executive capacity in the form of leadership is the most important strategic factor in human cooperation, a major task of the organization is to see that those in executive positions are indeed leaders.

- **DECISION MAKING –** Barnard felt that individuals are limited in their power to choose by physical, biological, and social factors. Simon's SATISFICING MAN model with its bounded rationality is firmly rooted in Barnard's explanation of individual behavior.   Barnard argued that facts could NOT be logically separated from values.

- Barnard stressed the need for a "science of organization or of cooperative systems" that would complement and enhance the power of the "executive arts". Barnard hoped this would stimulate work among social scientists.   Simon eagerly took on the challenge.

LINDBLOM (1959) – The Science of "Muddling Through".

- **INCREMENTALISM, MUDDLING THROUGH, MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT (SPONTANEOUS ORDER) & BARGAINING.**
- Spontaneous order, or mutual adjustment, is discernible at societal and organizational levels in the economic (market) price system, and bargaining – is the coordinating mechanism. The analytical instrument fitting central planning and policymaking is the rational-comprehensive model, while incrementalism best serves as the analytical instrument for mutual adjustment.
- Echoing WEBER, Lindblom argues that the key to hierarchical exercise of authority is not the command, but LEGITIMATION – that is, the ability to create the perception that the leader has the right to command and the subordinate the duty to obey.
- Lindblom contends that hierarchy runs counter to the ideology and ethos of democracy.   Hierarchical orgs are the means by which totalitarian regimes perpetuate themselves.
- Like WEBER, Lindblom sees bureaucracy as a special case of hierarchy. According to Lindblom, bureaucracy is an organizational form that is hierarchical in structure, but it also embodies a bundle of characteristics, including hierarchical organization, conscious adaptation of means to ends,

prescribed and limited discretion, specialization of skill and function, and separation of ownership from management.

- The basic advantage of bureaucracy is that it is an effective means by which a relatively small number of people can coordinate the activities of a relatively large number of people.
- Bureaucratic forms may frustrate efforts at control:
  - First, bureaucrats may see themselves as part of a professional, educated corps of managers with knowledge and experience outweighing that of their elected superiors.
  - Second, bureaucrats are also a part of a particular organization with which they are likely to strongly identify, and they may be willing to sacrifice the greater good to the interests of their own organization.
- This thwarting of control is possible both in the public and private orgs.
- Short-term political conditions shape the incremental nature of decision making much more than rationality.

MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT: LINDBLOM

- "If the market system is a dance, the STATE provides the dance floor and the orchestra. Polyarchy and democracy are both directed by the same mechanism – mutual adjustment among competing interests.
- The market system is a method of social coordination by mutual adjustment among participants rather than by a central coordinator.
- The market offers multilateral controls in an environment characterized by consumer sovereignty and free choice – by which individuals, driven by self-interest, seek mutually beneficial exchanges.
- This system of exchange is moderated by the operation of a price system.
- The price system dispenses with the necessity of a central authority and delegates decisions to a large number of individuals whose decisions are coordinated without the aid of even a supervisory agency.
- Lindblom asserts that like all controls, those of the price system function imperfectly – there are "market failures". Even when the market system operates perfectly, it may fail to produce optimal results for the following

reasons: subject to cyclical fluctuations; and the outcomes of market transactions can be inequitable and inhumane.

- Given these imperfections, THE EXERCISE OF GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY IS REQUIRED.
- Lindblom argues that all societies are mixtures of governments and markets. The greatest distinction between one government and another is the DEGREE to which market replaces government or government replaces market.
- THREE FORMS OF GOVERNMENTAL CONTROL OVER THE MARKET: Direct authoritative control, indirect manipulation of the markets, and , as a special form of indirect control, planner sovereignty.
- Lindblom's FIRST PROBLEM OF POLITICS: How to keep our rulers from becoming tyrants.
- It is not democracy that offers a solution to the First Problem of Politics, but POLYARCHY, which is a rough approximation of liberal democracy. POLYARCHY is a process in which NON-LEADERS exercise a relatively high degree of control over leaders. POLYARCHY is distinguished from HIERARCHY by the high degree of control exerted by NON-LEADERS.
- POLYARCHY is distinguished from DEMOCRACY in that control is not shared equally.

INCREMENTALISM: LINDBLOM

- Incrementalism as a policymaking process unfolded as a sequence of approximations, or in Lindblom's terms, a method of SUCCESSIVE LIMITED COMPARISONS that would allow the decision maker to easily revisit earlier decisions and rectify them if necessary.
- Incrementalism serves to simplify the decision process by limiting the conceptual space in which the decision maker operates. It simplifies the decision process in the following ways:
    - Limiting the number of alternatives that are considered, since only those that are marginally different from previous practice are included.
    - Allowing the decision maker to rely on feedback from previous experience in rendering a decision; and

- Managing risk by making the process serial and remedial and thereby avoiding the possibility of large, irreversible errors.

PARTISAN MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT: LINDBLOM

- Lindblom is best known for incrementalism, but THE REAL CORE OF HIS THOUGHT is the notion of MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT, which he designated early on as the "HIDDEN HAND IN GOVERNMENT".

- Mutual adjustment has origins in Adam Smith's notion that haggling in the market is guided by the "INVISIBLE HAND" of the PRICE SYSTEM.

- Much as actors in the market seek out mutually beneficial exchanges, actors in government seek out areas of agreement as the basis for constructing winning coalitions. One is reminded of FOLLETT'S CIRCULAR RESPONSE, EVOCATION, and INTEGRATIVE SOLUTIONS. The motivating force in both instances is self-interest.

- He believes that mutual adjustment is not only more common than, but also generally superior to, centralized decision making.

- Lindblom was the first to point out that policymaking and decision making do not proceed hierarchically and unilaterally, but depend highly on the supportive organization.

- The criterion for "good policy" is simply agreement. The bargaining process requires agreement only on the policy itself, not on objectives. This limited focus simplifies the process because it allows different parties to agree on the same policy for different reasons.

- Bargaining treats values as central to the process rather than excluding them, AS SIMON HAD DONE, and it takes us into a palpably political setting.

- Lindblom argues that there are identifiable benefits from the use of bargaining in the public decision process that parallel those of the market system.

- Bargaining is good because it leads to the realization of the GENERAL INTEREST.

IMPAIRMENT: LINDBLOM

- The problem with the American political process is IMPAIRMENT. The culprit is BUSINESS, which occupies a privileged position in the American political process.
- Impairment of thought is the consequence of systematic and continuous indoctrination and manipulation. Advertisements convey non-and misinformation, that are designed to move consumers by appealing to emotions, that thwart rational thought, and that obfuscate.
- Lindblom argues that more than ever before, humankind is crippled in its capacity to think critically and independently about social problems.

THE BEHAVIORAL APPROACH: Entails the study of actual behavior, usually taking the individual as the preferred unit of analysis. This approach calls for "rigor" in the use of scientific procedures; and it is primarily descriptive in intent. Behavioralism incorporates a diversity of perspectives, including the **Human Relations Movement, Simon's model of decision making, organizational humanism and contingency theory**. The major thrust of the Behavioral approach was organization structure and management, not definition of the field. The Behavioral approach sought to modify the hierarchical org structures so ardently espoused by the Classical authors.

Whereas the Classical approach emphasized executive decision making responsibilities, the Behavioral approach argued for more participatory decision making procedures. Classical argued for centralization for control and coordination, Behavioral argued for decentralization to give more members of the organization a greater sense of control over their own destinies.

If Follet, Mayo and Barnard were precursors to the Behavioral approach, Simon was an important part of the movement itself. Simon's distinctive contribution was to shift the focus of analysis to decision making in the organization.

Mary Parker Follett – Distinguishing feature of her work is her treatment of Social Conflict. Follett argues that conflict itself is neither good nor bad, but simply inevitable. If it is used to produce ideas and solutions, then it is good. If it results in domination by one side or compromise in which both sides simply yield something, the results will be unsatisfactory.

- **Social Conflict** - Follett argues that we can use conflict to produce harmony, not simply victory or accommodation.
- **Means for the resolution of social conflict: Domination, Compromise, and Integration**. Domination is flawed because only one side wins in a dispute. Compromise is also unsatisfactory because each party has to give something up, resulting in temporary change only. **Integration is Follett's preferred method of resolving social conflict. Circular Response** is the process by which integration is achieved. Progress is never truly achieved, but something that advances with continued integration and reciprocal interaction.
- **Power & Control:** The desire for power is a predominant feature of life and power is always unequally distributed. Rather than abolishing power, integration through circular response both transforms power and increases it. Power is transformed from **"Power Over" to "Power With". In an org setting, this means that managers should give workers a chance to grow capacity or power for themselves. This Integration, resulting in "Power With" is akin to today's "Empowerment" as seen in movements like TQM.**
- **Group Process & Group Dynamics**– A central theme, Follett argues that individuals achieve their true expression in group relationships. **She considers the State to be both a logical extension of the group process and its highest expression**; both the group and the State serve a purpose greater than individual interests.
- **The supreme function of the state is the moral ordering of social relationships**.
- **MGMT** – She argues that control in the organization is pluralistic and cumulative (that is, arises from below), as opposed to the conventional view that control should be concentrated in the apex of the org pyramid and cascade downward.
- **Authority should flow from the "Law of the Situation"** (the objective demands of the work situation), rather than being based on personal imposition. **Authority is cumulative in nature**, and comes from the bottom-up.
- **Authority** resides in a function (not a position), is derived from the demands of the situation, and is the result of circular behavior.

- Leadership is the ability to create functional unity in the org through the proper correlation of controls, rather than personal power to command based on position.
- **Circular Response** – To Follett, the reality of org behavior cannot be captured in subject or object alone, but must be seen in the interaction between subject and object, since each in a function of the other.
- **Ballot-Box democracy is not real democracy**. It relies on brute numbers rather than on a genuine union of interests; it is based on the "law of the crowd", which employs suggestion of persuasion as its primary technique. The tragedy of democracy is not that we have no public opinion, but that we think we do. What is needed is not consent, but co-action.
- **On Professionalism and the Role of the Expert** – Democracy requires both expert advice and an active electorate, and the findings of experts must be balanced against the ideas of others.
- FOLLETT CONCLUDES: "WHATEVER HEIGHTENS SELF-RESPECT INCREASESS EFFICIENCY". Closely related to this is pride in one's work.
- "DEPERSONALIZING ORDERS IS ONE OF THE LARGEST CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT". Follett shows that by changing the way we give "orders", or be depersonalizing orders, both manager and employee can work more efficiently together addressing the "Law of the Situation".

Elton MAYO – Mayo echoes two of Follett's basic themes: The importance of the Group Process and the Cumulative Nature of Authority in the organization.

- Founder of the Human Relations approach.
- Unlike Follett, **Mayo feels that conflict is pathological and should be avoided.**
- Mayo argues that modern society suffers from a breakdown of the social routines of traditional society. Mayo asserts that the problem of social disorganization has been exacerbated by an economic theory that emphasizes competition in the pursuit of individual self-interest and by a political system that heightens the level of social conflict by playing to the fears of the masses. Politics has become part of the problem.

- **INFORMAL RELATIONSHIPS** – Management has failed to perceive the importance of informal social groups, which are a response to a basic human need. Informal relationships, communication and cooperation are more important than technical logic and the material interests of the individual.

- **Management must learn to appeal to individual and social emotions and attitudes in a more intimately human way. A key ingredient in this effort is the supervisor, who is the human interface of the org, and who plays an important role in supporting interpersonal relationships and team morale.**

- According to Mayo, societies die because of ignorance. The particular ignorance of modern society is its ignorance of human nature.

- Mayo's empirical research led him to concentrate on **the role of the social group within the organization in determining the individual's attitude toward work.**

- **Mayo's work was largely responsible for a major shift in the study of organizations. His concern with the attitudes and sentiments of the worker, the importance he attached to the social group in determining individual behavior, and his search for "knowledge-of-acquaintance" based on direct observation, all served as inspiration for future scholars.**

Herbert SIMON (1946) *Proverbs of Administration* (pointing to the fundamental flaws in the principles approach – and his 1947 *Administrative Behavior*- A devastating critique of the field. Triggered the debate with Waldo and won him the Nobel Prize for transforming the way economists and others perceived rational behavior. Simon said PA has evolved as both as a basic and applied science.

Simon called for LOGICAL POSITIVISM. He was not "anti-scientific", quite the opposite. Simon sought to save PA from "bad science" and the pseudo-scientific approaches of Taylorism, the Human Relations Movement and the "principles of administration". Simon was proposing a more credible social science approach for the field. An important feature of Simon's approach was its roots in the **Logical Positivist approach**. Simon studied logic under **Rudolph Carnap** (member of the Vienna Circle). Carnap offered a clear vision of what constitutes a "science": the presentation of knowledge in empirically verifiable statements untainted by the bias of values or ethical statements. It is a position Simon adopts in the final chapter of his

dissertation *Administrative Behavior*: "science is interested in sentences only with regard to their verification."

Simon replaced the Wilsonian politics/administration dichotomy, and offered in its place the fact-value distinction of logical positivism. He demonstrated the "principles" to be rules-of-thumb, folklore, but held out the hope of arriving at empirically based knowledge that would pass the test of true science.

Simon adopted major aspects of Barnard's work, including his ideas on decision making in orgs. He agreed with Barnard's conceptualization of the organization as a system of exchange and the definition of authority as a bottom-up process.

Simon called Gulick & Urwick's "Principles" nothing but "Proverbs". Simon effectively demonstrated that for every "principle" of administration advocated in the literature, there was a counter-principle, thus rendering the very idea of principles moot.

BOUNDED RATIONALITY & SATISFICING (LOGICAL POSITIVIST PERSPECTIVE). Simon felt that at the basis of administrative organization is the concept of rationality. He felt that absolute or pure rationality could not be achieved; only approached. Because true rationality cannot be achieved, an individual is limited (bounded) in his perceptions of reality. Due to their limitations, individuals find it necessary to SATISFICE (he makes limited decisions that are merely satisfactory and sufficient for the situation.

Simon offered an alternative to the old paradigms (politics/admin dichotomy, principles of administration). For Simon, a new paradigm for public admin should involve TWO KINDS OF ADMINISTRATORS WORKING IN HARMONY – Those concerned with developing a "pure science of administration" based on "a thorough grounding in social psychology", and a larger group concerned with "prescribing for public policy". **Simon agreed with Barnard that complex formal orgs evolve from and consist of simple formal orgs. Simon's SATISFICING MAN model with its bounded rationality is firmly rooted in Barnard's explanation of individual behavior.**

DAHL – 1946 – PAR article backed-up Simon by highlighting the major obstacles facing any effort to establish a science of administration based on general principles.

Dwight WALDO – 1947

- Waldo represented the ADMINISTRATION-AS-POLITICS approach – which, combined with the BEHAVIORAL APPROACH, constituted a **devastating critique** of the CLASSICAL paradigm of public administration.

- Waldo's "*The Administrative State*" **attacked the "GOSPEL OF EFFICIENCY"** that dominated administrative thinking before WWII.

- **WALDO DENIED THE POSSIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTING A SCIENCE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**, doubted the existence of "PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION", questioned the plausibility of a unified theory of organizations, mistrusted those who would indiscriminately intermingle POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION, and despaired of reaching a common agreement on a definition of the field of public administration.

- Waldo denies that politics and policy considerations can be excluded from administration. Moreover, FACTS cannot be separated from VALUES. Consequently, ADMINISTRATION IS BOTH AN ART AND A SCIENCE, and perhaps more art than science.

- Also, since administration cannot be separated from politics, Waldo argues that public administration is different from private administration, being distinguished by the political environment in which the public administrator must operate.

WALDO – ON THE PA DICHOTOMY

- Waldo denies that politics and policy considerations can be excluded from administration. Moreover, FACTS cannot be separated from VALUES. Consequently, ADMINISTRATION IS BOTH AN ART AND A SCIENCE, and perhaps more art than science.

WALDO – CRITIQUE OF THE CLASSICAL APPROACH

- Waldo criticized TAYLOR for regarding his laborers essentially as draft animals.

- Mayo's Hawthorne experiments resulted in a "much more subtle and sophisticated paternalism."

- Waldo argued that we should move toward a philosophy that encourages cooperation among powers, be they administrative or political, not competition among separated powers.

- Waldo criticizes both the emphasis on supposed principles or commonalities among organizations and the rationalist bias of Classical organization theory. Organizations should be defined and structured to meet purposes, not general principles, and the organizational form and process actually adopted should be suited to the specific situation confronting the organization.

- Waldo argues that the Classical approach ignores the irrational and informal aspects of organizations. Regarding WEBER'S concept of bureaucracy, Waldo argues that Weber placed undue emphasis on the functional side of bureaucracy, ignored the informal and socioemotional aspects of organizations, and elevated position over knowledge as the basis for hierarchical authority.

- Waldo is critical of the possibility of developing a science of administration. He contends that PA must deal with thinking and valuing human beings and that the techniques of science are inappropriate to such subjects. Values cannot be treated scientifically, and human free will means that the principles of mechanical cause and effect are inapplicable.

- Critique of "efficiency" – Waldo argues that the idea of efficiency itself be came imbued with a moral significance, and the Classical approach was originally intended to replace a moralistic approach to public administration.

- In Waldo's judgement, the Classical approach contains much truth and represents an intelligent response to a historical situation. Moreover, the Classical approach is still deeply engrained in our culture, and no consensus on an alternative has yet emerged to replace the Classical paradigm of PA.

WALDO – ORG THEORY:

- **Waldo divides the development of Org Theory into three stages:**
  - **Classical period** – epitomized by the works of **TAYLOR, GULICK, FAYOL**. Classical period based on the **"machine model"** of the organization and emphasized the rational aspects of human behavior.
  - **Neo-Classical period** – Began with **Hawthorne experiments** in the 1920s and the following **Human Relations Movement**. In contrast to

the Classical stage, the neoclassical approach emphasized the emotive and sociopsychological dimensions of human behavior in orgs. The **Human Relations Movement** focused on morale, perceptions, attitudes, group relationships, informal groups, leadership and the bases for cooperation in org behavior. The Human Relations Movement demonstrated the limitations of perspectives such as Scientific Management.

- o **Modern Org Theory** – Began with publication of **March & Simon**'s *Organizations* in 1958. Modern Org Theory is based on an "organic" or "natural system" model of the organization and stresses organizational growth and survival. Simon's work on decision making is but one aspect of modern org theory. Waldo considers Simon's work to be a radical departure from Classical Org Theory. A second perspective on modern org theory is **ORGANIZATIONAL HUMANISM, represented by works of CHRIS ARGYRIS, WARREN BENNIS, and RENSIS LIKERT. Waldo** observes that the ORGANIZATIONAL HUMANISM focuses on much the same kinds of concerns as the Human Relations Movement. From the humanist perspective, the objective is to achieve organizational effectiveness and self-fulfillment simultaneously, under the assumption that the interests of the individual and the organization are compatible. A third strand of Modern Org Theory is the "scientific and managerial" literature (contingency theory, system perspectives).

- o **Waldo charges that modern org theory presents no unified "theory of organization". By becoming everything, systems theory runs the danger of becoming nothing in particular.**

- o **"A value-free theory of organizations is unattainable."**

WALDO ON PUBLIC POLICY:

- Waldo is connected with the NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION movement (He organized the 1968 MINNOWBROOK conference). The basic themes of the New Public Administration were participation, decentralization, and representative bureaucracy.

- **Waldo argues that VALUES should be studied consciously and should be used to give direction to empirical research.**

Dwight WALDO – 1947 –*The Administrative State.* Came out just after Simon's *Administrative Behavior.* If Simon represented the "hard" side of the social sciences, Waldo represented the "softer" approaches.

- **As bounded rationality became dominant concept to describe human decision making, the administrative state became the dominant concept to describe modern government.**
- **Central Issue of our time: the potential conflict between bureaucracy and democracy.**
- **Waldo argues that bureaucratic organization is not totally incompatible with the concept of democracy, for bureaucracies provide important support for democratic values, such as the universalistic criteria and opportunity based on ability and expertise.**
- **"The solution to the problem is to seek an optimal mix of democracy and bureaucracy, recognizing that while democracy is desirable, bureaucracy is necessary."**
- Called for a return to a value-centered approach to the discipline of PA. He tried to force the discipline away from logical positivism. While in agreement with Simon on the shortcomings of scientific management and the "principles" approaches, Waldo was more skeptical of efforts to rely solely on logical positivist methods in development of a theory of PA.

Waldo was critical of the popular conception of science dealing with "facts" alone, and that it is possible to apply the empirical methods of the physical sciences to human affairs without taking into account the cultural and social context of the observed phenomena.

Waldo believed that PA must give priority to carefully and critically examining normative theories rather than generating the kind of empirical theories advocated by logical positivist approaches.

Waldo sponsored the **MINNOWBROOK I** conference and resulting book – *Toward a New PA.* Several attendees were frustrated that PA was being increasingly identified

as simply a profession, and they argued that PA should have full disciplinary status as an empirical social science. The desire of obtaining disciplinary status was pervasive at the conference, but so was the desire to maintain the normative standards central to Waldo's approach.

1.11 The SIMON-WALDO Debate: Empiricism vs. Normative Theory

SIMON argued that the allegedly scientific principles characteristic of the orthodox classical tradition were contradictory proverbs.

Waldo's description of SIMON – "Simon did not argue the futility of trying to study administration scientifically, but rather that this was being attempted improperly." The basic defect of orthodox classical public administration was its lack of scientific sophistication.

SIMON - In practice, it is impossible to separate FACTS from VALUES. Simon argued that if we could invent procedural devices permitting a more effective separation of the factual and ethical elements in decisions, we could better approximate government responsibility in a democratic modern govt.

Empiricism vs. Normative Theory

See Dubnick, Melvin (1999). Early on in PA, an intellectual consensus built around the "Classical" approach (scientific management and the "principles" of administration). This dominated the field until the end of WWII. The postwar attack on that consensus came in the form of criticisms from two directions:

SIMON – **who sought to create a social science focused on administration and PA as its own DISCIPLINE within the social sciences, or as a sub-field of Political Science.**

WALDO – **who sought to create a normative agenda for the field – more as a PROFESSION than a discipline.**

Waldo rejected the two traditional alternative solutions: sub-disciplinary status within political science, and status as a distinct discipline among the Social sciences. Instead, Waldo advocates for a **profession**. "We try to act as a profession without actually being one". As an analogy –Waldo looks at the field of Medicine, where science and art, theory and practice, study and application are included under the umbrella of a profession. Not based on a single discipline, but utilizes many. Not united by a single theory, and is justified and given direction by a broad social purpose.

Any effort to resolve the identity crisis must encompass that strong commitment to purpose.

Waldo explicitly attacks the assertion that decisions can be analyzed without reference to values.

Simon criticized the "loose, literary style that political theorists" adopt. Simon characterized his critics as "political theorists" whose criticisms were faulty and lacking in rigor.

Chicago School behavioralism – Public Admin scholars trained at Univ. of Chicago. Charles Merriam and others were advocates for an empirical political science. **While stressing the need to apply scientific methods to the study of politics and government**, the behavioralists at Chicago were also progressives and New Dealers committed to political change.

MINNOWBROOK I – Waldo sponsored conference and resulting book – *Toward a New PA*. Several attendees were frustrated that PA was being increasingly identified as simply a profession, and they argued that PA should have full disciplinary status as an empirical social science. The desire of obtaining disciplinary status was pervasive at the conference, but so was the desire to maintain the normative standards central to Waldo's approach.

THE BLACKSBURG MANIFESTO – 1980s – maintained the Waldo-inspired aversion to endorsing a social science disciplinary identity for the field. They blamed Simon and the positivist/behavioralist movements in political science and organization theory for diverting PA theory "into an intellectual cul-de-sac" and creating "tacit boundaries" that took decades to overcome.

MERTON – Criticized WEBER's IDEAL-TYPE BUREAUCRACY – has inhibiting dysfunctions which prevent it from being optimally efficient. Bureaucracy also has negative effects on people.

SELZNICK (1948) – *Foundations of the Theory of Organization: TVA and the Grass Roots.*

- Orgs consist not only of positions for management to control, but of individuals with goals and aspirations that may not coincide with the org's formal goals.

- COOPTATION – Process of bringing in and subsuming external elements into the org's policy making process to prevent these external elements or orgs from being a threat.

Rudolph Carnap – Logical Positivism (member of the Vienna Circle). Carnap offered a clear vision of what constitutes a "science": the presentation of knowledge in empirically verifiable statements untainted by the bias of values or ethical statements. It is a position Simon adopts in the final chapter of his dissertation

Administrative Behavior: "science is interested in sentences only with regard to their verification."

MOSHER – 1956 – Wrote about the "boundary-spanning" problems in PA. The breadth of PA and its methodological diversity creates unusual problems in spanning several boundaries (academic disciplines, others in PA, and to the real world). Mosher lamented the absence of systematic ways for those in PA to keep abreast of relevant developments in other fields and the ignorance of PA research within other fields. Mosher wrote about the need for strengthening codes of ethics for elected officials in the wake of the Watergate scandal.

HENRY – 1975 - 5 Paradigms. 1) The Politics/Admin. Dichotomy; 2) The Principles of Administration; 3) Public Admin. as Political Science; 4) Public Administration as Administrative Science; 5) Public Administration as Public Administration.

John ROHR – (1978, 1986) – Made important contributions to the understanding of ETHICS in public service.

- In *Ethics for Bureaucrats*, Rohr argues that the fundamental ethical problem facing PA was in exercising discretionary authority, a problem that could be overcome by clearly understanding the values of the regime.
- In *To Run a Constitution*, Rohr performs a detailed analysis of the constitutional legitimacy of the administrative state as a prelude to a normative theory of public administration in a constitutional context. Rohr sees the agencies of government as subordinate to the three branches of government but simultaneously able to balance the various interests expressed there. Public administrators, key actors in this pluralistic balancing act, are to uphold the

Constitution – to use "their discretionary power in order to maintain the constitutional balance of powers in support of individual rights."

James MARCH - 1966 – "*The Power of Power*".

- Explores approaches for empirically studying social power in orgs and communities.

CYERT & MARCH - 1963 – *BEHAVIORAL THEORY OF THE FIRM.*

- Focus on POWER and POLITICS of establishing organizational goals. Discussed the formation of coalitions and negotiations to impose coalitions' demands on the org.
- Corporations tend to "SATISFICE" rather than engage in economically rational profit-maximizing behavior.

1.12 Major authors in PA theory

WILSON (1887) The Study of Administration – Discussed the necessary separation or dichotomy between politics and administration. Called for the serious study of the new field of public administration.

- "It is getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one."
- Wilson insisted that "administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics" and that "general laws which direct these things to be done are as obviously outside of and above administration". He likens administration to a machine that functions independent of the changing mood of its leaders.

Frank Goodnow – 1900 - *Politics and Administration*. Goodnow argues that there are "two distinct functions of government": Politics – has to do with policies or expressions of the state will. Administration – has to do with the execution of these policies.

Taylor – 1919 – Father of the Scientific Management Movement. Efficiency and finding the "ONE BEST WAY" through empirical analysis and time & motion studies.

Leonard White – 1926 – *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration.* FIRST TEXTBOOK DEVOTED IN TOTO TO THE FIELD.

White argued that politics should not intrude on administration; management lends itself to scientific study; public administration is capable of becoming a "value-free" science in its own right; the mission of administration is economy and efficiency, period.

WILLOUGHBY (1927) Principles of Public Administration. SECOND TEXTBOOK DEVOTED IN TOTO TO THE FIELD. Argued that certain scientific principles of administration were "there", that they could be discovered, and that administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these principles.

The net result of these early authors was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy.

GULICK – Called for a science of administration.

- Popularized the "principles" approach (orthodox) to managing organizations.
- POSDCORB

SIMON – **Rational Model of Administration.   Administrative Control.   Logical Positivism.   Satisficing Man.**

- Simon shares with the Classical approach the objective of developing a science of administration, an effort to describe a value-free domain for the construction of that science, a quest for general principles of administration, the acceptance of efficiency as the criterion for decision making, and an emphasis on hierarchy as well as its justifications (coordination, superior rationality, and the location of responsibility).
- Simon was determined that the fact-value dichotomy was the appropriate substitute for the politics/administration dichotomy in defining the domain for the construction of a science of administration.
- Simon was PREOCCUPIED WITH DECISION MAKING IN THE ORGANIZATION.
- Economic Man is translated by Simon into Satisficing Man, who has features of both Economic and Administrative Man.
- Simon argues that uncertainty pervades the decision process.
- Simon argues that the definition of RATIONALITY should be expanded to incorporate a wider range of human behavior.
- Simon argues that hierarchy simplifies the decision making task. He contends that hierarchy is THE adaptive form for finite intelligence to take in the face of complexity.
- Simon was concerned about GOAL DISPLACEMENT regarding the rationality of organizational decisions.
- Simon's proposed foundation for the construction of a science of public administration is the FACT-VALUE dichotomy, by which he sought to describe a value-free domain in which scientific investigation could be conducted.

DAHL – 3 Problems in the study of public administration:

- Lack of appreciation of cultural and historical context. (studies diff. in diff countries, not just one study of PA that transcends all boundaries).

- Managerial approach to the study and field risks forgetting the HUMAN FACTOR.
- Managerial approach tends to downplay the NORMATIVE NATURE OF CHOICES MADE IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE.

MOSHER – (1956)

- Wrote about the "boundary-spanning" problems in PA. The breadth of PA and its methodological diversity creates unusual problems in spanning several boundaries (academic disciplines, others in PA, and to the real world). Mosher lamented the absence of systematic ways for those in PA to keep abreast of relevant developments in other fields and the ignorance of PA research within other fields. Wrote about the need for strengthening codes of ethics for elected officials in the wake of the Watergate scandal.

MOSHER – (1982) *Democracy and the Public Service.*

- Provided the foundation for understanding how public service has developed in the U.S. and how merit and collective systems impact democracy and the public interest.

Nicholas HENRY – 1975 - 5 Paradigms.

- The Politics/Admin. Dichotomy; 2) The Principles of Administration; 3) Public Admin. As Political Science; 4) Public Administration as Administrative Science; 5) Public Administration as Public Administration.

LOWI – Critical assessment of the Chicago School behavioralism.

FRANK MARINI – 1971

Toward A New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. Noted that debates about the Identity Crisis in PA are common.

H. George FREDERICKSON – *The Public Admin Theory Primer*

- Dichotomy of Politics & Admin is too simplistic. Depending on situation, may range on a continuum from Politics-Admin.
- Scholars pushing Scientific Management and Efficiency also believe that PA is centered on DEMOCRACY, which is one of the most inefficient methods. This is

the reason why a scientific field of administration never came about – because no one can resolve this discrepancy.

- Governance involves the particular characteristics and activities and policy areas involved in solving problems and addressing issues.
- LEVELS OF GOVERNANCE:
  - Institutional Level – How problem is articulated - formal and informal rules.
  - Organizational Level (Managerial Level) – Admin. Discretion, measuring performance, running bureaus, depts., commissions.
  - Technical Level – solving the task at hand. Efficiency & accountability at the individual level.

H. George FREDERICKSON - (1997)– *The Spirit of Public Administration.*

- Focused on the role of Public Administrators as ***representatives of citizens***, as in looking out for the public good. In addition, what is the role of the public administrator as a **REPRESENTATIVE CITIZEN**, as they are citizens themselves.

Graham ALLISON – (1972) Essence of Decision. –

- Book tried to explain why the governments of U.S. & Soviet Union did what they did during the Cuban Missle Crisis. "Why do governments do what they do?"
- Allison created a **Model of Bureaucratic Politics:**
  - **Rational Actor model (Classical Model) –** Focuses on single actors in decision making.
  - **Organizational Process Paradigm –** Focus on multiple actors.
  - **Bureaucratic Politics Paradigm –** Combination of Bargaining and Compromise.

Paul LIGHT – (1997) *The Tides of Reform.*

- The book is based on the notion that **there is not too little management reform in government, but TOO MUCH**. Congress and the Presidency have moved effortlessly from one reform philosophy to another and back again, rarely questioning the contradictions and consequences of each separate act. Light

used the Congressional Quarterly Almanac to identify and analyze 141 federal management statutes signed into law from 1945 to 1994.

- **Four separate philosophies or Tides of Reform**:
- **Scientific Management** – **efficiency, principles of administration, experts, executive control** (Brownlow Committee & First Hoover Commission).
- **War on Waste** – **economy, audits, investigations,** generally accepted practices (e.g. welfare fraud hearings).
- **Watchful Eye** – **Goal: fairness, rights, information**, whistle-blowers, congress and the courts (e.g. Vietnam & Watergate).
- **Liberation Management** – **Goal: Higher performance.** Standards, evaluation, outcomes, employees, teams (e.g. Gore's National Performance Review)

Guy PETERS (1984) – The Politics of Bureaucracy

- Peters argues that PA is an integral part of the political process.
- The traditional Politics/Administration Dichotomy has eroded and will erode further as the public bureaucracy plays a greater role in the policy process.
- Peters argues for a COMPARATIVE approach to PA.

PETERS – The Future of Governing.

- FOUR MODELS OF GOVERNMENT:
  - MARKET
  - PARTICIPATIVE
  - FLEXIBLE
  - DEREGULATED

John KINGDON (1984) - Policies get made into law by capitalizing on "WINDOWS" of opportunity. TIMING IS EVERYTHING.

- Much of policy analysis has focused on the theoretical problem of agenda building and policy development.

Mary Parker FOLLETT – (1926) *The Giving of Orders*.

- Follett argued for a Human Relations approach. She anticipated the Hawthorne/Mayo findings.

- Advocated for PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT and the merits of exercising "POWER WITH" as opposed to "POWER OVER".

OSTROM – Identity Crisis in PA. *The Intellectual Crisis in PA* – Importance of Political Structure.

- OSTROM & OSTROM WERE BRUCE ROGERS' PROFESSORS AT IU.
- OSTROM – BIG, BIG NAMES IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.
- Embraced the idea of SELF-GOVERNMENT
- Ostrom is VERY critical of Bureaucracy and points out numerous failures.
- Argues that PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY is the way of the future and that PA should embrace the concept as modern and revolutionary. (Niskanen, Tullock, Downs – used econ & mathematical models to demonstrate bureaucratic wastefulness and irresponsibility – calling for limiting government).
- Public Choice Theory is similar to New Public Administration and Reinventing Government movements of the 1990s, though these movements went further by promoting public-private partnering, outsourcing, and privatization as a means to greater "marketization" of public goods than had been advocated by earlier Public Choice theorists.
- Public Choice Theory: Individual is the unit of analysis. 4 Public Choice Assumptions about individuals:
  - Self-Interested
  - Rational
  - Benefit-Maximizing
  - Uncertainty-Minimizing
- IDENTITY CRISIS IN PA:
  - Ostrom argues that there is a persistent crisis in PA starting with the war years, which provoked a challenge from which the field of PA has not recovered. Wartime control measures were plagued by persistent failures.
  - Ostrom cites DWIGHT WALDO's 1967 work characterizing the crisis in confidence in PA as a CRISIS OF IDENTITY: "Both the nature and boundaries of the subject matter and the methods of studying and teaching become problematic. Now, two decades after the critical

attacks, the crisis of identity has not been resolved." "What I propose is that we try to act as a profession without actually being one."

- o Ostrom suggests a new paradigm in Public Choice Theory. **Although his book is considered a classic, Public Choice has not replaced the traditional theory of bureaucracy.**

NISKANEN – 1971 – Economic approach to bureaucratic behavior. Market advocate, Anti-Bureaucracy.

Paul APPLEBY – *Policy & Administration, Big Democracy***.**

GOLEMBIEWSKI (1967, 1985) – Organizational Learning and Organizational Development.

- (1967) *Men, Management, and Morality.*
- (1985) *Humanizing Public Organizations* – Its theoretical importance to the field of public administration lies in its analysis of the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy, a moral and political question central to Golembiewski's 1967 *Men, Management, and Morality.*

Michael LIPSKY – (1980) Street-Level Bureaucracy.

- Lipsky first brought the term "street-level bureaucracy" to the attention of the field by pointing out that public policy is determined not merely by legislators and managers at high levels of government but by the police officer, the nurse, and the welfare worker (among others), who engage in the direct delivery of services.
- Lipsky writes that "the decisions of the street-level bureaucrats, the routines they establish, and the devices they invent to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out."
- Finding that systemic constraints on the professional practices of street-level bureaucrats result in confusion and conflicting demands, Lipsky offers several important suggestions for reform, suggestions addressed to the concerns of street-level bureaucrats but not without relevance to those at all levels of public agencies.

BROWNLOW COMMISSION – (1937) **Brownlow, Merriam and Gulick.** (Report of the President's Cmte on Admin. Mgmt.)

- Eager to remove politics from administration, the **report recommended a distinction between the executive and administration.**
- **Culminated in the Reorganization Act of 1939, creating the Executive Office of the President, BOB**, and authorized the President to submit future reorganization plans to Congress.

The HOOVER COMMISSION – (1949) The Report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

- Charge: To reduce the size of government. Instead, it aimed to strengthen the executive branch via reorganization through purpose for each department and better control by president.
- Unified discretion over presidential staff, strengthened Bureau of the Budget, created an office of personnel, created a staff secretary to mediate between President and staff.

MINNOWBROOK I – subsequent paper – *The New Public Administration.*

- Minnowbrook I was held to discuss the field's desires to "move values and norms to a central position in theory and practice."
- The terms "The New Public Administration" or "The Minnowbrook Perspective" refer to "a commitment to greater social equity" in the practice, theory, and discussion of PA.

THE BLACKSBURG MANIFESTO – 1982. in Wamsley, et. al., *Refounding Public Administration.*

- In response to the continuing practice of "bureaucrat bashing" by presidential candidates, Gary Wamsley convened the Blacksburg Conference.
- The paper resulting from the meeting was The Blacksburg Manifesto.
- Calls for a shift in the current political dialogue about PA and to encourage future work on a normative theory.
- Calls for a redefinition of the public administration to The Public Administration, an **institution** with a legitimate role in governing as provided by the Constitution and as envisioned by the Founders.
- Wamsley refers to The Blacksburg Perspective as "Minnowbrook I with institutional grounding".

- Calls for redefining the role of the public administrator as Constitutional Officer, with legitimate powers similar to those found in the U.S. Senate.

- Authors encourage new thinking toward a normative theory of PA and to a theory of the American state that is both positive in its outlook and normative in nature.

- Public service is NOT a JOB, but a CALLING.

- If The Public Administration asserts it rightful claim to be a constitutionally legitimate participant in the governance process, it can contribute to the correction of a major defect in the Constitution: its unsatisfactory resolution of the problem of representation.

John ROHR – *To Run a Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State.* (from Ch. 2 in Wamsley, et. al. *Refounding Public Administration*).

- Central Thesis: The Administrative State was contemplated by the Founders and is implicitly recognized in the framing of the Constitution.

- According to Rohr, an in-depth understanding of our founding principles is critical for administrators who must discharge their duties in accordance with an oath to uphold the Constitution.

- Rohr finds support for the ideas in the Blacksburg Manifesto in the Federalist Papers. The concern for a sound public administration was one of the Framers' most serious concerns.

- Rohr argues that the Founders would have been upset at the current practice of Presidents removing subordinates from office and appointing their own "team" without first obtaining the consent of the Senate.

- Rohr argues:

  o **Administrative institutions are not inconsistent with the constitutional principle of separation of powers (considering that they perform all three basic functions of government: making, applying and adjudicating rules), noting that the Senate also uses all three powers of government.**

- o **The higher reaches of the career civil service fulfill the framers original intent for the Senate.**

  - o That **the entire career civil service provides a remedy for a serious defect in the Constitution (the inadequate representation** that so distressed the Anti-Federalists of 1787-1788).

- He then argues that administrators should legitimately participate in *governance*, not simply as administrative managers, but as representative decision makers for the people. **"Members of Congress, like other officers of government, derive their authority from the Constitution, not from their election. Elections are merely a method of choosing, not a method of authorizing."**

- **Rohr concludes by proposing a normative theory of Public Administration that is grounded in the Constitution**. He argues: "The Senate, like the Public Administration, was intended to exercise all three powers of government. However, the Public Administration exercises all three powers in a subordinate capacity, and must make its peculiar contribution in conformity with that subordination. They must learn to think like judges as well as legislators and executives, because they are all three of these."

Charles GOODSELL – (from Ch. 3 in Wamsley, et. al. *Refounding Public Administration*).

- Goodsell argues that the <u>public interest</u> is the standard that guides the administrator in executing the law.
- Theorists in Public Administration have largely ignored "the public interest" in favor of defining administration in terms of economic efficiency and managerial control.

GOODSELL (1984) *The Case for Bureaucracy*.

- Proposed the POLITICAL ECONOMY approach.
- Despite its flaws, the public bureaucracy performs many important functions and is far less oppressive to its members and clients than conventional wisdom contends.

- Goodsell & others created the "Blacksburg Manifesto", which seeks to develop a more positive role for the bureaucracy in a pluralist system of governance.

Gary WAMSLEY (from Ch. 4 in Wamsley, et. al. *Refounding Public Administration*).

- Wamsley feels that the challenges facing the American political economy in the future will require a more effective Public Administration than we have today, but that this **cannot take place unless a "normative guide" is created that clearly answers questions about administrative power, and that recognizes a level of authority and discretion essential for empowering the work of Public Adminstrators.**
- **The challenges ahead require not management, but *governance.*** Yet governance requires a more dedicated public administration at all levels. This cannot be achieved until respect for public institutions and the self-image of public administrators is restored.

Orion WHITE - (from Ch.6 in Wamsley, et. al. *Refounding Public Administration*).

- Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate
- Regarding politics, White notes that "the prevalence and predominance of politics in a society is a sign of ill health at the level of the individual psyche. Political movements are symptoms of insufficiency in the pace and quality of transformation at the individual level. Just as constitution writing is birth, so then is politics youth, and administration maturity, in the developmental cycle of societies."
- White concludes with a warning of the dangers of "technicism". "Technicism reduces the humanly possible to the technologically available." When life is reduced this way, there exists a possibility of losing the human principle itself.

Camilla STIVERS - (from Ch.7 in Wamsley, et. al. *Refounding Public Administration*).

- Theorists of public administration must rethink the nature of theory itself, by rejoining truth and goodness. Stivers argues that: "active citizens are a necessary ingredient in the normative justification sought by the Blacksburg Manifesto." Stivers quotes Terry Cooper as saying: "Public servants are citizen-

administrators…employed as one of us to work for us and bearing the responsibility for encouraging participation by other citizens."

- There is a consensus among Public Administrators that the administrative state cannot be legitimated by apathetic, ignorant, or misled citizens. Although there may be many knowledgeable, concerned citizens, as a group they appear ill-equipped to validate, let alone take part in public policy formation and implementation.

- Stivers proposes a Theory of Active Citizenship in which the dialogue is expanded between Public Administrators and citizens, noting that the agency perspective is consistent with this aim. The missing ingredient in her mind, is "active accountability to citizens." To solve this problem, bureaucrats must find opportunities to work with citizens, explain processes to them, and include them as much as possible in the policy process.

STILLMAN (1999) *Preface to Public Administration.*

- "The dichotomy, which became an important instrument for the Progressive reforms, allowed room for a new criterion for public action, based on the insertion of professionalization, expertise and merit values into the active directive of governmental affairs. In practice too the dichotomy served to justify the institutional developments of such basic features of the administrative state as the civil service system, personnel classification and planning systems as well as the introduction of public budgets." (p112)

STILLMAN (1999) CONT.

- **No-State** (Jefferson)– Adam Smith, Milton Friedman (monetarists) AND James Buchannan, Gordon Tullock, William Niskanen, Vincent Ostrom (public choice)
  - o No-staters turn the PA dichotomy on its head and advocate for a clear division between the political appointees and the careerists, with a larger role for the political appointees
  - o No-staters bifurcate what is good for society (Unseen Hand of the Market) from what is good within the government (Authoritarian, rigid hierarchy and strict controls)

- **Bold State** (Hamilton)– Leonard White, Louis Browlow & Gulick are the founders of this tradition
  - Tradition is carried on by Robert Denhardt, Charles Goodsell, George Frederickson.
  - No single united front in support of one idea, or even a group of ideas
  - Recognize the difference between public and private sector administration
  - Speak the language of the practitioner
  - Have trouble justifying their vision, and seem to stand a bit one-sided with bureaucracies
  - Never seem willing to describe the circumstances under which the growth of the state will stop
- **Pre-State** (Madison) – John Rohr, Donald Kettl.
  - Recognize the uniqueness of public administration from private sector administration
  - Delve into the historical and organizational contexts when examining PA
  - Philosophy is realistic and humane for the practitioner
  - Works to deal with constitutional legitimacy problems in the field
  - Work around the edges of change, evolution not revolution
  - Criticized for descriptive only, lacking strong methodologies
- **Pro-State** – James Perry.
  - Creatures of post-WWII American state system, globalism, professionalism and technocracy
  - Carries the "toolbag" analogy a bit too far, making this view of PA the grand-son of Frederick Taylor's Scientific Management
  - The technocracy can solve problems with a variety of technologies, methods and a wide-ranging set of roles and responsibilities
  - This view promotes a global vision, interdisciplinary approach and shies away from normative solutions
  - Critics point to the positivist nature of the writings in this view, takes a dim view of the non-rational problem solving that must take place, promotes antidemocratic elitism, and places too much faith in the

technological instruments – with little regard to how those instruments might be biased

SVARA – ETHICS IN PA.

- Basic components of administrative ethics: Ethics, Morality and Law. These can be at odds with each other at times.
- Ethics for PA begins with DUTY. The duty-based approach to ethics derives the responsibilities of public administrators from the nature of the office they occupy.
- The Responsibilities of democratic public administrators:
  - Place public over personal interest.
  - Display a service orientation and commitment to serve.
  - Exercise fiduciary responsibility
  - Uphold the Law
  - Support the democratic process
  - Be responsive to policy goals and exercise leadership appropriate to position.
  - Public administrators have an obligation to serve superiors AND the public.
  - SVARA believes that politics and administration cannot be separated as they overlap and intersect.
  - The IDEAL for public administrators is to PROMOTE THE PUBLIC INTEREST.
- Need to balance:
  - Accountability and Independence
  - Responsiveness and Neutrality
  - Deference and Assertiveness in relationship to superiors

GRODZINS (1966) The American System.

- Argued to replace the antiquated traditional concept of Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) as a **"LAYER CAKE"** (with three separate and autonomous levels of government) Layer-Cake Federalism.

- **Grodzins described federalism as a "MARBLE CAKE"** for the cooperative relationships among levels of govt. without boundaries, and an intermingling of activities between and among federal, state and local levels.

FREIDRICH - FINER Debate: RESPONSIBILITY VS. ACCOUNTABILITY

Article Title: Administrative Responsibility in a Democratic Government

Author: Herman Finer

First Appeared In: Public Administration Review, Volume 19, 1941

Brief Synopsis of the Article:

This article by Herbert Finer directly responds to Freidrich's ideas about public administration ethics which Freidrich laid out in his 1940 book entitled "Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility."

In this book, **FREIDRICH proposed that there should be little explicit control over a public administrator. Instead, Freidrich believed that the administrator owed responsibility to two dominant factors in fulfilling his/her obligation and duty to the public.** Specifically, an administrator owed a duty to 1) technological knowledge and 2) popular sentiment. He thus believed that any policy which violates this standard makes the official irresponsible to the public. **In summary, Freidrich believed that public administrators must exercise a moral, not a rule-bound, responsibility to the public. Freidrich also believed that the quality of administration depends upon an official's sense of responsibility to the profession (and the sense of duty to the public).**

FINER believes that administrative responsibility and ethics are just as important to democratic government as administrative effectiveness. In order to make administrators responsible and ethical, it was necessary to have a correction system with known punishments and sanctions for administrators who violate the "rules." He cautioned against public administrators from using their own discretion, instead believing that public administrators are responsible to the elected representatives for the public. Finer advocated the use of the courts and as well as clear lines of authority in administration (sanctions). Finer defined the public administrator's responsibility to the public as three–fold. First, he believed that public

administrators should work for what the public needs, not what the public wants. Second, that public administration can only function through institutions. And third, public administrators must be obedient to the orders of their superiors. Finer felt that the a public administrator should have little or no flexibility or discretion and that in order to be truly accountable to the public, administrators must be provided with more than a sense of moral responsibility. Finer believes that moral responsibility is likely to operate in direct proportion to the strictness and efficiency of political responsibility and to fall into disarray if this political responsibility is not strictly enforced via sanctions. He was firm in his belief that professional standing and a duty to the public were not enough; sanctions were necessary to keep public administrators ethical.

What All the Fuss Was Originally:

This debate between Finer and Freidrich over how to make public administrators ethical actors and responsible to the public became extremely important for administrators' practices of how to enforce ethical behavior, whether through sanctions or through moral obligation and guilt.

Why It Is Still a Significant Article Today:

The exchange between Finer and Freidrich is the most cited article/exchange discussing the "best" strategy for achieving accountability in public administration.

NIETZSCHE – Was alarmed and distressed by the decline of individuality and free expression in the machine age.

DENHARDT – 1984 –

- Denhardt's definition of PA: "PA is concerned with managing change processes in pursuit of publicly defined societal values.

RAADSCHELDERS – From RAAD I.

- **VALUES** are the very fabric of society and possibly the most basic reason for the existence of government. Sociologists define values as part of **CULTURE**: the entirety of values, norms, goals and expectations in a given society.

- The values refer to shared opinions about good and bad.

- From these values, **NORMS** are derived: more specific and concrete guidelines for behavior, the written and unwritten rules that guide social interaction and communication and that determine the ways in which we associate and act.

- **LAW** is a set of formalized norms.

WEBER – "Authority is the legitimate use of power".

- Weber argued that there are **3 Pure Types of Authority:**

- **Charismatic** – rests in the charisma of an individual ruler.

- **Traditional** – Based on the belief that its legitimacy is derived from a predetermined order and stratification in society. Leader is vested with authority by tradition of birth, family, wealth, etc.

- **Legal-Rational** – This type is found in modern societies. Its legitimacy rests on the impersonal and standardized application of established rules in the most democratic and efficient way possible.

- **THE IDEAL ORGANIZATION FOR LEGAL-RATIONAL AUTHORITY TO THRIVE IS THE BUREAUCRACY.**

- Central to the notion of legal-rational authority is that people themselves can make the laws that rule society.

Don KETTL – *The Transformation of Governance.* **KETTL'S GOVERNANCE THEORY:**

- **HAMILTONIAN - Strong Executive, Top-Down hierarchical authority.**

- **JEFFERSONIAN - Weak Executive, Bottom-Up Devolved Power, Responsible to Citizens.** Jefferson mistrusting of executive power. He was for LOCAL power.

- **WILSONIAN - Bureaucracy-Centered. Need for good administration. Role of Permanent Bureaucracy.**

- **MADISONIAN – Balance-of-Power Centered. Modern Pluralist way. Middle-Way. Varieties of Orgs play a part.**

- Kettl feels that administration needs to be strong.

- Executive needs to have a lot of latitude and power to lead effectively.

KETTL on FUTURE MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES IN PA:

- **Kettl: "Americans have always been distrustful of governmental power, and especially administrative power. They have long believed that public administration is more inefficient and corrupt than private administration.**

MODELS OF PUBLIC DECISION MAKING (RAAD I p. 255-259)

- **RATIONAL-COMPREHENSIVE MODEL – aka ECONOMIC MAN model**. Assumes the decision maker has access to all needed information, ability, intellect, time, etc. and is able to select the ONE BEST solution. It presupposes that individuals are out to maximize their self-interest. Values are separated from facts.

- **SIMON** - **ADMINISTRATIVE MAN MODEL –** SIMON criticized the Economic Man model. The reality of decision making is quite different because information is limited and human processing capabilities are limited. Simon's decision maker is an ADMINISTRATIVE MAN whose analysis is based on BOUNDED RATIONALITY and whose actions are aimed at SATISFICING rather than maximizing. In Simon's view, objectives and values cannot be separated.

- **LINDBLOM** - **INCREMENTAL MODEL –** LINDBLOM. "MUDDLING THROUGH". Decision making is a non-comprehensive process of successive and limited comparisons. The rational-comprehensive model is fallible, too slow and costly and can never resolve conflicts of values and interests. Lindblom's model provided the foundation for a more realistic analysis of BUDGETING that his student WILDAVSKY provided in The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Values rather than facts determine budgetary decisions (view shared by Guy PETERS).

- **DROR** - **NORMATIVE-OPTIMUM MODEL – DROR** – Dror argues that Lindblom's model is more realistic than Simon's model, but is still unsatisfactory. Dror's model enhances rationalization, uses extra-rational input via sensitivity sessions and brainstorming. Policy Gambling: Dror argues that every policy is a RISK and may not work, but it is important to TRY and Experiment.

- **ETZIONI - MIXED-SCANNING MODEL – Amtai ETZIONI** - Distinguishes between contextualizing decisions (which outline the basic directions of policy

substance), and BIT-BY-BIT DECISIONS or incremental steps which prepare for or follow a contextualizing decision.

- **WILDAVSKY - IRRATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS – WILDAVSKY** – Argues that decision making is not very rational. It is very difficult to determine empirically the degree to which decision making processes are determined by RULE OF THUMB, perception (definition) of the situation, bias, emotion, the need for quick results, groupthink, stress, org and cultural history, the informal role and position of decision makers, and the physical messages (face, expressions of doubt, non-verbal cues, etc.) of decision makers.

- **COHEN, MARCH & OLSEN** - **GARBAGE CAN MODEL –** (Universities & hospitals) At the individual level, one has to work with conflicting groups of people. Organized anarchy. In this type of decision making, policies and goals are often vague and, when clear are often conflicting. Members of the org have little knowledge of the overall work of the organization, and decision making is erratic. This decision making model is good for professional orgs where individuals are highly educated, opinionated, and independent.

James MARCH - 1966 – "*The Power of Power*".

- Explores approaches for empirically studying social power in orgs and communities.

CYERT & MARCH - 1963 – *BEHAVIORAL THEORY OF THE FIRM.*

- Focus on POWER and POLITICS of establishing organizational goals. Discussed the formation of coalitions and negotiations to impose coalitions' demands on the org.
- Corporations tend to "SATISFICE" rather than engage in economically rational profit-maximizing behavior.

New Public Management (NPM) (a management reform movement worldwide in 1980s-1990s) – focused on productivity, marketization, service orientation, decentralization, accountability.   NPM is more ideological (Republicans & conservatives like it).   Looks to MINIMIZE government role in society with citizens increasingly involved in policymaking.

GOVERNANCE THEORY – talks about the RELATIONSHIP between Govt. & Society. Governance is about PROCESS, NPM is about OUTCOMES. Governance is a theory about Politics. Tries to explain what government does and how to make it better.

BOTH NPM and GOVERNANCE THEORY believe that government is too distant from the citizen and clientele. Capitalism is helpful in correcting deficiencies. Both are results oriented. Both embrace the concept that government should STEER NOT ROW.

1.13 Iron cage – Weber

Iron cage is a sociological concept introduced by Max Weber. Iron cage refers to the increasing rationalization of human life, which traps individuals in an "iron cage" of rule-based, rational control. He also called such over-bureaucratized social order "the polar night of icy darkness".

The original German term is stahlhartes Gehäuse; this was translated into 'iron cage', an expression made familiar to English language speakers by Talcott Parsons in his 1958 translation of Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Recently some sociologists have questioned this translation, arguing that the correct term should be 'shell as hard as steel' and that the difference from the original translation is significant. A more literal translation from German would be "steel-hard housing."

Weber wrote: "In Baxter's view the care for external goods should only lie on the shoulders of the 'saint like a light cloak, which can be thrown aside at any moment.' But fate decreed that the cloak should become an iron cage."

Weber became concerned with social actions and the subjective meaning that humans attach to their actions and interaction within specific social contexts. He also believed in idealism, which is the belief that we only know things because of the meanings that we apply to them. This led to his interest in power and authority in terms of bureaucracy and rationalization.

Rationalization and bureaucracy

Weber states, "the course of development involves… the bringing in of calculation into the traditional brotherhood, displacing the old religious relationship." Modern society was becoming characterized by its shift in the motivation of individual behaviors. Social actions were becoming based on efficiency instead of the old types of social actions, which were based on lineage or kinship. Behavior had become dominated by goal-oriented rationality and less by tradition and values. According to Weber, the shift from the old form of mobility in terms of kinship to a strict set of rules was a direct result of growth in bureaucracy and capitalism.

Effects of bureaucracies: Positive contributions

Bureaucracies were distinct from the former feudal system where people were promoted through favoritism and bribes because now there was a set of rules that are

clearly defined; there was promotion through seniority and disciplinary control. Weber believes that this influenced modern society and how we operate today, especially politically.

Weber's characteristics of an ideal bureaucracy:

1. Hierarchy of authority
2. Impersonality
3. Written rules of conduct
4. Promotion based on achievement
5. Specialized division of labor
6. Efficiency

Weber believed that bureaucracies are goal-oriented organizations that are based on rational principles that are used to efficiently reach their goals. However, there are constraints within this bureaucratic system.

Negative effects of bureaucracies

Bureaucracies concentrate large amounts of power in a small number of people and are generally unregulated. Weber believed that those who control these organizations control the quality of our lives as well. Bureaucracies tend to generate oligarchy; which is where a few officials are the political and economic power. Because bureaucracy is a form of organization superior to all others, further bureaucratization and rationalization may be an inescapable fate.

Iron cage of bureaucracy

Because of these aforementioned reasons, there will be an evolution of an iron cage, which will be a technically ordered, rigid, dehumanized society. The iron cage is the one set of rules and laws that we are all subjected and must adhere to. Bureaucracy puts us in an iron cage, which limits individual human freedom and potential instead of a "technological utopia" that should set us free. It's the way of the institution, where we do not have a choice anymore. Once came about, it was like a machine that you were being pulled into without an alternative option; currently, whether we agree or disagree, if you want to survive you need to have a job and you need to make money.

Laws of Bureaucracies:

1. The official is subject to authority only with respect to their official obligation

2. Organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices
3. Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence
4. The official has a free contractual relationship; free selection
5. Officials are selected through technical qualification
6. The official is paid by fixed salaries
7. The office is the primary occupation of the official
8. Promotion is based on a achievement which is granted by a the judgment of superiors
9. The official is subject to strict and systematic discipline within the office
10. Costs of bureaucracies

"Rational calculation . . . reduces every worker to a cog in this bureaucratic machine and, seeing himself in this light, he will merely ask how to transform himself... to a bigger cog... The passion for bureaucratization at this meeting drives us to despair."

Loss of individuality; labor is now being sold to someone who is in control, instead of individuals being artisans and craftsmen and benefiting from their own labor.

Loss of autonomy; others are dictating what an individual's services are worth.

Individuals develop an obsession with moving on to bigger and better positions, but someone else will always be determining the value of our achievements.

Lack of individual freedom; individuals can no longer engage in a society unless they belong to a large scale organization where they are given specific tasks in return for giving up their personal desires to conform to the bureaucracy's goals and are now following.

Specialization; with specialization, society becomes more interdependent and has a less common purpose. There is a loss in the sense of community because the purpose of bureaucracies is to get the job done efficiently.

Bureaucratic hierarchies can control resources in pursuit of their own personal interests, which impacts society's lives greatly and society has no control over this. It also affects society's political order and governments because bureaucracies were built to regulate these organizations, but corruption remains an issue. The goal of the bureaucracy has a single-minded pursuit that can ruin; what might be good for the organization might not be good for the society as a whole, which can later harm the

bureaucracy's future. Formal rationalization in bureaucracy has its problems as well. There are issues of control, depersonalization and increasing domination. Once the bureaucracy is created, the control is indestructible. There is only one set of rules and procedures, which reduces everyone to the same level. Depersonalization occurs because individual situations are not accounted for. Most importantly, the bureaucracies will become more dominating over time unless they are stopped. In an advanced industrial-bureaucratic society, everything becomes part of the expanding machine, even people.

While bureaucracies are supposed to be based on rationalization, they act in the exact opposite manner. Political bureaucracies are established so that they protect our civil liberties, but they violate them with their imposing rules. Development and agricultural bureaucracies are set so that they help farmers, but put them out of business due to market competition that the bureaucracies contribute to. Service bureaucracies like health care are set to help the sick and elderly, but then they deny care based on specific criteria.

Debates regarding bureaucracies:

Weber argues that bureaucracies have dominated modern society's social structure; but we need these bureaucracies to help regulate our complex society. Bureaucracies may have desirable intentions to some, but they tend to undermine human freedom and democracy in the long run.

"Rationalization destroyed the authority of magical powers, but it also brought into being the machine-like regulation of bureaucracy, which ultimately challenges all systems of belief."

It is important note that according to Weber, society sets up these bureaucratic systems, and it is up to society to change them. Weber argues that it is very difficult to change or break these bureaucracies, but if they are indeed socially constructed, then society should be able to intervene and shift the system.

1.14 Paradigmatic Progress in Public Administration: Knowledge Development

The Study of Public Administration in Times of Global Interpenetration: A Historical Rationale for a Theoretical Model.

Andres Perez Baltodano (1997).

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7(4), 615-638.

The stated problem of Baltodano's article is that scholars of public administration have lacked a theory of the state and an explanation of the role of state bureaucracy in the development of modern political societies.

The purpose of the article is to develop a historical interpretation of the evolution and social significance of the administrative state and also to develop a foundation for a theoretical model for the study of public administration in times of global "interpenetration".

Baltodano argues that both theorists and practitioners of public administration need to reinterpret the administrative state in these times of global interpenetration. He believes the study of public administration lacks a theory of the state and an explanation of the role of state bureaucracy in the development of modern political societies. He notes that profound changes are underway in the conventional understanding of the general interest, social responsibility, and of the relationship between the market and the state. The author reviews the historical evolution of the discipline of public administration as well as the social construction of the state from the middle ages and Monarchical absolutism to the current age of globalization with economic, social and political interpenetration. Baltodano suggests that the discipline needs to develop its own theoretical capacity that elucidates the relationship between sociohistorical change and public administration. Baltodano addresses the problem by proposing a "critical" model which incorporates the following basic propositions:

Public Administration in Times of Global Interpenetration

- The institutionalization of social relations and historical identities within the boundaries of the modern state involves the exercise of a relational form of power; it requires the use of an administrative state or public administration

system as a vehicle either to reproduce or change established patterns of social order.

- The exercise of a relational form of power through the administrative state is a purposeful event that involves the need to adjust, replace, or maintain the structural properties of the reproduction circuits of public administration to ensure that the formulation and implementation of public policies will not distort a government's attempt to reproduce or change existing patterns of social relations. The following four reproduction circuits should be considered: the organizational design of the state apparatus; its social domain; its organizational character; and its management.

- The process whereby governments attempt to make the functioning of the reproduction circuits of the state compatible with their political objectives is called the structuration (see Giddens 1990, 64) of public administration. The mastering of this process is the main objective of the public administration discipline.

- The structuration of public administration is not entirely determined by a government's will. Governments have to confront the various systemic forces that condition the nature and the role of public administration. These forces both constrain and enable the agents in control of the administrative state in their efforts to institutionalize patterns of social relations across historical time and territorial space.

- The relationship between social systems within a societal totality does not follow any rigidly determined pattern. From this perspective, the functioning of the reproduction circuits of the administrative state, and consequently a government's capacity to structure them, is conditioned by the interplay of the government system, the political system, the economic system, and the internal dynamic of the administrative state.

- The functioning of the government system, the political system, the economic system, and the reproduction circuits of the administrative state also is conditioned by international and transnational forces; thus, the study of the process of structuration of public administration must take into account the process of global interpenetration within which public administration operates today.

In conclusion, we can agree with Baltodano that globalization represents a challenge to the capacity of the administrative state to formulate and implement policies that connect society's collective experience with its expectations. Instead of choosing to operate as a reproducer of established patterns of social order as in the past, the state can choose to change established patterns of social order. However, to witness real paradigmatic change there must be political support throughout the system.

Baltodano makes a valid point by emphasizing the importance of institutionalization (see DiMaggio, 1988) and the process of structuration (see Giddens, 1984, 1990, 1991) in the modern state. We can also agree with the author that any new overarching theory of public administration needs to incorporate how structuration and institutionalization are affected by the forces of globalization.

A Science of Public Administration?

Gregory A. Daneke (1990).

Public Administration Review, 50(3), 383-392.

Gregory Daneke's article is an answer to Harland Cleveland and others scholars who feel that "it is time to put behind us the idea that the politics and administration of human endeavors are some kind of science." Daneke feels that much of the scholarly work that has been done in public administration in the recent past has not contributed to advancing a new paradigm for public administration, but instead have centered on critiques of positivism and/or neoclassical economic theory. Daneke argues that scholars in the discipline should channel their energies into reforming the system's basic unifying paradigm and to advance it in the direction of a "comprehensive design approach", capable of enhancing the processes of adaptive learning and institutional evolution.

Daneke then presents a new prospective paradigm called "Advanced Systems Theory". This emerging paradigm builds on general systems theory and contemporary economics, while integrating a number of unique ingredients derived from advances in the physical, biological, and cognitive sciences. By incorporating new knowledge from works in diverse areas such as chaos theory and quantum logic, the social sciences

(and public administration in particular) may be able to overcome their current lack of progress in paradigm development. Daneke gives additional suggestions of areas scholars can look to for inspiration in developing a new paradigm for public administration, including recent innovations in fractal geometry, theoretical mathematics, chaos theory, evolutionary systems theory, and general systems theory.

Daneke concludes by suggesting that the best road to a "Grand Theory" should include the work of systems theory. He concedes that systems theory has many flaws, but that these can be addressed by developing an "Advanced Systems" paradigm. Advanced systems would allow applied policy and administrative studies to do all that they are currently doing, maintaining and conceptually enhancing many applied economics and systems analytics. Yet, advanced systems would also extend concepts and techniques to embrace insights arising from paradigmatic revolutions in other sciences. Some of these include: resiliency, co-evolution from the new biology and ecology; observer/observation-interaction mutual causality, potential, complementarity and others from quantum logic and physics; dissipative structures, order through fluctuation, and chaos theory from physical chemistry and theoretical mathematics; theories of creativity, cognition, and intuition from computer science.

I feel that Daneke's article is pointing to a meta-inclusive paradigm that may not only be applicable to explaining activity and behavior in public administration, but also to society and social networks as a whole. I feel that he is leaning toward development of a more "science" orientation for the discipline, but this may be difficult considering the social forces also at work.

Toward A Critical Theory of Public Organization.

Robert B. Denhardt (1981).

Public Administration Review, 41(6), 628-635.

Denhardt begins by stating the problem: "We are in a situation in which we seem to be somewhat unsure of the historical and philosophical grounding of our work." Denhardt recognizes that we can trace the roots of our heritage in many directions, but as we do, we discover that there are "serious conflicts among our ancestors." (Denhardt, 1981)

In short, the problem he identifies is that our concern for making public administration an object of "scientific" study has often been at odds with our interest in extending the normative principles we associate with democratic governance. The purpose of the article is to examine recent works in "critical" theory, while addressing implications for developing a comprehensive theory of public organization. Following a brief review of the development of critical theory, Denhardt focuses on the work of Jurgen Habermas, who is perhaps the best known contemporary scholar of the critical approach.

Critical thinking is "motivated today by the effort really to transcend the tension and to abolish the opposition between the individual's purposefulness, spontaneity, and rationality, and those work-process relationships on which society is built." (Denhardt, 1981). The critical perspective proffered by Habermas includes the following aspects:

It examines:

- The critique of instrumental reason
- The scientization of political life and the reduction of the public sphere, and
- The relationship between knowledge and human interests.

Habermas, a member of the "Frankfurt School" of thought, describes the "public sphere" as that arena in which the various interests in society engage in discourse related to the establishment of the normative agenda for society. "In recent times, the public sphere has been considerably narrowed, to the point that the interests being voiced tend to be those of hierarchical superiors in business, labor, and the professions, mediated or administered by the mass media." (Denhardt, 1981). Habermas seeks a "critical" approach that would aim at revealing the "false consciousness" which binds us, thus permitting movement toward emancipation. "Since what appear to us as causal relationships are manifestations of our particular historical circumstance (rather than natural and unalterable "laws"), they are subject to alteration by autonomous and responsible action on our part, and that process is initiatied in the act of critique." (Denhardt, 1981).

Denhardt speculates further about the many facets that could be included in a new "critical approach". He also suggests that the discipline's current "crisis of legitimacy" may be corrected if a new critical theory of public organizations is developed and

institutionalized. Organizational members and clients might be aided in understanding the nature of their relationships with one another through internalization of a critical theory of public organizations.

Denhardt concludes by noting that the critical approach is suggestive of alternative conceptions of the role of public organizations in a democratic society, as well as changing patterns of relationships within the bureaucracy. "It reminds us that the theory and practice of public administration is integral to the development of the state and its allocation of values in society and therefore must encompass far more than technical concerns".

We can agree wholeheartedly with Denhardt's assessment, and feel that an enhancement of the critical approach put forth by Habermas would be of great value for those involved in theory development for public administration.

What Makes Public Administration A Science? Or, Are Its 'Big Questions' Really Big?

Francis X. Neumann, Jr. (1996).

Public Administration Review, 56(5),409-415.

The problem addressed by Neumann's article is "What are the appropriate basic research questions public administration must address if it is to aspire to the status of a science?"

Neumann criticizes a recent essay by Robert Behn (1995), entitled "The Big Questions of Public Management". He agrees with Behn's assertion that "any field of science is defined by the big questions it asks". However, he feels that Behn incorrectly identifies the "big questions".

Behn proposed the following "big" questions:

- How can public managers break the micromanagement cycle?
- How can public managers motivate people?
- How can public managers measure achievement?

Neumann says that these questions are not incorrect or irrelevant, but they are at the wrong level. Neumann argues that Behn's questions are not "big" questions at all, but are for an argument at a much lower level. His three questions are questions of application, not probes into the origins or basic nature of a discipline.

Neumann proposes his own "big questions" for Public Administration:

- What is the nature of an organization? Of a "public" organization?
- How is the public organization related to its environment?
- What does it mean to manage or to administer the public organization?

Neumann acknowledges that the questions appear to address basic organizational theory, and that much work has already been done in these areas to answer similar questions. However, he feels that among the scientific disciplines, "The big questions are never really completely answered. The big questions, by their very nature, are multifaceted and extend into dimensions of which we are never fully cognizant at any one time." Neumann cautions us that although it may seem that all the major questions have been put to rest, "in truth we have only produced the answers that our existing vision has enabled us to find." What is needed is a paradigm shift in public administration.

Neumann concludes by suggesting a new paradigm based on non-linear systems theory. He feels that this world view appears to have great implications not only for the physical world, but for the social world as well. He adds: "the new paradigm is that of the nonlinear system. Nonlinear systems theory, "complexity" or "chaos" theory, is providing researchers with a new view of both physical and social systems." Some of the characteristics of these systems might be considered to be of important for application to public administration and public management. Neumann gives guidelines for the development of a new paradigm based on reasons why the older understanding of organizations may now be inadequate:

- Complex problems require complex mechanisms of solution.
- Attention to the parts of the problem may not solve the whole of the problem.
- Nonlinear systems do not necessarily tend toward equilibrium.
- Mechanisms of positive feedback are widespread and may cause unforeseen deviation amplification.

- Complexity may develop spontaneously in a system.
- Natural complex systems contain a balance of both random and deterministic elements.
- Accurate forecasts for future states of the nonlinear system may not be attainable.

Neumann notes that several authors (Jantsch, Ashby and Kiel and others) have supported the idea that the tenets of chaos theory can be married with the more traditional perspectives of political science and public administration.   Under the new paradigm, "the organization is again terra incognita, and the implications for the discipline are truly profound. All the closed doors and all the apparently settled questions must now be reopened. The big questions have not been satisfactorily answered at all." (Neumann, 1996).

In summary, Neumann is arguing that incorporating non-linear and chaotic systems theory means that we need to start with consensus on the core definitions of the organization, its internal dynamics, and its relationships with its environment. This means there is a great need now for a new exploratory wave of research in this area.

We can agree with Neumann that important answers needed for further theory development in public administration can be found in systems theory and other theories from diverse fields. I also agree with him that a new wave of research is needed, one that has the goal of developing a united theory for our discipline, even if it "borrows" from the important work being done in other fields.

From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens and the Next Generation of Public Administration.

Eran Vigoda (2002).

Public Administration Review, 62(5), 527-540.

Vigoda's article centers on the problem of illuminating the differences between "responsiveness" and "collaboration" with regard to modern public administration. He argues that there is an inherent "tension" between better responsiveness to citizens as clients and effective collaboration with them as partners. "The differences between responsiveness and collaboration/partnership are not merely conceptual or

terminological. In fact, they represent an intensifying paradox that emerges in both the theory and the practice of contemporary public-sector management". (Vigoda, 2002).

Vigoda argues that most of the current theoretical thinking in public administration deals with responsiveness and collaboration separately, but never integrating them in a useful manner. Vigoda illustrates by reviewing works from both camps. One group highlights administrative responsiveness to citizens' requests as the most important value of public agencies in a businesslike arena.   The other group emphasizes partnership between citizens and government as a premise for cultural revolution in contemporary bureaucracies.

The purpose of the article is to show that current focus on New Public Managerialism expands the orientation of government and public administration toward responsiveness. This is treated as a negative factor, because NPM implementation is frequently accompanied by several pathologies such as: lower willingness to share, participate, collaborate, and partner with citizens.

Vigoda feels that NPM and most of the other administrative reforms in recent years focus on a relationship with citizens as customers, with all focus on satisfying the customer in one central way - by improving responsiveness.   However, this view disguises the truth that the citizens are not just customers, they are the owners, and should be treated as such. Vigoda argues that "neo-managerialism and New Public Management encourage passivity among the citizenry by limiting opportunities for inclusion in decision-making. Vigoda feels that collaboration is an indispensible part of democracy, and that citizens are being relegated to a lower experience without their knowledge. He recommends that future theory building work should concentrate on the view of citizen collaboration with government, while giving up on the misguided notions of "customer" and "responsiveness".

The central argument is in how government and public administration view and treat the citizenry. The choice at hand is between a view of citizens being treated as clients and customers, or being perceived as equal partners in the process of governance.

Vigoda suggests that the "old" public administration treated citizens as subjects. With the installation of the voter electoral system, another style of citizen-government

relationship emerged – citizens as voters. Next is the model of citizens as clients/customers, illustrating a relationship dynamic that still exists today. On the extreme end of the government-citizen spectrum is citizen as owner. However, Vigoda mentions that this extreme should also be avoided.

Vigoda concludes by calling for future scholarship in public administration that renews the values of collaboration and partnership. There needs to be movement from a "they" spirit to a "we" spirit. Both parties (citizens & government), must be actively engaged in the process of administrative change and reforms.

We can agree with Vigoda that the overriding theme of current policy and reforms seems to be aimed at this notion of citizen as client or customer – a business mindset. I also agree that this needs to change, because in reality, the rights and responsibilities of a citizen entail much more than a "customer" mentality and passive level of involvement in the work of government.

1.15 Outlines

FOUNDATIONS

Tensions btw Bureaucracy/Democracy

Raadschelders (2003, 316) "Democracy is the rule of the people; bureaucracy is the rule of bureaus."

Aristotelian/Platonic view of three types of power:

- Monarchy/Tyranny
- Aristocracy/Oligarchy
- Polis/Democracy

Raadschelders sees a fourth type: Bureaucracy/Bureau mania or Bureaucratism (333) Bureaucracy is marginalizing politicians (and representative democracy) through specialization and permanence.

Democracy undermines bureaucracy by advancing representativeness over specialization, expertise or power (Note: This is inferred, not explicitly stated in Raadschelders)

Raad says that the bureaucracy and the administrators are indirectly accountable to the public because there is a layer of insulation (as mentioned by Peters.)

Van Braam (1986, 191) wrote on the representativeness of bureaucracy and three qualities he believes it enhances from a democratic perspective:

- Political legitimacy – if bureaucracy is representative, then society recognizes itself in bureaucratic action
- Political loyalty – if bureaucracy is representative, then bureaucracy will respond to political (democratic) values in a society
- Political reward – if bureaucracy is representative, then minority rights to equal opportunity are recognized and satisfied

Peters (1996 & 2001, 26) Bureaucracies undermine democracy in four fundamental ways:

- Monopoly of information allows bureaucracy to have an advantage over legislatures (as an expression of representative democracy) and to, in turn, pursue bureaucratic self-interest versus the public interest
- Hierarchy insulates the policy decision-making core from political leaders and citizens
- Permanence immobilizes action in a dynamic environment and halts policy innovation by perpetuating the policy choices and governing styles to which bureaucrats are accustomed
- Internal regulation prevents the exercise of individual discretion, allows bureaucrats to avoid taking responsibility for administrative action by blaming the rules

Svara (2007) suggests that administrators are ultimately responsible to its masters and political creators.

Frederickson (1997) believes that administrator is accountable to the public directly by suggesting the responsibility "ennobles the practice" of public administration.

Reconciliation

Frederickson (1997, 202) says that bureaucracy should seek to promote democratic rather than its own values.

"This, then, is the model for public service – the combination of patriotism (the love of regime values) with benevolence (the love of others) realized in action."

Bureaucracy should be the guardian of democratic values and pursue them through efficient, effective and equitable administration. It is in a unique position to do so because of bureaucratic permanence and day-to-day administration of government.

Raadschelders (2003, 379-388) – Balance along several continuums is the way to reconcile tensions between bureaucracy and democracy:

- Balance of individualism and collectivism – discretion versus control and standardization; direct democracy versus indirect democracy; freedom versus equality
- Balance of juridical and sociological modes of action – formal/impersonal application of rules versus informal, discretionary application of rules

- Balance of abstract and concrete layers of understanding – long term concerns, multi-disciplinary issues, normative planning versus a management perspective, operational concerns, etc.

"We must accept the idea of walking the middle ground."

If you substitute "administrative self-interest" for "bureaucracy" and "public interest" for "democracy", you've got the same argument as above…with little difference.

Still, what does it look like when the bureaucracy pursues self-interest? According to Frederickson (1997, 29), it looks like this:

- Efficiency
- Economy
- Order
- Predictability
- Due Process
- Protecting Boundaries
- Reduction of Big Questions to Questions of Mean and Short-Term Benefits

Svara (2007) prescribes a healthy mix of bureaucratic and democratic responsibilities for public administrators, thereby "walking the middle ground". They are:

- Put the public interest over personal interest (democracy)
- Display a service orientation and a commitment to serve (democracy)
- Have a commitment to procedural fairness (bureaucracy)
- Exercise fiduciary responsibility (bureaucracy)
- Be bound by and uphold the law (both)
- Support the democratic process (democracy)
- Be responsive to the policy goals of political superiors while fairly examining all policy options and exercising leadership appropriate to position (democracy)

There an appropriate level of ethics properly integrated into the organization will greatly improve the situation.

Svara believes that no theory of public administration is complete without an ethics component.

Svara further suggests that given the right tools, training, guidance, codes and supervision, administrative self-interest can be minimized and thus reducing the tension between bureaucracy/administration and democracy and the public.

Search for an Identity

This identity crisis of P.A. study is, according to Richard Stillman's comments for a 1999 ASPA Miniplenary Session, best summed up in a 1982 paper from Dwight Waldo entitled "Politics and Administration: A Profound Disjunction" in which he says: "…our politics are Greek but our administration is Roman."   Essentially, Stillman argues that Waldo identified our "thinking" or academic side as public-oriented while our "action" or pragmatic side is administrative-oriented.   Stillman argues for us to embrace this disjunction in order to find the answer or bridge the identified gap.

Waldo (1968)

Two 1968 essays by Dwight Waldo reflect on the state of the field of PA. Waldo rejects the two traditional solutions to the identity crisis: sub-discipline of political science or something else OR a distinct discipline among the social sciences

Waldo advocates, instead, for the solution that "we try to act as a profession without actually being one, and perhaps without the hope or intention of becoming one in any strict sense."

The profession argument uses medicine as an example of "science and art, theory and practice, study and application" all fitting nicely under an umbrella of profession.

"It is not based on a single discipline, but utilizes many. It is not united by a single theory, and is justified and given direction by a broad social purpose."

Waldo agreed with Simon on the shortcomings of scientific management and the "principles" approaches, but was more skeptical than Simon of efforts to rely solely on logical positivist methods in development of a theory for PA.

Dubnick (1999) (a political scientist at an ASPA meeting

"Identity crisis" is but one of several labels used to illustrate the field's problems.

Ostrom (1974) called it an "intellectual crisis"; Henry (1987) called it a "paradigmatic quandary"; Stillman (1991) called it a "shifting" among "competing visions".

Dubnick argued that the blame lay in the writing of the field's intellectual leaders.

The founding of ASPA in 1930s represents a split between those in political science that wished to establish that field as a separate social science and those committed to maintaining the link between research and practice in governmental affairs.

Public administration involved not merely the study of government operations and management; it inherently included a "broad social purpose" no different from that characterizing the study of medicine. Any effort to resolve the identity crisis must encompass that strong commitment to purpose.

Ostrom (1974)

Using Kuhn's terminology, Ostrom argued that PA faced a "paradigmatic crisis" because of the proliferation of prevailing theories; the methodological experimentation; the explicit discontent among scholars; the large amount of philosophical speculation and the debate surrounding fundamental epistemological issues.

Ostrom's solution was to develop PA as a science of association

Golembiewski (1977a and b)

Golembiewski has suggested that the discipline of PA ought to be developed by means of a "family of miniparadigms" such as organizational development

Raadschelders (2003)

Presents the idea that the "identity crisis" is a generic term referring to two types of crisis: academic crisis and existential crisis

Academic crisis concerns itself with the study of PA and the practice of PA/government, dealing with the theoretical, methodological, epistemological weaknesses and controversies

Existential crisis concerns itself with study and practice of PA/government, dealing with authority, legitimacy and credibility crises.

This refers in part to the legitimacy of the administrative state

The following refers to the academic crisis as it relates to Raad:

- Nicholas Henry (1975) "Paradigms of Public Administration" PAR 35(4):
  - 5 paradigms
  - PA Dichotomy 1900-1926
  - Principles of Administration 1927-1937
  - PA as Political Science 1950-1970 (PA resubmits to the domination of PoliSci)
  - PA as Administrative Science 1956-1970 (PA submits to the domination of Administration, public and private)
  - PA as PA (?) 1970 - ? (PA comes into its own, following the Simon prescription in 1947)
- 1938-1950 – Challenge to PA Dichotomy and Principles:
  - 1938 Barnard's Functions of the Executive (influenced Simon)
  - 1946 Fritz Marx ed. Elements of Public Administration (questioned dichotomy assumptions)
  - 1947 Simon's Administrative Behavior (blows the principles away)
- 1947-1950 – Reaction to the Challenge:
  - 1947 Simon's "A Comment on 'The Science of PA'" (prescribes two tracks – scholars working on the science of admin and a larger group working on prescriptive public policy)

Frederickson Questions

- How important that we have a paradigm?
- Are we making progress toward one?
- Which is the most promising?

Rainey Answers

- Not very
- No

- Mine!

Elaborating, Rainey says:

The importance of a paradigm is debatable – yes, we can travel in a herd, with all the advantages that might offer BUT we are also subject to the disadvantages.

It's difficult and dangerous to achieve and impose consensus on a field of inquiry.

Distinctions between public/private are snagging progress in the field, esp. with org theory.

Paradigmatic Discussion:

- Five paradigms:
    - Positivist
    - Post-positivist (Stanley identifies with this one)
    - Interpretivist
    - Conflict
    - Post-modern
    - Every paradigm should must have three things
    - An ontology – the nature of reality
    - An epistemology – how to know reality
    - A methodology – how to test reality

Given that, most professors don't see Henry's 1975 work as really being paradigms – they are more like theories. But that really depends on your definition of paradigm, doesn't it?

Henry accounts for this in his article by using paradigm as "How mainstream public administrationists have perceived their enterprise during the last 80 years"

Stanley is using the Kuhn paradigmatic definition

Rainey points out the Kuhn used "paradigm" in 21 distinct senses in 1962

French, Spears & Stanley (2005) The Fifth Paradigm of Public Administration?...

Once Public Org Theory is redefined as Public Org Efficacy, paradigmatic progress can begin

Efficacy = efficiency, effectiveness, equity, responsiveness and accountability through various modes of research

The last step is recognizing the quantitative and qualitative nature of inquiry, and establishing an equal respect for both – because some problems are better solved with numbers, some with words

Reformist Roots

Historical Overview of the Progressive Era (and around the edges)

1883 – The Pendleton Act creates the U.S. Civil Service Commission

1886 – The American Federation of Labor is formed

1887 – Woodrow Wilson publishes The Study of Administration AND the Interstate Commerce Commission is established as the first federal regulatory commission

1894 – The National Municipal League was formed to combat local government corruption

1900 – Frank Goodnow's Politics and Administration provides the first definition of the politics-administration dichotomy

1911 – Frederick Taylor publishes The Principles of Scientific Management

1912 – The Commission on Economy and Efficiency, the Taft Commission, calls for a national executive budget

1918 – William Willoughby outlines developments that were leading to the creation of modern budget systems

1920 – The Retirement Act creates the first federal service pension system

1920 – The Nineteenth Amendment gives women the right to vote

1921 – The Budget and Accounting Act is passed

1922 – Weber's structural definition of bureaucracy is published posthumously

General Thoughts

A large limitation of this view is that if the Reformist movement started PA, what was going on in America prior to the turn of the twentieth century?

The limitation of viewing PA as rooted in reform is that is does not take into account the values discussion to which several writers continue to return

While it may be true that PA was born out of and has continuously sought civil service/personnel reform; continued with any number of various budgetary reforms; and has more recently involved privatization and "Reinventing Government" reforms, to simply view PA as a series of reforms is missing the "values" component of the equation

This, in my view, is what the scholars are getting at in the Minnowbrook Conference and the Blacksburg Manifesto

Rosenbloom (2008)

Makes an argument that the PA dichotomy was misinterpreted from Wilson's (and the Progressive's) original meaning

Rosenbloom insists that the original meaning of "politics" was narrow, meaning only "partisan politics" and not the politics inherent in public policy formulation

Pointing to the civil service reforms right before and during the Progressive Era, Rosenbloom demonstrates that this was the "politics" that had to be separated from administration

Waldo, says Rosenbloom, used a broader definition of "politics" (that includes policy) to destroy the dichotomy as a viable view of PA

Further, Rosenbloom recalls discussing the dichotomy with Waldo at Syracuse and having Waldo label him "revisionist" but "he conceded that my interpretation was more than viable and made more sense of the dichotomy than any other of which he was aware".

Peters (1995)

Civil servants can present themselves as apolitical servants of the state who are able to serve any government. They can also claim that they are "divorced from partisan politics" (235).

Raadschelders (2003)

"Kettl points out that evidence of savings does not necessarily mean that contractors or private suppliers provide the same quality of service nor does it mean that they have a focus on fairness or equity." (p239)

Stillman (1999)

"The dichotomy, which became an important instrument for the Progressive reforms, allowed room for a new criterion for public action, based on the insertion of professionalization, expertise and merit values into the active directive of governmental affairs. In practice too the dichotomy served to justify the institutional developments of such basic features of the administrative state as the civil service system, personnel classification and planning systems as well as the introduction of public budgets." (p112)

No-State (Jefferson)– Adam Smith, Milton Friedman (monetarists) AND James Buchannan, Gordon Tullock, William Niskanen, Vincent Ostrom (public choice)

No-staters turn the PA dichotomy on its head and advocate for a clear division between the political appointees and the careerists, with a larger role for the political appointees

No-staters bifurcate what is good for society (Unseen Hand of the Market) from what is good within the government (Authoritarian, rigid hierarchy and strict controls)

Bold State (Hamilton)– Leonard White, Louis Browlow & Gulick are the founders of this tradition

Tradition is carried on by Robert Denhardt, Charles Goodsell, George Frederickson and Anne-Marie Rizzo

No single united front in support of one idea, or even a group of ideas

Recognize the difference between public and private sector administration

Speak the language of the practitioner

Have trouble justifying their vision, and seem to stand a bit one-sided with bureaucracies

Never seem willing to describe the circumstances under which the growth of the state will stop

Pre-State (Madison) – John Rohr, Donald Kettl,

Recognize the uniqueness of public administration from private sector administration

Delve into the historical and organizational contexts when examining PA

Philosophy is realistic and humane for the practitioner

Works to deal with constitutional legitimacy problems in the field

Work around the edges of change, evolution not revolution

Criticized for descriptive only, lacking strong methodologies

Pro-State – James Perry

Creatures of post-WWII American state system, globalism, professionalism and technocracy

Carries the "toolbag" analogy a bit too far, making this view of PA the grand-son of Frederick Taylor's Scientific Management

The technocracy can solve problems with a variety of technologies, methods and a wide-ranging set of roles and responsibilities

This view promotes a global vision, interdisciplinary approach and shies away from normative solutions

Critics point to the positivist nature of the writings in this view, takes a dim view of the non-rational problem solving that must take place, promotes antidemocratic elitism, and places too much faith in the technological instruments – with little regard to how those instruments might be biased

A Feminist Perspective:

Stivers 2002

"The discussion aims to show how women's work and thought were at the center of the movement to reform city governments and how gender dynamics at the time resulted in bifurcation between what could have been complementary impulses of systematization and caring. The extent to which the contemporary administrative state has roots in women's reform work has been obscured because male reformers, painted by party politicians as effeminate, felt the need to make public administration masculine by making it 'muscular' – that is, scientific and businesslike."

Professionalism

Waldo, Dwight. (1968)

Rejects the two traditional solutions: sub-discipline in political science or some other discipline and a distinct discipline within social sciences

"We try to act as a profession without actually being one, and perhaps without the hope of intention of becoming one in any strict sense."

Uses the analogy of the field of medicine that is a combination of "science and art, theory and practice, study and application" to illustrate the concept of a profession

Van Wart, Montgomery (1998). Changing Public Sector Values

5 Major Sources of Values for Public Administrators are (p. 8):

- Individual
- Professional
- Organizational
- Legal
- Public Interest

6 Characteristics of a Profession (p. 12):

- Self awareness
- A body of theory and knowledge
- A social ideal

- A formal organization to promote its interests
- A national academy
- Ethical standards

Van Wart's claim is that PA is a profession only by the flimsiest of standards.

Ernest Greenwood's 5 Attributes of a Profession (according to Van Wart p. 62)

- A body of theory/knowledge – systematic body of knowledge requiring formal education and intellectual practice
- A professional culture – expressed in norms, symbols and a world view
- The sanction of the community – the profession controls training and accrediting
- A regulative code of ethics – professional "disinterestedness" or neutrality toward the client
- Substantial professional authority – lay people must trust the professionals

Van Wart applies the 5 Attributes to PA:

- A body of theory/knowledge – yes, many positions require considerable training and knowledge
- Professional culture – yes, professional organizations pop up for all types of public administrators
- Community sanction – yes and no, often the community/elected officials control training and standards
- Ethics standards – yes and no, the ethical standards are often set by legislation or by someone other than those in the profession
- Professional authority – yes, judges and social workers are an example

Conclusions:

Positive values of professionalism in PA

Heightened competence

Outside review

Job satisfaction

Innovation

Client satisfaction

Negatives associated with professionalism in PA

Limited access to profession due to educational requirements

Over-specialization

Excessive control and power

Promotion of self-interest above the public interest

Cost-benefit distortion

Wamsley, Gary; Goodsell, Charles; Rohr, John; Stivres, Camilla; White, Orion and Wolf, James. Refounding Public Administration (a.k.a. The Blacksburg Manifesto) (1982)

Public administration as a profession is immaterial, what matters is that public administrators act in a professional manner by doing the following:

View themselves as "trustees"

Pursue the public interest

Adhere to the rule of law and limited government (constitutional)

Prudently accommodate powerful forces

Facilitate real citizen involvement in governance

Be responsive to valid orders

Be conscious of their own values

Be able to give reasons for their actions

Know that social problems don't have quick, cheap or permanent solutions

Some solutions are market-based; some come from the state

Be an analyst and educator

Be committed to praxis- reflection and action – thoughtful assessment of action taken

Live for PA as a cause, not off it for less noble reasons

Goodsell's article (1990) "Public Administration and the Public Interest"

P. 107 – professional public administrators are the "leading embodiment and proponent of the public interest"

Public administrators should use the public interest as a verbal symbol by the expression of 6 values or rules:

Legal-morality

Political responsiveness

Political consensus

Concern for logic

Concern for effect

Agenda awareness

Kirlin (1996) Big Questions of PA in a Democracy (in the discussion of Professionalism of the field)

- What are are the instruments of collection action that remain responsible both to democratically elected officials and to core societal values?
- What are the roles of nongovernmental forms of collective action in society and how can desired roles be protected and nurtured?
- What are the appropriate tradeoffs between governmental structures based on function and geography?
- How shall tensions between national and local political arenas be resolved?
- What decisions shall be isolated from the normal processes of politics so hat some other rationale can be applied?
- What balance shall be struck amount neutral competence, representativeness, and leadership?
- How can processes of societal learning be improved, including knowledge of choices available, of consequences of alternatives and of how to achieve desired goals, most importantly, the nurturing and development of a democratic polity?

Legitimacy of the Administrative State

Raadschelders (2003)

American government is a societal creation, founded in the U.S. Constitution with negotiated authority and a system of checks and balances.

Legitamacy of Public Administration:

- "Is public administration a legitimate professional study?"
- Raadschelders (2003), comments that public administration is a product of multiple disciplines, somewhat of a garbage can. Although public administration has profited from a multipdisciplinary approach, it has also led to a reputation of being intellectually underdeveloped. Some scholars suggest that public administration actually has the potential to arrive at a more complete understanding of government because it draws on so many disparate disciplines.
- If we agree that public administration is a field of discipline, then the second inquiry is a logical one:
- "From where does public administration draw its authority?"
- Raadschelders (2003) suggests that government is facing a legitimacy crisis that is evidenced by declining voter participation and citizen participation in policy making. He comments however, that today's government is society's creation, founded in the U.S. Constitution with negotiated authority and a system of human-made checks and balances. Democracy refers to a state system in which sovereignty is formally invested in the citizens, with guaranteed civil rights and freedoms. Democracy supports a society where individual rights are revoked only when a citizen has in some way harmed another.

Stillman (1999)

Growth of the American state is linked to the rise of PA theory

Stillman defines state as concrete national institutions and organizations and people that carry out the basic functions common to all modern nations, such as tax collection, business regulation, national defense, public education, social welfare, etc.

Suggests that U.S. was "stateless" until the passage of the Pendleton Act in 1883

American PA differs greatly from European PA in that American PA does not have authority grounded in thousands of years of "state" history

Box (2004)

Legitimacy centers on the relationship of public administration to the constitution and the nature of the founding period. A legitimized PA would be one that is respected by the public, has more control, authority; discretion to act independently and is given the status of an equal partner in relation to elected leaders and other parts of government

The framers would likely disapprove of the power of the modern federal government, although a strong government is needed to protect individual rights

Stivers (2002)

Legitimate power is seen as flowing from the people to their elected representatives and indirectly to appointed officials

The exercise of power by civil servants is neither elected or removable but problematic

Legitimacy premised on arguments of expertise, neutrality/objectivity and management

New Public Management used this function to advocate "breaking through bureaucracy" by making bureaucrats into entrepreneurs and innovators; suggests the polity needs an entity to carry and implement the vision

Rohr (1986)

Framers left congress to decide which executive departments should be created, and in so doing expressed their desire that some departments should be created (173).

Must be concerned how management and control which are necessary in modern industrial society can be performed without violating commitments to individualism and self-government (178).

While we make the case that the administrative state is compatible with constitutional principles it is useful to remember that the constitutional principles were themselves the object of intense debate (179).

The role of PA is to fulfill the objective of the oaths of office: to uphold the Constitution of the United States, meaning that administrators should use discretionary powers in order to maintain the constitutional balance of powers in support of individual rights

The Senate, in its original intended state, is the constitutional model for PA as a balance since it was supposed to exercise all three powers of government.

PA exercises those powers, but in a subordinate capacity to the three branches of government

Rohr (2002)

Recurrent debate over the proper role of public administrators, stemming from their balance of demands for efficiency and for political definitions of the public good; efficiency and a business approach currently holds the upper hand

"Nothing is more fundamental to governance than a constitution; and therefore to stress the constitutional character of administration is to establish the proper role of administration as governance that includes management but transcends it as well."

Rohr promotes the ideas of administrative discretion and civil servants as constitutional actors

1993 PAR Debate (Spicer/Terry Debate) found in PAR 53(3)

Characterized Rohr as one who romanticized the view of the founders; he and others perpetuated a distorted view of the founders

Idealist method of historical explanation – explain actions or intentions after the face

Empathetic method of historical explanation – imagine themselves in the place of the person involved in the event

Characterized the founders as noble men who possessed superior minds

John Hope Franklin – "created a tragically flawed revolutionary document and a constitution that did not bestow the blessings of libery"

Herbert J. Storing – responded founders compromised on slavery

Seeks to explain the logic of the documents rather than the history

The effect of constitutional rules is to limit the discretionary power available to government officials; insurance against risk of exploitive government

Madison's arguments for a stronger central government are based on a role in checking the abuse of discretionary power by majority factions in the legislature

Frederickson and NPA – public administration being used as an instrument of repression

Rohr (1993) response to Spicer/Terry criticisms

Without the slavery compromise, it would likely have been impossible to form "the more perfect union"

The consideration of the founding fathers as human beings is secondary to the practical consideration that their influence still has an enormous effect on the normative dimensions of contemporary public argument

Contention that rational individuals would, of necessity, choose a democratic government is elitist; the founders chose as they did because of a reasoned assessment of their peculiar historical situation

Pro-slavery criticisms may diminish respect as persons but it leaves untouched the principles of the regime that was founded

Jefferson on slavery: "We have a wolf by the ears and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go."

Warren (1993)

By the end of the 1930s the courts had completely accepted the major role the administrative state was playing in our governmental system as constitutionally legitimate (Kenneth C. Davis)

The administrative state became a blatant reality during FDR's administration

The administrative state is legitimate not only because our sociopolitical legal system has sanctioned it but because the administrative state is obviously consistent with

recent tradition, established sociopolitical patters and is overwhelmingly supported by public opinion

The more representative the public service becomes, the more legitimate as a governing body it tends to be

New PA school held that the administrative state was illegitimate because it has long ignored the centrality of human dignity

Others have argued that the bureaucracy is illegitimate because all parties do not have equal access to the bureaucracy's decision-making

Each individual has a unique perspective of what constitutes legitimate administrative behavior on the part of the administrative state

The agonies of the bureaucratic age constitute reality and we can best deal with big bureaucracy if we acknowledge its existence, try to understand it and then do what we can to cope with it (Hummel, 1987)

It should be stressed that both liberal and conservative courts have upheld the power of the administrative state by deferring time after time to agency discretion and expertise

Congress has sanctioned the legitimacy of the administration through delegation

Wise (1993)

Federalist 15 implies that since coercion is necessary in government, the people should be glad to choose civil rather than military coercion

When examining the contributions of the founders we should concentrate on the relevancy of their experience as applied to real governing.

Hamilton argued in Federalist 27 that the more people experienced the actual operation of government on the common occurrence of their lives "the more it will conciliate the respect and attachment of the community".

Once public administrators renounce their subordinate position in favor of an independent position of interpreting the constitution, they forfeit the legitimacy that the actual constitutional scheme offers

Lowi (1993)

Administration was legitimate as long as it was consistent with democracy and it was consistent with democracy as long as it was accessible to the common person

Nowhere in the constitution is an explicit theory of separation of powers as a principle of limitation on the national government

Article I and Article II indicate that the executive branch was to be an institution of delegated powers

Spicer/Terry Debate (1993) The Final Response

Meier/Kaufman: Why do scholars, elected officials, political pundits, interest groups and the general public continue to worry over the ominous specter of a powerful imperial bureaucracy controlled by non-elected and nonpolitically appointed public officials?

Freedman: the history of the modern administrative process can be seen as having been marked by an extended sense of crisis. This sense of crisis is something more serious than routine criticism and reflects a persisting uneasiness over the place and function of the administrative process in American government

STATS/METHODS

What are the possible limits of quantitative policy analysis? Can qualitative analysis help the policy analyst to overcome all of them?

Research in the social sciences uses several different methods to answer questions. The experimental method is used with the quantification of data, the process of converting data to a numerical format (Babbie, 396) and used in evaluation research. Another method is quasi-experimental – non-rigorous inquiries somewhat resembling controlled experiments but lacking key elements such as pre-and post-testing and/or control groups (Babbie, 349). The third type of method is the qualitative evaluation

What are the elements of the classical experimental design?

The elements of the classical experimental design are:

- Randomization (R) – each subject or case has an equal chance of being assigned to the experimental group or to the control group (random sampling)
- Observation or Measurement 1 (pretest)
- Administration of the experimental treatment to the experimental group, but not the control group.
- Observation or Measurement 2 (Posttest)
- Compare the measurement of the two groups

Classical Experimental Design

Group Comparison	Randomization	Observation 1	Treatment	Observation 2
Experimental Oe2 – Oe1	Re	Oe1	X	Oe2
Control Oc2 – Oc1	Rc	Oc1		Oc2

Step 1   Assign subjects to two or more groups, with at least one "experimental" and one "control," so that the groups are as comparable as possible. The best way to assemble comparable groups is through random assignment of subjects to groups.

Step 2 Measure all subjects on relevant variables. Although a pre-experiment measurement or pretest is usually administered, some experimental designs do not require a pretest.

Step 3 Expose the experimental group(s) to a treatment or stimulus, the independent variable. Ensure that the other control group(s) is not exposed. Exposure to the treatment should constitute the only difference between the groups.

Step 4 Measure the groups again on the requisite variables in the postexperiment groups.

Step 5 Compare the measurements of the groups. If the independent variable does lead to changes in the dependent variable, this result should be evident in pretest-

posttest comparisons between the experimental and control groups. Or, if the groups are large and known to be equivalent through random assignment, the analyst can simply compare posttest scores between the two groups. If the causal inference is valid, these comparisons should bear out predicted differences between the experimental and control groups.

What are the requisites necessary for researchers to conclude that a causal

Relationship exists? Why is this the case?

The three main criteria for causal relationships in social research are 1) variables must be correlated – there is an actual relationship, 2) the cause takes place before the effect – time order, and 3) the variables are non-spurious – there is not a third variable effecting the relationship (Babbie, 90). Note these definitions:

Correlation – An empirical relationship between two variables such that 1) changes in one are associated with changes in the other or 2) particular attributes of one variable are associated with particular attributes of the other. Correlation in and of itself does not constitute a causal relationship between the two variables, but is one criterion of causality (Babbie, 90).

Time order – We can't say a causal relationship exists unless the cause precedes the effect in time (Babbie, 90).

Spurious Relationship – a coincidental statistical correlation between tow variables, shown to be caused by some third variable (Babbie, 91).

An alternate answer, that is, there are four criteria to conclude that a causal relationship exists. The criteria are 1) time order – If A is the cause of B, then A must precede B in time. Also, Changes in A must occur before changes in B. So, cause must precede effect. 2) Covariation – means that the two variables move or vary together. If A changes and B also changes, this covariation provides some evidence that A is the cause of B. If changes in are never accompanied by changes in B, then A cannot be the cause of B. 3) Non-spuriousness – a relationship is an association between two variables that cannot be explained by a third factor. 4) Theory – Not only must the conditions of time order, covariation, and non-spuriousness be satisfied, but also a theoretical or substantive justification or explanation for the relationship must

be provided. Theory interprets the observed covariation; it addresses the issue of how and why the relationship occurs (Meir, K. J. & Brudney, J.L., 32-34).

Please answer the following question in its entirety:

   a. What are the requisites necessary for researchers to demonstrate causality?

   b. What type of research design is most likely to enable a researcher to conclude that a causal relationship exists? Why is this the case?

   c. How do you distinguish between internal and external validity?

   d. Propose an experimental research design that can be utilized by public administration analysts. In that experimental design you are to specify:

The nature of the problem that you wish to explore and why it is amenable to research through an experimental design.

What is the major hypothesis that you would test; how would you operationalize the independent and dependent variables?

How would you set up the experiment?

How would you collect the data?

How would you know that the data support or do not support the hypothesis?

How would your design control specifically for threats to internal and external validity?

Why is it very difficult to utilize experimental designs in the social sciences?

Answer the following question in its entirety:

In recent years much attention has been given to the issues of equity in funding and performance of children in public schools. The Tennessee Supreme Court in 1993's Tennessee Small Schools systems, et. al. V. Ned Ray McWherter, et. al ruled that the:

State Constitution imposes upon the General Assembly the obligation to maintain and support a system of free public schools that afford substantially equal educational opportunities to all students.

The small school districts that sued the state for equity in funding were primarily poorer counties or cities or special school districts that did not have a substantial taxing base in their communities.

It is now nine years after the implementation of the funding equity formula and you have been called upon to design a study to see if equity in funding has led to comparable performance between the small school systems and the non-litigants in the case.

How would you operationalize performance? What are the component parts that would comprise a valid, reliable measure of performance in the context of the lawsuit?

How would you operationize equity? What are the component parts that would comprise a valid, reliable measure of equity in the context of the lawsuit?

What type of research design would you construct to do this study? What would be your unit of analysis? Why? What would be your sampling frame?

Babbie (2007) – see also Joy Clay study guide for first 5 chapters of Babbie defines "theory" as "a systematic explanation for the observations that relate to a particular aspect of life"

Social theory is more descriptive than normative

Conceptual definition – refinement and specification of abstract concepts, a bridge from direct and indirect observables to useful constructs (theoretical creations based on observations…)

Operational definition – specifies precisely how a concept will be measured

Kuhn (1962)

Positivist and post-positivist paradigm

The only reality we can understand is the reality that we can measure using formal models

Can't have a paradigm or discipline without scientific technique

Normal science; allows us to create knowledge; left up to discipline to determine how knowledge is made

The researcher has a responsibility to declare belief in a paradigm, so a shift can be recognized and a discipline can exist.

It's OK for PA to know what it is; Consensus is found in the research

H. George Frederickson () caused a "scurrying" to find the paradigm in social sciences, PA is barren

Hal G. Rainey points to Masterman's (1970) criticism of Kuhn's (1962)use of the term paradigm in 21 distinct senses as an indictment of the whole "identity crisis" in PA

Yin (2003)

Case study research methods

Daneke (1990)

Advocates a mixed methods approach

The environment affects the organization (environment is mostly politics)

Mixed methods promotes comprehensive knowledge

New tech should advance sciences

Must have some consensus for a paradigm to exist

There are multiple paradigms, esp. in social sciences, but for a science to exist, must have agreement; PA is not a paradigm; it is pre-paradigmatic; PA doesn't have big questions (from Stanley 5th paradigm paper) Daneke, on the other hand, indicates that paradigmatic progress is essential for establishing an identity of public administration. He advocates the use of advanced systems theory for his paradigmatic choice in public administration, again suggesting that public organization theory has dealt with this issue.

Ziman (1968)

Anyone can make an observation or conceive a hypothesis

Scientific knowledge is more than an observation.

Facts and theories must survive a period of critical study and testing by other competent and disinterested individuals and have been found so persuasive that they are almost universally accepted.

The objective of science is not just to acquire information not to utter all non-contradictory notions

The goal is a consensus of rational opinion over the widest possible field.

Recognition that science knowledge must be public and consensible allows one to trace out the complex inner relationships between its various facets.

Intellectual = attempt to discriminate between scientific and nonscientific disciplines

Psychological = role of education, the significance of scientific creativity

Sociological = Structure of the scientific community and the institutions by which it maintains scientific standards and procedures.

Popper (1963)

Popper's Formulated Conclusions to incompatible with certain possible results of observation:

Easy to obtain confirmations, or verifications, for nearly every-theory

Confirmations should only count if they are the result of risky predictions

The more a scientific theory forbids certain things to happen, the better it is

A theory is nonscientific if it is not refutable by any conceivable event.

Every genuine test of a theory is an attempt to falsify it.

Confirming evidence does not count unless it is the result of a genuine test of the theory.

Some genuinely tested theories, when found false, are still upheld by their admirers.

The criterion of the scientific status of a theory is its falsifiability, or refutability, or testability.

The criterion of falsifibility because it states that the statements or systems, in order to ranked as scientific, must be capable of conflicting with possible or conceivable observations.

The beginnings of the use of a null hypothesis in testing

Feyerabend (1975)

Any ideology that breaks the hold a comprehensive system of thought has on the minds of men contributes to the liberation of man.

Any ideology that makes man question inherited beliefs is an aid to enlightenment.

The teaching of "facts" without the attempt to awaken the critical abilities of the pupil so that he may be able to see things in perspective.

Has Science found the correct method for achieving results?

Theories cannot be justified and their excellence cannot be shown without reference to other theories.

Science itself is not clear, unambiguous, and precisely formulated.

Has science produced results with its methods?

Great scientific advances are due to outside interference which is made to prevail in the face of the most basic and most "rational" methodological rules.

There does not exist a single argument that could be used to support the exceptional role which science today plays in society.

There is no "scientific methodology" that can be used to separate science from other ideologies.

Science is just one of many ideologies that propel society and it should be treated as such

There must be a clear separation between science and state such as there is a clear separation between church and state

Science may influence society to the extent that any other political or other pressure group my influence society.

Final judgement must be left to the democratically elected bodies.

Kitcher (1982)

Evolutionists vs. Creationists

Science demands proof

Can be argued that there is no "proof" supporting either side.

"Complete certainty is best seen as an ideal toward which we strive and that is rarely, if ever, attained."

Fallibility is the hallmark of science

Historically, the natural sciences is "strewn with the corpses of intricately organized theories, each of which had, in its day, considerable evidence in its favor."

"Forlorn skepticism" - George Berkeley

From the idea of science as certain and infallible, scientists jump to a cynical description of their endeavors.

Science is sometimes held to be a game played with arbitrary rules, an irrational acceptance of dogma, an enterprise based ultimately on faith.

Theories win support by producing claims:

About what can be observed

That would not have seemed plausible prior to the advancement of the theory

That are in fact found to be true when we make the appropriate observations.

Theory as a collection of claims or statements

Some offer generalizations

Used to infer whose truth or falsity can be decided by observation

Theory is supported when we find that the observational consequences are true

The credentials of a theory are damaged when some of the observational consequences are found to be false.

Successful Science:

Independent testability = achieved when possible to test auxiliary hypotheses independently of the particular cases for which they are introduced.

Unification = result of applying a small family of problem-solving strategies to a broad class of cases.

Fecundity = grows out of incompleteness when a theory opens up new and profitable lines of investigation.

Hempel (1948)

Science attempts to provide explanations for phenomena occurring in the physical and social world

"Explanations are arguments offered to establish that the event-to-be-explained had to occur given the initial conditions and the presence of certain regularities in nature"

Laws are what distinguish scientific explanations from descriptions

If it's a law, it will be true in all places at all times.

The typical assumption is that human behavior is unique and often un-repeatable; therefore, it is difficult to determine causality.

Hempel suggests that even in physical sciences exact replication may not be possible. He also purports that the concept of 'causal explanation' is misunderstood. All that is needed for causality is for antecedent characteristics to be met and for those events to repeat.

Can we explain human behavior?

Situational characteristics

History of the individual

Hempel argues that we can make generalizations based on previous experiences and behavior.

"The determining motives and beliefs must be classified under antecedent conditions of a motivational explanation, and there is no formal difference on this account between motivational and causal explanation"

Denzin and Lincoln (2003)

On case studies:

As a practice one might commonly associate with qualitative analysis, Denzin and Lincoln discuss the importance of the case study. Different types of case studies are identified as intrinsic studies, instrumental studies and collective. The intrinsic study is where the researcher wishes to better understand a particular situation or occurrence versus the instrumental study where the case itself isn't as important because the researcher is seeking to gain insight on a problem or issue. Finally there is the collective where the researcher examines a number of cases in order to better understand a cohort, society, problem or phenomenon. The authors acknowledge that these are not the only descriptions for case studies but they share the main traits that are accepted in the field (136-138). The authors suggest that researchers only undertake case studies that provide an understanding of other cases the field has be underutilized and that the current methodology of the field, which stresses contributions to generalization, further exacerbates the problem (140).

On program evaluation

The authors undertake an important discussion to public administration with their examination of social program evaluations. The presented goals of a social program evaluator is to improve the service and raise the public discourse on a policy or program (590). The authors suggest there are a couple of good reasons that a qualitative process is a good process for evaluations. First is the fact that the epistemologies of interpretivism and constructivism were founded in the traditions of philosophy and value pluralism. Next is the fact that these perspectives value the stakeholders who are involved with the evaluated program giving the researcher a "contextualized understanding (595)." The argument is presented that a qualitative methodology will tell a story of a situation rather than just presenting data. This is important because as the evaluator is an ethnographer they will understand the plight and situation of those who are impacted by the program or policy that is being

evaluated. (601). This process isn't without its detractors who will ask how good is a particular program and whose interests are really being advanced. Because this style of evaluation doesn't have strong scientific method and is more philosophical in nature there won't be ready answers for the critics. The evaluator must keep in mind several recognition inquiry cannons which guide all of their work in order to properly deal with these questions: credibility, dependability, applicability and confirmability (606). With all of this understanding the authors say that qualitative evaluations should be conducted by individuals who have a constructivists perspective and have strong morals so that they will have the ability to showcase honest representations to the stakeholders.

On qualitative versus quantative

And the ability to weave these skills into research (the quilt) that can be used for the betterment of society is not without its detractors. The work of these researchers who use qualitative methods is considered a soft science and subjective due to its position of not accepting that all research is going to be value-free presentation. The largest group of detractors are those who hold the numerical and quantitative methods as the only real study that can offer insight into reality. The specific differences between quantitative method and qualitative method is the presentation of positivism and postpositivisim, which share the opinions mentioned that there is one reality and it can only be understood with the use of structured analysis (statistics.) Quantitative analysis relies on a postmodern perspective, versus the positivist and postpostivist perspective meaning that a postmodern researcher believes that the data gathered from a structured analysis is but one way of representing the reality. A postmodern researcher is looking for other ways to tell the story of the situation (i.e. make the quilt.) A quantitative researcher is going to have the perspective of one who needs to better understand an individual's point of view through examining the constraints of everyday life. Being an active part of the research is what truly separations between qualitative and quantitative methods (13).

On Mixed Methods

Once the data has been collected in the initial survey and followed by interviews and document review the information will then be reviewed through a series of approaches to best capture the usefulness of examining the phenomenon. This "mixed-methods"

approach enhances the usefulness of the data for future policymakers (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). The first method used to examine the data collected will be a process called triangulaization. Trinangularization is a term based in surveying where knowing any two points on a map and their distance between one another, allows the surveyor to find the distance to any other point on the map (Patton, 2002). Much like the three points of the triangle, using this mixed-methods approach to the data allows the researcher more examples of what exactly occurs with these local governmental entities and their use of performance measurement. There are four forms of trinagulaization; data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theory triangulation and methodological triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). This research design has already presented a proposal to use methodological triangulation with its use of a survey which is more quantitative in nature and interviews and document research which is more qualitative in nature. The research findings in the quantitative function of the design give the researcher the directions; a roadmap as to who should be the subject of further research. The qualitative component, documents and interviews, will give the researcher a better understanding as to what, why and how occurs with the local governments and their decision-making.

ADMIN MANAGEMENT

Mintzberg (1998)

"There is no 'one best way' to create strategy, nor is there 'one best form' or organization. Quite different forms work well in particular contexts."

Strategy as plan, ploy, pattern(consistency in behavior), position (within an environment), and perspective (character of an organization)

Strategic Management – Making the strategic plan work

Strategic Planning (Fred David 2007)

Formulation

Identifying opportunities and threats in the environment

Attaching estimates or risk to the alternatives

Strengths and weaknesses evaluated with resources on hand

Actual or potential capacity should be estimated objectively

Preferences and politics

Ethical considerations

Implementation

Evaluation

Performance Measures – Benchmarking (for performance/production improvement)

Best Value or Best Value for Money (for accountability)

Principal-Agent Theory

Porter – Cost Leadership

Differentiation

Focus

Mintzberg – locate core, distinguish, elaborate, extend and reconcieve

BUDGETING

Budgeting Comps

Questions (from Mid-Terms and Comp Questions)

In her article treating budgeting…Naomi Caiden concludes that "Public Budgeting is undoubtedly a discipline in the dictionary definition of the term as a "branch of knowledge or learning." What evidence supports this assertion? Caiden then cautions "But if the study of pubic budgeting is to be more than a collection of disparate concerns, it requires stronger themes, and theories that act not only to unify them but also to reveal the philosophical assumptions underlying empirical description and normative proposals." Assess the state of the discipline of public budgeting.

In a renowned 1940 article, V.O. Key, Jr. lamented about "the lack of budget theory". Twelve years later, Vernon B. Lewis attempted to construct a normative budget theory. In one of her numerous writings, Irene Rubin noted that "budget theory today is fragmented and incomplete…It is in the process of being invented." Based on the work of scholars who address this issue, discuss the extent to which the literature of public

budgeting evidences "theory". Assess the limitations of such a "theory of budgeting". Why is budget theory still viewed as incomplete or fragmented? Briefly discuss at least three of the major competing theories of public budgeting treated in the literature (where appropriate, distinguish between normative and descriptive theories).

Some of the readings covered in this course posit various ideas or theories to explain public budgeting "allocation decisions". Write an essay that assesses the validity of the following statements: While governments have tried various "rational" decision making systems, and while scholars have posited various explanations, incrementalism remains the best explanation for public budget decisions.

(Hint: Begin your essay with a description of specific rational budget decision systems adopted and later abandoned at the federal level before you explain what incrementalism is and why many scholars still content it is the best explanation for public budget decisions.

Trace the development of public budgeting in the United States beginning with the Report of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency (Taft Commission) up to the passage of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974. Focus on the contributions of the key players (individual reformers and commissions) involved in the reform effort and highlight the major legislation that shaped the development of the federal budget process. What are the most common elements shared by the early reformers and what are their major differences?

Cite the major federal financial and budget reforms of the past decade(or some other time period), identifying the basic characteristics (provisions) of these reforms. Discuss the implications these budget reforms hold for public management at the federal, state and local levels. Discuss the implication of the value assumptions implicit in these reforms vis-à-vis the fundamental values and beliefs which undergird public administration.

What is performance based budgeting (PBB)? What differentiates PBB from PPBS and ZBB? What are the similarities among the three? Explain the major opportunities and challenges of implementing performance based budgeting. What is the purpose of OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in regard to PBB implementation?

What is a budget?

A gov't budget is

1. Financial plan

2. Policy document---what we want to do and how/distrib and redistrib of scarce res

3. Managerial tool---projection of future rev and exp

4. Econ instrument --- way to control fin transactions

BUDGETING AS A DISCIPLINE/STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE

V.O. Key (1940) – "On what basis shall it be decided to allocate X dollars to activity A instead of activity B?"

Key noted at the time of his writing that there were very few articles written on the allocation of expenditures to achieve the greatest return.

Key asserts that budgeting is a form of applied economics, requiring the allocation of scarce resources among competing demands

Sought to take the field away from focus on mechanics of budget-making

Vernon B. Lewis (1952) – Attempted to construct an economic theory of budgeting based on three economic principles:

Return on expenditure must be worth its cost in terms of sacrificed alternatives

Incremental analysis is necessary because of the phenomenon of diminishing returns

Comparison of relative merits can be made only in terms of relative effectiveness in achieving a common objective

Lewis' plan involved focusing on budget alternatives (in terms of levels or quality of service – ex. "Bare-bones; Mid-level; Cadillac") and incremental requests for resources

Wildavsky (1961) defends Incrementalism, and asserts that we may never find a better theory, since a budgeting theory would be the same as a political theory.

Lindbloom (1959) – "muddling through" thanks to bounded rationality, leading to incrementalism

Schick (1966) wrote that dependent on the environment of a given time-period, budgets emphasize three things

Financial control

Managerial improvements

Planning

Rubin (1996) adds Prioritization and Accountability to Schick's list

Janet M. Kelly (2005) "A Century of Public Budgeting Reform: The "Key" Question

Kelly sees the answer to Key's question in the cyclical nature of public opinion regarding the role of government

Public opinion is in favor of business (or against govt.) the opinion is PRIVATE REGARDING

Public opinion is in favor of govt. (or against business) the opinion is PUBLIC REGARDING

Jacksonian (1829-1872) PRIVATE REGARDING

Progressive (1873-1921) PUBLIC REGARDING

Roaring Twenties (1921-1932) PRIVATE REGARDING

Depression and the New Deal (1933-1945) PUBLIC REGARDING

The Management Movement (1946-1958) PRIVATE REGARDING

Realism and the Great Society (1959-1969) PUBLIC REGARDING

The Modern Era (1969-1979) DISILLUSIONMENT, STILL PUBLIC REGARDING

Neo-Jacksonians (1980 to Present) PRIVATE REGARDING

Kelly also finds that incremental budgeting reflects American preferences for incremental policy change

Traditional line-item budgeting promotes financial accountability

So, we have a theory of budget reform, which is a theory of public opinion cycles.

BUDGET THEORIES

Types of theory (from Rubin 1990)

Normative

Descriptive

Normative Theory Features

Based on narrow range of observations

Solutions may be based on values rather than observations

Weakness – if advice offered in normative theory isn't followed, it widens the gap between theory and practice

Evaluations of budget reforms have often been negative

Public participation tends to be short lived or non-existent (Incrementalism, Hierarchy theories)

Normative budgeting is underestimated because evaluators look for short range results instead of long range effects

Descriptive Theory Features

Based on close observations or participation in public sector activity

Weakness – if the explanatory power of descriptive theory is too weak, it widens the gap between theory and practice

Budget theory has been much weaker, often unable to see the phenomena in plain view to theorize about their meaning

Public Choice

According to Rubin (1992) and Forrester (2001)

Forrester (2001) suggests Public Choice is a response to Wilson's PA Dichotomy

Human behavior is based on individual economic rationality and the maximization of individual benefits (economists call this "utility")

Emphasizes the relationship between what citizens want government to do and what government actually does

Citizens vote in a manner that reflects their own spending priorities

Weaknesses of this theory include

Difficulty explaining change over time

Cannot explain why government has not expanded further

Impossible to arrive at a figure for aggregate individual utilities

Conflicts:

Economics framework

Methods of analysis

Bureaucratic assumptions

Value orientations

Reality

Incrementalism

According to Rubin (1992)

Budgeting occurs exclusively inside government (to the exclusion of citizens)

Based on bounded rationality (Herb Simon (1947) – "satisfice"; Lindbloom (1959) "muddling through")

Government is not directly or indirectly controlled by society

Interest groups exist, but do not determine outcomes

Many reforms required comprehensive evaluation of programs and specific delineation of spending, which would have negative effects (Rubin 1990)

Weaknesses of this theory include

Underestimation of the relationship between society and budgeting

Overestimation of agency autonomy in determining budgets

Fails to account for a budget process that responds to societal ills, emerging situations or environmental changes

Assumes budgets will be allocated the same way from year to year

Rubin and Schick believe that incrementalism as an explanatory model did not describe the budgeting process well, noting a budgetary base is not always defined

According to Neuby (1997):

Wildavsky, Lewis and Lindbloom tend to support incrementalism

Lewis (1988) notes recent budget reforms such as ZBB and PPPB have not altered us from a base and increments

Principal-Agent Theory

According to Forrester (2002)

When applying this theory to budgeting, the budget itself is the contract between the principal and the agent

Focuses on the relationship between those who allocate resources and those who provide agency services

Information management/distribution

Principals and agents manage information and both may act in their own self-interests

Managing information is challenging because of the conflicting interests

Adverse Selection: principal picked the wrong agent or has incorrectly identified the agent's role, responsibility or agenda

Hierarchical relationships among budget participants

Principals are setting policies and goals

Agents (service agencies) implement the programs that will address the principal's policies or goals

Hierarchy Theory

According to Rubin (1992)

Argues that top-level executives make decisions about broad policy issues, judge the environment and pass that info down via the budget office to the agencies before agencies make their requests

Similar or the same as Elite Theory

Macro-Micro Budgeting

According to Rubin (1992)

Bargaining still exists over budget strategies, but broader policy issues are explicitly dealt with and frame the choices and outcomes of the bargaining

Economic policies, priorities, spending ceilings and assumptions about the growth of the economy are made by the budget committees and guide the decisions of other committees

Neo-Marxist

According to Rubin (1992)

Class interests dominate budgeting and allocation choices

Govt. is controlled by capitalists and they determine spending base on their own priorities

Theorists call attention to military spending as a way to enrich arms manufacturers and tax breaks that only benefit the well-off more than the poor

The major weakness of this theory is that it doesn't explain why one groups wins out over the other

Transaction Cost Theory (not recognized as an official budget theory in PA, but it applies)

According to Bartle (2001)

Developed in economics and focuses on private sector org forms

Transaction Costs: the costs that occur above and beyond the purpose of exchange

How does this relate to PA budgeting?

Costs involved in budget negotiations, contracts, deals, political exchanges, what groups have to give so that another group can have

Concepts can be applied to budgeting and finance, as budgets are the culmination of deals and agreements

Centered on institutions and history

Transaction cost theory is general enough to apply to a variety of findings under an over-arching framework

Under-utilized as a theoretical construct in public budgeting and finance

Public budgeting needs to further incorporate transaction cost theory into a public budgeting framework or theory

Weakness is there's not an established measurement for all costs of providing government/social services

Other Theories (from Stapleford 1992)

Classical (Pre-Keynesian) – Adam Smith, capitalism, free market, ltd. Govt.

Keynesian – John Maynard Keynes (1936), govt. spending is necessary to fine-tune the economy; performance by economy in aggregate is more important than individual; small deficits are useful for fine-tuning

Neo-Keynesian – larger tuning of the economy; larger swings in govt. spending/taxes; use of monetary policy (interest rate setting) to influence economy

Monetarists (Counter-Keynesian) – Milton Friedman, Alan Greenspan; monetary policy more effective than fiscal policy; economy is inherently stable – govt. fine-tuning not needed; money supply/interest rates controlled by Federal Reserve is important

REFORMS

Line-item (prior to 1921 was the only model)

Agencies are evaluated on program to program (line to line) to measure efficiency and determine funding

Congress needed large staff to do this

No rational decision-making mechanism was in place

Politics substituted for rationality

Led to the re-establishment of line-item budgeting with the executive budget (1921)

PPBS (emerged in the 1950s; implemented by LBJ in 1961 for D.o.D./1965 for all federal agencies)

Utilizes Cost Benefit Analysis and systems theory

Emphasizes the planning stage to determine and view program objectives and outputs

CBA is conducted on the outputs; if objectives are not met funding will be discontinued

Process creates "enormous information and analytical burdens" (Schick 1973)

It is difficult to set program objectives for social policy and critique the program based on those objectives

Military uses it to this day, though it fell out of fashion in the late 1960s

Officially died with OMB memo in 1971

Target-Based Budgeting (1980s)

Target-based budgeting is a another form of a zero-based budgeting, except that agencies are told what the funding ceiling is going to be

Each agency will be allotted a certain amount of money to operate

The agency must prioritize those funds in the order they feel is important.

The budget is broken into two categories: operating and capital projects.

The agency may not get funding for capital, only if there is money left over

Performance-Based (Current)

Determine outcomes based on performance

Performance-based budgeting is outcome oriented

Determine allocation based on the output of that program

If output is efficient and effective, the program will receive funding

Problem with performance-based budgeting: how do you determine the efficiency and effectiveness

Agencies define efficiency and effectiveness

Models cannot be applied to all other agencies because the output or criteria are different

Placed each program on a system of merit, but people themselves are the ones who defined the criteria

Zero-Based Budgeting (1977-1981)

Jimmy Carter brings this from Georgia to Washington

Every year the agency starts from zero

Agency performs a CBA – unallocated on all programs for which they are responsible

Recommendation goes up the chain of command

Takes too long, people ask for more than they need, no previous budget to refer to

HISTORY/TIMELINES

<u>Chronology</u>

1912---Taft Commission---we need a national bud / public involvement / bus standards / move toward Exec involv

1921---Bud and Accntng Act---gave power to the Pres/created the Bur of the Bud (OMB) and GAO

1937---POSDCORB---included planning and budgeting

1937---Brownlow Committee---the Pries needs help

1946---Legis Reorg Act ---required approval by Cong of overall bud package
                           led to impounds by Nixon and backdoor spending

1949/1953---Hoover Commission I (role of the exec) and II (priv sector)

1974---Congress Bud and Impoundment Control Act---created the Cong Bud Office
        Nixon had impounded funds---also set Cong timetable for the bud
        created new fiscal year

1977---ZBB (abandoned in 1981)

1978---Inspector General Act

1984---Grace Commission

1985---Gramm Rudman---set targets for deficit reduc and bal bud by 1993
                         sequestration---cuts if targets were not met

1990---Bud Enf Act---limited discretionary spending and created Paygo for increased
                        entitlements

1990---CFO's Act---appoint CFO's in 23 major depts. cause of fraud in DoD.
                fragmentation / inadeq accntng systems / lack of audits
                    in fed gov't led to CFO

1993---NPR --- called for more managerial discretion

1993---GPRA---calls for performance targets and accountability
                strat planning / customer focus / outcomes

1994---Contract with America---bal bud / line item veto / smaller gov / accntbty

1995---Unfunded Mandates Act---req'd cost est from CBO of mandates over $50 mill

1996---Line Item Veto Act---unconst --- 44 states have it

2000---entrepreneurial

ORG. THEORY

Some words on Paradigms:

Nicholas Henry (1975) "Paradigms of Public Administration" PAR 35(4):

5 paradigms

PA Dichotomy 1900-1926

Principles of Administration 1927-1937

PA as Political Science 1950-1970 (PA resubmits to the domination of PoliSci)

PA as Administrative Science 1956-1970 (PA submits to the domination of Administration, public and private)

PA as PA (?) 1970 - ? (PA comes into its own, following the Simon prescription in 1947)

1938-1950 – Challenge to PA Dichotomy and Principles:

1938 Barnard's Functions of the Executive (influenced Simon)

1946 Fritz Marx ed. Elements of Public Administration (questioned dichotomy assumptions)

1947 Simon's Administrative Behavior (blows the principles away)

1947-1950 – Reaction to the Challenge:

1947 Simon's "A Comment on 'The Science of PA'" (prescribes two tracks – scholars working on the science of admin and a larger group working on prescriptive public policy)

Hal G. Rainey (1994) "On Paradigms, Progress, and Prospects for Public Management" J-PART 4(1):

Frederickson Questions

How important that we have a paradigm?

Are we making progress toward one?

Which is the most promising?

Rainey Answers

Not very

No

Mine!

Elaborating, Rainey says:

The importance of a paradigm is debatable – yes, we can travel in a herd, with all the advantages that might offer BUT we are also subject to the disadvantages

It's difficult and dangerous to achieve and impose consensus on a field of inquiry

Distinctions between public/private are snagging progress in the field, esp. with org theory

Paradigmatic Discussion:

Five paradigms:

Positivist

Post-positivist

Interpretivist

Conflict

Post-modern

Every paradigm should must have three things

An ontology – the nature of reality

An epistemology – how to know reality

A methodology – how to test reality

Given that, most professors don't see Henry's 1975 work as really being paradigms – more like theories

But that really depends on your definition of paradigm, doesn't it?

Henry accounts for this in his article by using paradigm as "How mainstream public administrationists have perceived their enterprise during the last 80 years"

Stanley is using the Kuhn paradigmatic definition

Rainey points out the Kuhn used "paradigm" in 21 distinct senses in 1962

French, Spears & Stanley (2005) The Fifth Paradigm of Public Administration?...

Once Public Org Theory is redefined as Public Org Efficacy, paradigmatic progress can begin

Efficacy = efficiency, effectiveness, equity, responsiveness and accountability through various modes of research

The last step is recognizing the quantitative and qualitative nature of inquiry, and establishing an equal respect for both – because some problems are better solved with numbers, some with words

Classical Organization Theory

Authors/Works:

Fayol (1949) General Principles of Management in General and Industrial Management

Taylor(1916) Principles of Scientific Management in Bulletin of the Taylor Society

Weber (1946) Bureaucracy in Essays in Sociology

Gulick (1937) Papers on the Science of Administration

Main Points to Remember:

Dominated thought into the 1930s

Structuralists--focused attention on structure or design of orgs

Rational and closed systems pursuing the goal of efficiency

Adam Smith, Henri Fayol, Daniel McCallum, FW Taylor, Max Weber, Gulick &Urwick

Organizations should work like machines, using people and capital as their parts

Adam Smith (1776) The Wealth of Nations

Developed the concept of Division of Labor

Gives the example of the pin factory

Assembly lines would yield mass production

Mass production would increase efficiency

Frederick Taylor – Scientific mgt; legal-rational basis of govt; "one best way"; time & motion studies

Max Weber – bureaucracy as an ideal; perpetuates p/a dichotomy

Formal rules and regulations

Division of labor

Written documents

Hierarchy

Formal Authority

Formal education/certification for employment

Daniel McCallum, 1856, first modern organization chart for the NY and Erie RR Company

Fayol's organizational principles: technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, managerial (greatest emphasis on managerial)

Taylor's "one best way"

Gulick & Urwick's POSDCORB; organize work by purpose; process; persons or place

Often viewed as narrow and simplistic; however, laid a foundation for all future scholars

NeoClassical Organization Theory

Authors/Works:

Barnard (1938)The Functions of the Executive

Merton (1957) Social Theory and Social Structure

Simon (1946) Proverbs of Administration, PAR 6 1946

Cyert and March (1963) A Behavioral Theory of the Firm

Main Points to Remember:

Transitional theory that revised Classical Theory by adding human element, 1950

An organization cannot exist outside of its environment

Robert Merton, James March, Philip Selznick, Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon

Barnard: individuals are what hold the organization together; thus, they must be reduced to cooperate for success to be achieved (persuasion principle)

Simon: openly and vehemently attacked Classical Theory, said G&U's principles were merely proverbs, offered idea of satisfice

Selznick: idea of cooptation (TVA study) and the Institutional Matrix

Cooptation - the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to is stability or existence – balance between action and formal systems

Institutional Matrix is the combination of the Action System and the Formal System

Action system – the socialization aspect of the org

Formal system – structure, authority, procedures, process

Cyert and March: alliance-forming and coalitions; Garbage Can Model

Unclear goals

Imperfect technology

History of the organization

Input of new org members, training

All public organizations are in big garbage cans: everyone has varied backgrounds, educational experience, demographic characteristics, and they are thrown into the same organization together, somehow, they make it work.

Merton: informal organization among workers; latent functions of standardized practices

Human Relations Organization Theory

Authors/Works:

Follet (1926) Scientific Foundations of Business Administration

Follet (1926) The Giving of Orders

Mayo (1933) The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1st account of Hawthorne)

Roethlisberger (1939) Managemen and Morale (definitive account of Hawthorne)

Maslow (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation, Psychological Review 50 1943

McGregor (1957) The Human Side of Enterprise

Janis (1972) Victims of Groupthink

Main Points to Remember:

People are considered to be as important, or more so, than the org itself

Elton Mayo considered founder of the Human Relations school of thought

Follet suggests superior-subordinate roles inhibit productivity

Boleman & Deal (1997): organizations exist to serve humans (not the other way around)

Hawthorne Effect 1924-1932 (Elton Mayo studies at Western Electric plant)

Workers are part of a social group and respond to peers

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs:

Physiological needs

Safety needs

Social needs

Esteem needs

Self-actualization

McGregor's Theory X & Y

X – people inherently dislike work and will avoid it if possible

Y – work can be a source of satisfaction for people

Janis' Groupthink:

A mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members' strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action

Frederick Herzberg – psychologist concerned with mental health and work

Motivation-hygiene theory: the job versus the environment

Satisfiers/motivators: achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth

Dissatisfiers/hygiene factors: company policy; supervision; interpersonal relations; salary status; job security; personal life

Most optimistic of all schools - under right circumstances, people and organizations will grow and prosper together

Modern-Structural Organization Theory

Authors/Works:

Burns & Stalker (1961) The Management of Innovation

Blau & Scott (1962) Formal Organizations

Walker and Lorsch (1968) Organizational Choice: Product vs Function,

Harvard Business Review, Nov. 1968

Mintzberg (1979) The Structure of Organizations

Jaques (1990) In Praise of Hierarchy, Harvard Business Review Jan.1990

Main Points to Remember:

Second half of 20th Century

Hierarchy, formal rules in place to attain goals

Sought a return to the Structural Element, retaining the human aspects of Neoclassicism

"Modern" in quotations b/c it is used simply to refer to the time period--there is little substantive difference between the Structuralists in Classical Theory and this one, other than time frame

Organization efficiency is the essence of organizational rationality, and the goal of rationality is to increase the production of wealth in terms of real goods and services

Mintzberg and the 5 (6) Parts of an Organization:

Strategic Apex (top mgt)

Middle Line (mid mgt)

Opearting Core (operations, op processes)

Technostructure (analysts that design processes, systems)

Support Staff (supports operating workflow)

Post 1979 article – Ideology (org culture)

Peter Blau and Richard Scott: all orgs consist of a formal and an informal element and it is impossible to understand an org. without knowing each element

Walker and Lorsch, Lawrence and Lorsch: stable environments/bureaucratic orgs; unstable environments/non-bureaucratic orgs

Buzzwords: differentiation, specialization and integration

Elliott Jaques: remains a lonely defender of the bureaucratic-hierarchy models; in that the structure must be fixed, not the employees

Power and Politics Organization Theory

Authors/Works:

Pfeffer (1981) Power in Organizations

Kanter (1979) Power Failure in Management Circuits, Harvard Business Review, July 1979

Mintzberg (1983) Power in and around organizations

Main Points to Remember:

Organizations are viewed as complex systems of individuals and coalitions

Conflict in inevitable and influence is the primary weapon

Organizational goals change with shifts in the balance of power

John Kotter: differentiate between power resulting from authority and power resulting from being able to get job done

Power is aimed in all directions, not just down the hierarchy

Jeffrey Pfeffer: power and politics are fundamental concepts in defining an org

Politics defined as "the process of gaining, maintaining and exercising power. Organizational politics involves those activities taken within organizations to acquire, develop and use power and other resources to obtain one's preferred outcomes in a situation where there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices."

Kanter's Theory of Structural Power in Organizations (1977):

Work behavior and attitudes are shaped by a person's position and situations in the org, rather than by personal characteristics and socialization experiences

Power structures (mobilization of support, allocation of resources, gathering of information) are accessible via the position of a person in the org (and the power inherent in it)

The extent to which a position accesses power structures is dependent on the formal and informal power of the person

More Kanter:

"Power is the ability to mobilize resources, to get and use whatever it is a person needs for the goal he or she is attempting to meet."

French and Raven (1959): Description for Power in Groups:

Reward power: the power to confer or withhold rewards that others want, i.e. pay

Coercive power comes from the ability to take forceful action against another

Referent power is when a person has power over others because they see him/her as a standard to emulate

Expert power is the control of knowledge, information and other skills

Legitimate power is where others accept the authority and ability to tell them what to do

Systems Theory

Authors/Works:

Katz & Kahn (1966) The Social Psychology of Organizations

Thompson (1967) Organizations in Action

Richard W. Scott (2003) Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems

Main Points to Remember:

Rose to dominance in the late 1960s

Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn: organizations are open systems

Apply Ludwig Bertalanffy's (1951) general systems theory to organizations and use quantitative tools and techniques to understand complex relationships among organizational and environmental variables

(remember input→output / blackbox diagram)

Search for order in complex systems, cause-and-effect oriented

Seeks optimal solutions (not "one best way")

Computers, experts, etc. are the tools necessary

Draw heavily from Neoclassicals---bounded rationality and satisficing (Simon) and cognitive limits (Cyert and March)

Richard Scott (2003) – rational, natural and open systems theories OR Chinese handcuffs

Rational systems do not take the environment into account

Rational systems view organizations as a means to an end goal

Natural systems focuses on the org's survival in the environment, emphasizing the survival of the organization for its own sake, in spite of the hostile environment

Open systems portrays the organization as a living organism with loose boundaries, sub groups attaching and detaching, inputs and outputs moving at the same time

Open systems recognizes a changing environment

Genius of the systems theory is that competing schools of thought can be classified as sub-theories (Scott says class, neo-class and HR are closed rational or closed natural systems)

To complicate it further, the rational natural and open perspectives may apply to the same organization, just at a different level of analysis

One more bit on paradigms and I promise it won't hurt too much…

A take on Scott:

Rational Systems	Scholars and One Best Way	Positivist
Natural Systems	Scholars and Motivation/People	Post-Positivist – maybe Interpretivist
Open Systems	Scholars and Environment	Interpretivist

Scott's Big Question:

How do you assess organizational effectiveness?

Stanley's Big Question about Scott:

What's in the Black Box (and how would you measure it)?

ORGANIZATION THEORY: A CHRONOLOGY

400 B.C.   SOCRATES – MGT IS AN ART UNTO ITSELF

360 B.C.   ARISTOTLE – CULTURAL CONTEXT

1776   ADAM SMITH – OPTIMAL ORGANIZATION OF PIN FACTORY

1813   ROBERT OWEN – EMPLOYEES ARE VITAL MACHINES

1910   LOUIS BRANDEIS AND FREDERICK TAYLOR – SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

1922   MAX WEBER –BUREAUCRACY AS A STRUCTURE

1937   GULICK'S POSDCORB

1940   MERTON AND THE DYSFUNCTIONS OF BUREAUCRACY

1946   SIMON ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLES APPROACH

1948   WALDO ATTACKS THE GOSPEL OF EFFICIENCY

1949   SELZNICK AND TVA'S COOPTATION

1954   DRUCKER AND MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES

1957 ARGYRIS & THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PERSONALITY AND THE ORGANIZATION

1961   THOMPSON FINDS DYSFUNCTION DUE TO ABILITY VS AUTHORITY

1962   PRESTHUS' UPWARDMOBILES, INDIFFERENTS AND AMBIVALENTS

1964   CROZIER: BUREAUCRACY AN ORGANIZATION THAT CANNOT LEARN FROM ERRORS

1966   BENNIS PROCLAIMS DEATH TO BUREAUCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

1968   HERZBERG – MOTIVATORS, SATISFIERS AND HYGIENE FACTORS

1972   CLEVELAND – CONTINUOUS IMPROVISATION IS REQUIRED

1976   MACCOBY AND THE GAMESMAN

1981   PFEFFER – POWER IN ORGANIZATIONS

1983   ROSABETH MOSS KANTER AND THE CHANGEMASTER

1988   ZUBOFF AND THE AGE OF THE SMART MACHINE

1990   GAGLIARDI AND SYMBOLS AND ARTIFACTS

1992   OSBORNE AND GAEBLER RE-INVENT GOVERNMENT

1997   VIRTUAL ORGANIZATIONS AND BEYOND

2000   SNOOK ANALYZES SYSTEMIC BREAKDOWN IN FRIENDLY FIRE

2002   PERROW & ORGANIZING AMERICA: WEALTH, POWER & ORIGINS

CORPORATE CAPITALISM

PUBLIC POLICY

Some scholars have argues that "public policy is public administration". First, evaluate whether this statement accurately captures the field to date. Then, examine if this statement – or a replacement – explains where the field appears to be heading for the foreseeable future.

Public policy making is made by various official and unofficial stakeholders in the polity. Identify these stakeholders and describe the "legitimate" power that each stakeholder possesses in the policy making process. Secondly, is policy making a "process" or does it resemble something else? How can it be improved?

The "policy orientation" after 40 years: Review major developments and their implications for researchers and practitioners.

What characterizes different policy arenas? Describe one typology and discuss how it might help to conduct public policy analysis.

Discuss two views about the proper way to study policy implementation.

What is agency (principal-agent) theory and how can it be used to improve our understanding of public policy making?

THEMES

The state of the policy field

Theories

Is policy political? (Parallel to Wildavsky's budget assertion)

Stakeholders

Process/Streams/Open Window

Principal-Agent

STATE OF THE FIELD

(Lots of crossovers with budgeting – since budgets are a form of policy)

Birkland (2001) – the systematic study of policy is a 20th century creation dating to Charles Merriam who sought to connect the theory and practices of politics to understanding the actual activities of government

Koven (1994) – sees 4 foci in the literature:

- Sequential study of specific policies
- Studies of the public policy process
- Study of analytical and evaluative methods
- Cross national comparison of public policy

Lindbloom (1959) – "muddling through" thanks to bounded rationality, leading to Incrementalism

Wildavsky (1961) defends Incrementalism, and asserts that we may never find a better theory, since a budgeting theory would be the same as a political theory.

Anderson (2006) and the Typology Discussion:

Older typologies were done by issue; institution; or time period

Newer typologies are:

- Substantive/Procedural
- Distributive, Regulatory, Self-Regulatory and Redistributive
- Material/Symbolic
- Collective Goods/Private Goods

Thomas Dye ( ) – defines policy as "Whatever governments choose to do or not do."

Kingdon (1995) – know for "policy stream model": a policy agenda, supported by a policy community, becomes public policy when the three "streams" converge at a crucial moment

Easton (late 1960s) – Grandfather of Public Policy – Code of Relevance for policy research

THEORIES OF POLICY STUDY

(According to Anderson and Robinson Notes)

Political Systems Theory

Group Theory

Elite Theory (Dye & Ziegler)

Institutionalism

Rational Choice Theory (a.k.a. Public Choice)

(According to Thomas Dye)

Institutional – policy as institutional output

Process – policy as political activity

Rational – policy as maximum social gain

Incremental – policy as variations on the past

Group – policy as group equilibrium

Elite – policy as elite preference (Dye & Ziegler)

Public Choice – policy as collective decision making by self-interested individuals

Game Theory – policy as rational choice in competitive situations

THEORIES OF DECISION MAKING

Rational-Comprehensive

Incremental

Mixed Scanning (Amatai Etzioni) – looking for "hot spots" while watching the "big picture"

POLICY AS POLITICS

STAKEHOLDERS

PROCESS/STREAMS/OPEN WINDOW

PRINCIPAL-AGENT

Iron Triangle – earliest formulation by Grant McConnell (1966) in Private Power and American Democracy

Top-Down

Bottom-Up

- Bottom-up scholars emphasized everyday problem-solving strategies of "street-level bureaucrats"
  - [✳] – Lipsky (1971,1980)
  - – Ingram (1977)
  - [✳] – Elmore (1980)
  - – Hjern and Hull (1982)

  } MAJOR AUTHORS

8

Hybrid

- Elmore (previous member of the bottom-up camp,)
  - Combined "backward mapping" with the idea of "forward mapping."
    - Success is contingent upon both intertwined elements
    - Start with policy instruments and available resources for change (forward mapping)
    - Identify incentive structure of implementers and target groups (backward mapping).
  - "Advocacy coalition framework"
    - Policy does not occur in 'stages' and change must be explained as a whole
    - Start from a problem and construct the strategies of relevant actors to solve problem
    - Emphasize policy learning and extraneous conditions that impact policy making

33

Garbage Can (Cyert, March & Olsen)

Bardach's *The Implementation Game* (1977)

- Acknowledged the political character of the implementation process
  - used game theoretic tools to explain implementation
- Emphasized the "scenario writing" process

15

Public Choice – Leaders manipulate pubic into choosing their previously conceived policy preferences

1.16 Some Important Comps Questions and Student Answers

Question #1: What is the nature of public administration, and how has it developed as a field?

The nature of public administration is in the distillation of political ideas, legislation and policy into administrative action and regulations with resulting effects that liberate or restrict the actions of citizens, groups and society in general. Politicians and legislature make policy, administrators implement those policies. However, proper administration requires a balancing of loyalty to political bosses with ethics and loyalty to the public interest. It is this discretion, and authority that is a constant source of debate.

The establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission signaled the passing of the US from a simple, agricultural society into a highly complex and interrelated Great Society. Waldo says this new society, based on division of labor, specialization, systems of transportation and communication, and high technology were all based on a new method of controlling the environment called "scientific method".

Closing of the Frontier: Economic and social readjustment from the closing of the frontier along with the increasing ratio of population to available resources, caused a movement aimed at saving our natural resources (and human beings) through adopting the idea of a "planned" and "administered" human community. Urbanization resulted from the closing of the frontier.

Our Business Civilization: From the beginning, America has been a uniquely wealthy country, and has become characteristically a Business Civilization. This has influenced our methods of administration. Business methods were applied to managing the affairs of State. Forms of public organizations historically have followed the corporate model closely.

Raadschelders says that PA first developed as goods and services were increasingly provided by the government instead of private concerns. We went from a Nightwatch State with voluntary militias to having permanent police forces and a standing army. Services that were formerly provided by church organizations were increasingly expected to be provided by government.

In response to corruption and the Spoils System, Woodrow Wilson wrote that PA should be buffered from politics and developed into a discipline of its own with its basis in scientific management and employing professionals to run government. Politicians and legislature make policy, administrators implement those policies.

Scientific Management – Gulick with POSDCORB and Taylor with Scientific Management tried to fit the role of PA into definitive actions and a hierarchical structure with unity of command.

Herbert Simon critiqued the Scientific Management approach by saying that PA was more of an art than a science. He called for "bounded rationality".

As a field of discipline, PA has not settled into a paradigm of its own. There is much debate about creating a unified theory and a normative model.

Denhardt says that PA cannot be a discipline because it draws from so many other fields and sciences.

Minnowbrook I – sought to make a bold synoptic approach to the discipline of PA.

Blacksburg Manifesto – Sought to change the negative dialogue surrounding PA and to develop a normative approach to the discipline.

Minnowbrook II – saw further fragmentation of attempts to define PA.

Others argue that it should be included in business as a form of "administrative science", but Khun says that PA does not meet the test of being called a "normal science" because it lacks a generally accepted paradigm and methodology.

HRM – Human relations movement focused on the informal organization that exists under the formal structures. People understand the limits of the formal structure and fill in gaps with NORMS.

Institutionalism – Recognizes multiple stakeholders, public-private partnerships, coproduction, privatization, contracting-out, and fuzzy distinctions between public and private.

Governance Theory – Rohr says administrators should legitimately participate in governance, not just management. Governance theory talks about the dominance of policy networks instead of traditional govt structures. The State's declining ability to

control means we should embrace multiple approaches to administration and a increased blending of public and private resources. Steering rather than rowing. Blacksburg Manifesto – earliest work.

New Public Administration – Promotes Social Equity in the performance and delivery of public services. NPA called for a change in the public discourse about PA and a movement away from the rational model toward increased social equity. Productivity, Marketization, Service Orientation, Decentralization, Accountability. Sweep away programs that don't work.

Global Professional Technocracy – Stillman sees the current state and future of PA as increasingly global and specialized.

The implications of this are: Policy definition by little clusters of professional experts, hyper-impermanence (lack of adherence to a stable and immutable set of principles or concepts) and complexity surrounding the policy arena, and the blurring of the boundaries between public and private sectors.

Question #2: Addressing the literature, what are the issues in the relationship between the public, politicians, and administrators?

Raad says that representation of the public is not synonymous with obedience to the public. He also says that in Western societies, the Primacy of Politics means that Bureaucracy and Administration are subordinate to politics.

Raad says the Highest Authority in Western systems of government is not a political institution, but the COMPROMISE and the Negotiation Process between elected officials.

Politicians and legislature make policy, administrators implement those policies while being accountable to both politicians and the public.

Administrators should be NON-PARTISAN in their work.

Svara says that administrators must have an understanding of the complex issues and implement policies while keeping the ultimate goals of service to the public and ethical behavior as guiding principles.

To whom are administrators accountable?

Svara says the public administrator should act on behalf of the public interest, but is directly accountable to his political leaders and the organization.

Frederickson would say that the public administrator is directly responsible to the citizens. He says the Spirit of PA is in serving the people.

Rohr says the primary moral obligation of public administrators is to be the guardian and guarantor of the founding values of every citizen.

Peters says that administrators should be APOLITICAL in implementing public policy, but notes that a balance must be kept betwn Pol & public interest.

Question #3: Discuss the tensions between democracy and "bureaucracy", and how they can be reconciled.

Raad says Democracy is the rule of the People and Bureaucracy is the rule of bureaus.

Raad views the tensions as:

Bureaucracy seeks permanence and expansion for self-serving reasons with aims at maximizing power, income, security and prestige.

Democracy dictates that bureaucracy's sole purpose is to administer policy with the main goals of efficiency and serving the public interest.

A major tension over the past 30 years is the increasing use of political appointees in bureaucracy. This politicization of bureaucracy goes against the goal democracy and what Weber calls for neutral civil servants, who are expected to be models of integrity, rational, politically neutral and acting in compliance with the rules.

Raad says that as a result of the politicization of bureaucracy, bureaucrats have substantial influence on policy and decision making. Bureaucracy should seek to promote democratic, rather than its own values.

Raad recommends how they can be reconciled:

Balance individualism and collectivism (direct democracy vs. indirect)

Balance juridicial and sociological action (formal rules vs. discretionary)

Balance of abstract and concrete layers of understanding (long-term planning vs. immediate political & operational concerns)

Question #4: Discuss the tensions between promoting administrative self-interest and the public interest. How can they be reconciled?

Raad says that as a result of the politicization of bureaucracy, bureaucrats have substantial influence on policy and decision making. Bureaucracy should seek to promote the public interest, rather than its own values.

Bureaucracy has been associated with several pathologies and seeks permanence and expansion for self-serving reasons with aims at maximizing power, income, security and prestige.

Budget-Maximization, permanence of agencies, perceived permanence of civil service positions, political appointees who simply serve their masters, are all examples of "administrative self-interest". These are contrary to the public interest. Promoting the public interest necessarily means reduction of the pathologies currently found.

How can they be reconciled? By

-Emphasizing professional civil service

-Putting public interest over personal or political interests

-Encouraging governance instead of management

-Adopting a view toward social equity and ideas from the New Public Administration: NPA called for a change in the public discourse about PA and a movement away from the rational model toward increased social equity. Productivity, Marketization, Service Orientation, Decentralization, Accountability. Sweep away programs that don't work.

Question #5: Discuss the normative base of public administration, i.e. values that guide administrative practice.

Normative base includes ideas of effective administration from Scientific Management, (efficiency, economy) as well as

Values:

SVARA:

Sense of duty

Adherence to the law

Treat all equally

Pursue public interest

Embrace accountability

Avoid Conflict of Interest

Promote Ethical Practices

Frederickson adds - Equity, Fairness, justice, ethics, responsiveness, acting in the public interest and commitment to democratic principles.

- also responsibility to support the power of the elected officials.

Svara adds that there is tension between the administrator's sense of acting in the public interest and the need to serve their elected political leaders.

Question #6: Explain the influence that professionalism has had on public administrative practitioners and discuss some of the paradoxes, problems or controversies surrounding this subject today.

Frederickson (pg. 220-223) points out that throughout history, the practice of public administration has shifted between societies adopting models that focus on high citizenship (as in the case of ancient Athens), to models of high professionalism (as in the case of Egypt).

In the case of ancient Athens, where high citizenship was prized, professionalism took a back seat as citizens were empowered to fully participate in managing the affairs at virtually all levels of state. In the case of ancient Egypt, professionalism was highly valued, and the role that citizens played in participating was curtailed.

Louis Brownlow and Luther Gulick were major proponents of professionalism at all levels of government. Mosher issued a study in 1982 labeling the period 1955 to 1970 of civil service as the "professional period" in which government is run by professionals. Raadschelders identifies the period from 1970 to present as "the professional public administration period". The 1978 Civil Service Reform Act listed merit principles and established the SES (Senior Executive Service – currently 7,900 personnel). The act emphasized the importance of government by professional managers, already called for by the Brownlow Committee report of 1937.

The growth of government in its responsibilities and the massive growth of the population have influenced the changes in the role and position of civil servants. The shift to more professionalism is seen as necessary to manage the massive and complex bureaucracy and intergovernmental networks that exist today. Mosher calculates that almost 40% of public sector positions are professionals and technicians, while only 11% of private sector positions can be labeled as such.

Self (1979) says that a professional civil servant's most important function in modern times may be "intellectual appraisal". This is in contrast to a historical view of the civil servant administrator – characterized as simply as a blind follower of their political leader's wishes.

Frederickson proposes a model for combining selected views of citizenship and professionalism in which there are four scenarios: High Citizenship, Low Professionalism (Emphasizing Civic Friendship and Technocracy), Low Professionalism, Low Citizenship (Emphasizing Technocracy and Entrepreneurship), High Professionalism, Low Citizenship (Emphasizing Trusteeship and Entrepreneurship), and High Citizenship, High Professionalism (Emphasizing Civic Friendship and Trusteeship).

The problem for the public administrator is in balancing the needs and interests of individuals and groups on the one hand, with the community on the other. For this reason, Frederickson says that High Administration (or High Professionalism) is essential.

The paradox is that American democratic government is highly responsive to the interests of organized and well-financed forces, but the needs and rights of individuals, and particularly of poor people, are left as the special responsibility of a benevolent public administration. Where low public administration is the norm (as is presently the case in many American jurisdictions), public organizations lack the capacity to make the laws fair and just. High administration alone might work if there were a wider consensus about what professionalism means and if its definition included obedience to codified professional standards as well as the power to rule.

Another problem with increasing professionalism (increased value placed on specialization, degrees, special certifications, etc.), is that less emphasis is placed on administrators adherence to the public interest and human values. Frederickson hopes that American public administration will be able to make the move to High Citizenship, High Professionalism – where citizens have a voice in how government is run, and where administrators think of themselves as Trustees of the public good. In this way, we can realize the "moral unity of society".

Stillman (pgs 96-106) has this to say about the influence of professionalism on PA practice: "Professionals tend to want to establish clear-cut boundaries where they can operate relatively free from outside pressures and set policy agendas, so they can maintain exclusive privileges. As a result, large patches of government policy-making processes have been handed over to clusters of professional groups in various fields, many of whom have no particular allegiance to the public or even an organization, but float among public, private and nonprofit sectors. At times their policy turfs overlap and can create heated controversies, such as the turf fights among the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force over control of the US defense policy."

Stillman pg. 101:

To sum up the chief methods by which professionals influence the direction of policy and administration within the contemporary American state system:

Professionals stake out territory within a particular policy field and governmental activity, likely spanning across various private, public and nonprofit enterprises.

Professionals apply their expertise based on length of experience and specialized training that serves to legitimize their claims for dominance and influence within specific policy arenas.

Professionals create "dogmas" for correct views of the world and ways of doing their work that provide the essential ideological glue to knit together a profession and give it distinctiveness and claims to influence in public affairs.

Professional associations, hierarchies, and elites provide a significant degree of shared corporate identification, policy discretion, and control over their members' activities through the discipline they impose and the ideals they articulate.

Professionals strive continuously for freedom from external control over their activities and value internal accountability through peer-imposed codes of ethics or licensing processes.

Professionals aim to link up to scientific and university bodies outside government in order to enhance their knowledge base, prestige, and status as "authoritative experts" within public policy arenas.

Stillman warns against the emergence of a "global professional technocracy" as dominating postwar American state governance. The implications of this are: Policy definition by little clusters of professional experts, hyper-impermanence (lack of adherence to a stable and immutable set of principles or concepts) and complexity surrounding the policy arena, and the blurring of the boundaries between public and private sectors.

Question #7: At the close of his book, Svara reasserts that "a theory of public administration in the political process is also a theory of ethics." Analyze or break down this statement and, in doing so, re-state his argument.

Svara says that without ethics, PA is merely an instrument and administrators are simply the tools of their political masters.

His argument is that government can only work if the public views the public administrator's authority and role as legitimate. In order for this to happen, administrators must have a dedication to advancing the public interest as well as promoting democracy, ethics, justice, fairness, equity while balancing the need to serve their political leaders.

Svara adds that there is tension between the administrator's sense of acting in the public interest and the need to serve their elected political leaders.

Question #8: How does public administration legitimize its activities? How does the concept of nation figure in?

According to Rohr, administrators and the higher reaches of the civil service fulfill the Framers' original intent for the Senate. Rohr also says that the entire career civil service provides a remedy for a serious defect in the Constitution (the inadequate representation).

According to the Blacksburg Manifesto, the public administration is legitimized by the Constitution's plans for the Senate as well as the Founders' view of public service as both a calling and a "trusteeship".

The public views it as a major social asset because of its experience, managerial skills and commitment to advancing the public interest.

Wamsley says that PA legitimizes its activities by viewing its role as a "citizen-agent" – standing in place of other citizens, exerting power on their behalf to achieve a collective purpose.

How does the concept of nation figure in?

Raad defines "nation" as "a large community of people living together under one government whose actions are considered to be representative of all."

If we consider public administration as an extension of the Senate, solving the defect of inadequate representation, then by legitimizing PA, we are ensuring that the government's actions are "representative of all".

Question #9: Compare four of the various models of public administration and the underlying assumptions of each.

Peters four models + Traditional Govt.

Market model: The central assumptions of the market model are:

- Monopoly is the principal source of traditional government;
- Structurally, decentralized government is preferable;
- Management can be improved through pay-for-performance and other private-sector techniques and incentives;
- Policy making is accomplished through internal markets and market incentives; and
- This model's primary public benefit is less costly, less intrusive government.

Participative model: Although the participative model shares the market model's view that traditional bureaucracies impede good government, it "is almost the ideological antithesis of the market approach". Its advocates would remove or minimize hierarchical layers of top-down controls, opting instead to empower employees and

increase their involvement in decisions. The participative government model rests on the popular assumption that "workers and clients closest to the actual production of goods and services in the public sector have the greatest insight and information about the programs". The central assumptions of the participative government model are these:

- The principal source of traditional government's problems is hierarchy (not monopoly, as proponents of the market model argue);
- Structurally, flatter government organizations are preferable;
- Management can be improved through greater employee involvement, for example TQM and other team-based models;
- Policy making is accomplished through consultation and negotiation; and
- The model's primary public benefit is greater involvement.

Flexible model: Flexible government," the least clearly articulated of the four models, is less ideological in its approach. "Flexibility" refers to "the capacity of government and its agencies to make appropriate policy responses to environmental changes rather than merely responding in habitual ways to inherently novel challenges". The flexible government model's central assumptions are:

- Permanence is the principal source of problems with the traditional model of government;
- Structurally, "virtual organizations" and networks are preferable;
- Management is improved by utilizing temporary personnel;
- Policy making is accomplished through experimentation; and
- The model's primary public benefit is low cost with coordination.

Deregulated model: In this model, "deregulation" refers to government, not industry. Its central theme is the removal of rules, policies, and other constraints on government action. Public managers should be freed to be entrepreneurs. For example, this model's advocates endorse the 1991-92 congressional policy that permitted the Department of Defense's Maintenance Centers to compete with private industry for maintenance work, often successfully. Proponents of the deregulated government model argue that deregulation is as important in the public sector as in

the private sector, and for the same reason: to liberate workers' entrepreneurial energies.

Government deregulation would produce a lean, resolute civil service able to decide and act, rather than wait and see. The model's central assumptions and characteristics are:

- Internal regulation, such as restrictive policies and rules, is the principal source of traditional government's
- problems;
- No particular structural arrangement is to be preferred;
- Management is improved through greater freedom;
- Policy making is accomplished through entrepreneurial government; and
- The model's primary public benefits are creativity and activism.

Stillman:

No-State (Negative State): Minimalist public administration.

Natural adjustments in the marketplace via competition and little state oversight is best.

Sees work of administrators as low-level, technical work.

Bold-State (Positive State): Activist public administration.

the State has ability to do much good and nat govt can lead in positive planning.

Focus on organizational effectiveness, limit political intrusion on decision making and maximize the community good and public welfare.

Pre-State (Half-way State):

- Sees PA as part of the Constitutional system, but includes a holistic approach.
- Big Picture of the issues, but no clear-cut answers to modern challenges.

Pro-State (Professional Global Technocracy):

- Higher education is key
- Govt run by groups of professionals
- Ultimate faith in scientific management and technology

- Blurring of boundaries of public and private sectors

Compared to the traditional or orthodox model, which poses the greatest promise for the future of effectiveness in government?

If I had to choose one, I would choose Flexible Government. There is more freedom to close down programs and agencies that are not working, while experimentation is encouraged to find better ways to manage.

Ideally, I feel the greatest promise would be a mixture of Market Government and Flexible Government.

In Stillman's model – Bold-State!

the State has ability to do much good and nat govt can lead in positive planning.

Focus on organizational effectiveness, limit political intrusion on decision making and maximize the community good and public welfare.

QUESTION 10– In attempting to define the field of public administration several authors have commented that American PA has its origin in the progressive era and the reform of government and/or society. The field, according to these authors, has never strayed from these roots. If accurate, this scenario has its limitations. Discuss how this description is or is not true today as well as broader implications for the future of the field.

Actually, most mainstream authors accept that PA has it origin in the Progressive Era, generally regarded as 1890 to 1920. Specifically, Woodrow Wilson's publication of The Study of Administration in 1887 has been reported by many prominent authors as the beginning of public administration.

(A Little Note of the Progressive Era)

The Progressive Era was a period of reform that began in America's urban regions from, approximately the 1890s to the 1920s. Progressivists sought change in labor and fiscal policies in different levels of government. The reformers were predominantly members of the middle class. Furthermore, women came to the fore in the Progressive era and proved their value as good workers. Although the Progressives pushed for social justice and general equality, there was extreme diversity and contradiction

within the Progressive movement. Many reforms dotted this era, including Prohibition with the 18th Amendment and woman's suffrage through the Nineteenth Amendment, both in 1920 as well as the initiation of the Income Tax with the Sixteenth Amendment and direct election of Senators with the Seventeenth Amendment (both in 1913). The four original goals of Progressivism were 1) protecting social welfare - YMCA, 2) promoting moral improvement – prohibition of alcohol, 3) creating economic reform – change of individual behavior, 4) fostering efficiency – Tayorism. President's Theodore Roosevelt, William H. Taft, and Woodrow Wilson served during this era.

A good number of authors would agree that PA had its origins during the Progressive Era. This was an era characterized by attempts to accommodate or balance a life in an increasingly urban, industrial, routinized, and multiethnic environment. The methods for these attempts was imperialist expansion of the American West, conservation movements, organizing labor, increasing business regulation, and remaking the political process. Fredrick Taylor, Willoughby, and others had established the "scientific period of public administration". This was during the "Classical" period of our discipline; a field dominated by Positivism theories of epistemology. The fact that many authors contend that we have not progressed beyond these roots is not overly surprising as many would have us retain positivist beliefs and to a lesser degree, scientific management principles. However, for any author to suggest our existence is continuing in an era nearly a hundred years past would be purporting that in spite of vast technological, cultural, societal, and political advancements we haven't progressed is ludicrous, or is it?

Paul Light has studied reform efforts over nearly a 60 year period (1945 to 2002) and suggests that very few of the reform efforts have had any impact on government. The bureaucratic and hierarchical government organizations that existed in the Progressive Era continue to exist today suggesting little change over the years in the area of reform or organizational structure.