

The Study of Public Administration in Perspective: A Passing Review of the Development of the Discipline

DANILO R. REYES*

Public administration can be roughly defined as the implementation of public policy, largely by the executive branch. It can also be stated as a field of study preparing persons for careers in the public service. It has been said all through the years that Public Administration as a field of study evolved from Political Science, more of a stem from the branch. Apart from adopting theories from the social sciences, it has also embraced some schools of thought from the field of behavioral sciences. This paper discusses how Public Administration developed as a field of study by amalgamating principles from the other disciplines to eventually contrive its own foundations.

Public Administration as a field of study today continues to confront remarkable interludes of intellectual ferment. Throughout its development as a discipline, much effort has been invested by its scholars towards examining its focus or terrain of inquiry. While every discipline, says Donald Kettl (1990: 411), periodically undergoes a period of sometimes wrenching reassessment, Public Administration has experienced constant, almost periodic episodes of reexamination in the course of its struggle for academic acceptance.

In the United States, the discipline has received a steady, nearly obsessed stream of evaluation as to epistemological questions — the problematic of its boundaries, methodologies, scope, direction and heritage. Public Administration as a field of study has certainly been ruthless to itself and this ruthlessness has evoked the intellectual motivation among its scholars to confront what they perceive to be searing and unsettled questions of their field. Assessments of the discipline have ranged from the benign to the most virulent which surprisingly has proven to be convivial instead of being fatal. Much of these bouts of intellectual debates as to epistemological and ontological issues have helped shape

*Associate Professor, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

This article is drawn from Chapter 3 of the author's doctoral dissertation submitted to the College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines in March 1995.

remarkable congeries of theoretical images and posturings, which have for the most part reflected a rich and enriching heritage of intellectual pluralism and dynamism.

The concern for epistemologies, particularly in American Public Administration, may be justified, considering the historical provenance and evolution of the field. The study of modern Public Administration has agonized for over a century as being treated as a subfield of Political Science in that country (Waldo 1948: 24; Caiden 1971: 12-19).¹ It has emerged from schools or departments of Political Science in most universities in the United States;² many of its leading scholars have come from the discipline of Political Science.³ Some of the compelling issues that fall within the discipline's area of inquiry are spin-offs from the broader field of Political Science. Such questions that are addressed today in Public Administration as accountability,⁴ legitimacy of rulers and governors,⁵ democratic administration⁶ and the ramifications of public policymaking⁷ are residues of Political Science.

But, as most P.A. scholars would argue, Public Administration has meandered into other interests encompassing concerns that are distinct and outside the realm of Political Science (Barton and Chappell, Jr.: 1985: 258-260). It has ventured into areas of management science, employing managerial techniques such as queuing theories, linear programming, PERT-CPM and a host of other methods that became popular as early as the sixties when the systems approach to the study of organizations gained currency.

Likewise, it has adopted approaches in the behavioral sciences as part of its human behavior studies of organizations. Propositions have been advanced to the effect that the modern study of Public Administration has grown to be an eclectic field, so vast and interdisciplinary that it has accommodated knowledge, methodologies and techniques from other disciplines, from organization theory, Sociology and Anthropology, Economics, Law, Business Administration, Psychology and the quantitative sciences (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 258-260; Golembiewski 1977: 26). This development perhaps has not at all settled the discipline's episteme but has aggravated the calibrated uncertainty that has bedeviled its thinkers. It has invited academic debates that have ignited such metadilemmas as whether it is art or science,⁸ what are the locus and the focus of the field which spurred such perennial controversies as the "identity crisis," or "the intellectual crisis" of Public Administration⁹ and the validity of its cherished axioms and propositions (Simon 1946: 53-67).

This paper looks into the development of administrative thought and the prominent theoretical images and perspectives that have pervaded the field, particularly in the United States, which by and large, have largely influenced the study and practice of contemporary Public Administration in the Philippines. In examining these episodes of intellectual orientations, this discussion will identify

and review various theoretical propositions that have accumulated through the years and which provide us today with more cogent insights as to the ramifications of thought that have evolved to contribute to the foundations of Public Administration as a discipline.

Public Administration Defined: "A Plethora of Voices" and that 'Little' Question of Definitions

"A definition of the parameters of a field of study," says Stillman (1976: 1), "is normally considered a good place to begin any academic subject." This specifies the boundaries, the landmarks and the terrain that distinguish it from other scientific and humanistic disciplines. "Unfortunately," he continues, "no one has produced a single definition of public administration — at least one upon which most practitioners and scholars are inclined to agree" (Stillman 1976: 1). It is ironic that although thousands study it and millions work at it, Public Administration has never been satisfactorily defined, and invariably, there has been great difficulty delimiting its parameters (Garson and Overman 1983: 43; Mushkin *et al.* 1978).

This perhaps characterizes both the dynamism and volatile nature of the field in the course of its long history. Its scope and meaning have defied standard definitions which can readily be seen in the manner by which various perspectives have been offered to explain what it is and what it must be. Through the years, the definition of Public Administration itself has assumed various critical transformations, as its subject matter and terrains of inquiry continued to expand. Waldo contended about two decades ago that Public Administration remains to be a "slippery term" (Waldo 1975: 181fn) where a single, conclusive definition acceptable to its scholars has proven to be elusive. Caiden also adds that any definition "would be either so encompassing as to call forth the wrath or ridicule of others, or so limiting as to stultify its own disciples" (Caiden 1982: 20).

Almost a decade later, Fesler and Kettl (1991: 6-7) continued to articulate the same sentiments, saying that "*Public administration* has never achieved a definition that commands general assent..." and that *administration*, being so "elusive a term..." it is natural that "we should not be surprised that *public administration* has yet to be satisfactorily defined..." It thus reflects, as Stillman (1991: 142) suggests, "a plethora of voices" that perhaps may need some unification or convergence even if consensus is to be apparent at some stages.

It is certainly not so surprising either, that the appreciation of the term has changed and shifted over time, evolving gradually from one perspective to another. In its generic sense, public administration is understood today both as an academic subject matter, and as the activities and dynamics of the management of public organizations and the practice of the profession. But even the

understanding and appreciation of its meaning, its scope, coverage and foci have remarkably expanded in recent years in three respects, one, from being simply the study of institutions that are limited to the executive branch of government and the bureaucracy to one that encompasses the dynamics of administrative processes in the legislative and judicial departments; two, from simply being concerned with the internal affairs and operations of government to one that addresses the social milieu and the impact of government administration on its public, a feature that evolved and gained currency in the client centered philosophies that started in the seventies; and three, from a definition that refers only to the operations of government to one that has become a distinct field of study.

Thus, from being simply construed as "government in action," involved in "the detailed and systematic execution of public law" as suggested by Woodrow Wilson (1887 in Waldo 1953: 72) who wrote what is now considered as a seminal paper heralding a clarion call for a specialized study of a "science" of administration, the term "public administration" today has acquired a larger meaning than what it was originally interpreted to be. Where it encompassed merely the activities of the "administrative aspects" or the "accomplishing side" of government as distinguished from policymaking, or the dichotomization of politics and administration as espoused by Wilson, it soon adopted a broader perspective, one that cannot be relegated only to the executive branch and to the execution and management of public policy.

The politics-administration dichotomy tradition of Wilson's Public Administration provided sufficient distinction in its time, which served the demands of a fledgling field of inquiry. But this had to be redefined to accommodate the realities of the policy and the administrative processes, considering that these two dimensions are now viewed as better aggregated and appreciated jointly rather than taken separately.

In its earlier context, Public Administration as the discipline — or public administration as the practice, depending on how one looks at it — appears to have been understood to cover a narrower meaning than how it is interpreted today. Following the Wilsonian tradition, earlier views reflected principally the activities of the bureaucracy and the executive branch and the activities that refer to the execution or implementation of public policy and the maintenance of government. Simon, Smithburg and Thompson (1950) provided a characteristic definition of this then prevailing limited scope by describing public administration as referring:

... to the activities of the executive branches of national, state and local governments; independent boards and commissions; and certain other agencies of a specialized character. *Specifically excluded are judicial and legislative agencies within the government.* ... (Simon et al. 1950: 7) (Italics supplied).

Leonard White, who is credited for writing one of the first textbooks on public administration in 1926 titled *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, defined it in a revised edition also within the context of the execution of public policy. White identified public administration as:

... the composite of all the laws, regulations, practices, relationships, codes, and customs that prevail at any time in any jurisdiction for the fulfillment and execution of public policy. . . (White 1955: 2).

Other earlier descriptions around this period also expressed management centered definitions. Waldo, in his earlier works, identified public administration as "the organization and management of men and materials to achieve the purposes of government." He also added, "the art and science of management as applied to the affairs of the state" (Waldo 1955: 2). Fritz Morstein Marx however began to consider a more elaborate definition although still wary of its conventional usage. Thus he said:

At its fullest range, public administration embraces every area and activity governed by public policy. . . [including] the formal processes and operations through which the legislature exercises its power. . . the functions of the courts in the administration of justice and the work of the military agencies. . . By established usage, however, public administration has come to signify primarily the organization, personnel, practices, and procedures essential to effective performance of the civilian functions entrusted to the executive branch of government. . . (Marx 1959: 6).

By the 1970s, the setting of institutional boundaries to distinguish the focus of public administration that isolated it within the confines of the internal affairs of the executive branch had begun to be redefined.¹⁰ Nigro and Nigro represented this evolving perspective in the 1970s when they defined public administration not only in relation to the executive branch or the bureaucracy and not only in relation to the affairs of the government, but of the client or public it is purported to serve. Thus, public administration is described in the following manner:

1. is a cooperative group effort in a public setting,
2. covers all three branches — executive, legislative, and judicial — and their interrelationships,
3. has an important role in the formulation of public policy and is thus part of the political process,
4. is different in significant ways from private administration, and
5. is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals in providing services to the community (Nigro and Nigro 1977: 18).

From this definition, one can see the broadening of the scope and nature of public administration. Succeeding definitions have likewise begun to adopt this shift, which in a way, attempted to incorporate a larger dimension into the

concerns of Public Administration as a discipline. In this shift, the interpretation of what public administration should and must be has expanded to cover not only the executive branch, but the other branches of government as well. It also began highlighting the importance of giving attention to the community, the citizen-consumers of public administration as can be discerned from such definitions offered by Dimock and Dimock who contended that "Public Administration is the production of goods and services designed to serve the needs of citizen-consumers" (Dimock, Dimock and Fox 1983: 5).

An equally important distinction that also began to crystallize during the 1970s is the differentiation of the reference to the academic field from that of the practice, which began with the advent of what Waldo (1975: 182) refers to as "self-conscious" Public Administration, or the attempts of the discipline to identify its terrains of inquiry. For the sake of convenience, Waldo took the effort of distinguishing the academic subject matter by using capital letters to refer to the discipline, in this case Public Administration, in contrast to the activities or practice of the profession, which is identified by small letters, public administration (Waldo 1975: 181fn).

But much of the succeeding definitions have begun to fuse these concepts together to encompass the range and breadth of how public administration is to be appreciated. Current definitions have emphasized the "public" in public administration, and that public administration is concerned not only with the operations and affairs of the executive branch, but also of the legislative and judicial branches. This recent stream of definitions has also begun to fuse the theory with the practice, the study with the profession, or the praxis of Public Administration. These evidently represent attempts to integrate the various concerns of the field. Rosenbloom for instance described public administration to be

... the use of managerial, political, and legal theories and processes to fulfill legislative, executive, and judicial governmental mandates for the provision of regulatory and service functions for the society as a whole or for some segments of it (Rosenbloom 1986: 6).

Henry likewise provided what appears to be an all-encompassing definition, suggesting that public administration:

... is a broad-ranging and amorphous combination of theory and practice. Its purpose is to promote a superior understanding of government and its relationship with the society it governs, as well as to encourage public policies more responsive to social needs. It seeks to institute managerial practices attuned to effectiveness, efficiency and the fulfillment of deeper human requisites of the citizenry (Henry 1989: 20).

This current trend perhaps has been the product of the stream of consciousness provoked by the activist and turbulent years of the past three

decades which spans to the present time. The shift expresses the increasing consciousness assumed by its scholars and practitioners, and in a way, the responsibility attached to public administration by the larger society. It is a response towards finding the discipline's relevance in an environment that has grown to be both complex and volatile, and increasingly disturbed by the anxieties of its age. Caiden marks this point well by saying that as it has developed, public administration "includes anything that can be construed as the community's response to social problems which require collective [and] not individual resolution through some form of public intervention outside social conventions and the private marketplace" (Caiden 1982: 1).

But more than defining the field and finding its role and relevance in the overall framework of society, a more difficult challenge that has preoccupied Public Administration is the challenge of its own epistemology. While its antecedents are rich, it is argued that it is theoretically impoverished. As Bozeman and Straussman (1984: 2-3) stressed:

Unlike many traditional social sciences, Public Administration has never been dominated by theorists posing as detached and disinterested observers ... [and that] there is a core set of issues that have captivated Public Administration scholars through the years . . . but there is little theoretical consensus.

In essence, there are core issues but no core theory (Bozeman and Strausmann 1984: 2-3). Although its subject has existed since the dawn of history, it remains today as experiencing the predicament "of justifying itself to itself and to the bigger community in general." It is a field "that is assaulted from all sides, that it is part of something else, of some other discipline and that it has no right to exist intellectually with a self-contained, separate identity" (Caiden 1982: 1-2).

The Challenges to the Study of Public Administration in the United States: Tocqueville's Contributions

Public Administration has had a long and hard history, particularly in the United States where the field has experienced recurring episodes of examination made by its own scholars. Ironically, the early rumblings of the dilemma of Public Administration in the United States both as a field of academic study and as a profession received its major challenge not from its own scholars like Woodrow Wilson (1887) or Frank Goodnow (1900), or from the Progressive Movement of the late 19th Century which heralded the advent of civil service reform and the philosophy of merit and fitness in the American Federal Government.

The earliest challenge emerged perhaps as a result of the observations of a young French magistrate, Alexis-Charles-Henri-Cleavel de Tocqueville who arrived in the United States in May 1831 poised to study the American penal system, then

increasingly becoming recognized as one of the most advanced in the world. Docking at Newport, Rhode Island with a friend, he travelled across America and part of Canada for the next nine months by stagecoach, by horseback, by steamer and by other means of transportation. At age 26, he proved equal to the rigors of his journey which covered some 7,000 miles and which allowed him to interview thousands of Americans. In the course of his travel, he meticulously collected notes and observations not only of American prisons, but of the workings of American democracy and government (Stillman 1991: 4-5).

The trip provided the young Tocqueville and his friend, one Gustave de Beaumont, with valuable insights not just on prison management in the United States, but, more significantly, on the democratic process in America. Tocqueville's journey however went far beyond his intentions, for after publishing a comprehensive report on the American penal administration, he went on to produce a remarkable two-volume book on the United States, *Democracy in America*, published in 1835 and 1840. This account has since been considered as one of the most "insightful, detailed, and generalized studies of the United States," and rapidly became a best-seller then and perhaps, even today. (Stillman 1991:5). Tocqueville offered a view of the inner workings of American democracy and government which fascinated Europeans, impressing upon them the viability of American democracy and its system of government.

But if Tocqueville lavished much praise on American governance, he also called attention to what he saw as weaknesses of its administrative system. He noted that American public administration was "not taken seriously as a subject for study" and that "there was little lasting content to public administrative ideas in the United States" (Stillman 1991: 6).

He liberally commented that "the public administration [in America] is, so to speak, oral and traditional," and that "little is committed to writing, and that little is soon wafted away forever, like the leaves of Sibyl, by the smallest breeze." In contrast, he pointed out that the development of a more refined science of administration seemed to be "a major continental European preoccupation" in that day but the subject was apparently neglected in America (as quoted from Stillman 1991: 3-4; and from Fesler and Kettl 1991: 17). This challenge would be addressed some thirty years later, and intensified in the 1950s. It is in this sense that Tocqueville perhaps became one of the earliest voices to call for a more serious treatment of Public Administration as a "science" preceding by more than three decades another scholar, Woodrow Wilson, who wrote the early seminal paper calling for a the study of Public Administration in 1887 at the height of the Progressive Movement in the United States.

The Progressive Movement: Woodrow Wilson and the Politics-Administration Dichotomy Tradition

Tocqueville's advocacy of a "science of administration" languished for three decades as part of an ideal struggling for attention in the bowels of the spoils system that then dominated the American administrative system. It however found its vindication not because of some intellectual awakening, but rather because of the conflicts and contradictions that became evident with the rise of the patronage system in the United States.

For years since American Independence, President Washington and his successors sought the selection and appointments of personnel in the federal government on the basis of qualifications and merit. But these selections were also largely influenced by the political leanings of appointees which resulted in the tendency to choose administrators from the upper classes of society (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 94). Around 1830, a more pronounced change occurred in the practice with the administration of President Andrew Jackson. The era was characterized by increasing democratization in America which witnessed a period of widening voting and other rights to more and more people.

This spirit of increasing democratization, however, also affected the personnel management system of the American government which led Jackson, in what is known today as "Jacksonian democracy," to advocate the democratization of jobs in the public service and open it up to all segments of society. In Jackson's view, the duties required by federal positions were simple and did not demand experience. Government was seen as a rather simple operation and ability was believed to be widely distributed among citizens. As a result, public employment soon began to be regarded as a reward rotated among citizens on the basis of their political loyalties (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 94). In time, patronage, or the "spoils system" became the common practice and political appointees, knowing that their tenure in office was short, enriched themselves.

The problems spawned by the system met public criticism and censure, but reform made little progress even if initiatives were taken by the succeeding administrations of Presidents Lincoln and Grant. The impetus for reform, however, came because of an intervening event in 1881 when an office-seeker and supporter of the party in power, one Charles J. Guiteau, failed to secure an appointment for a consulship in Paris. Guiteau expressed his disappointment by assassinating President James Garfield (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 95). The event invited attention to the cause of what is now known as the Progressive Movement. Soon reforms in the civil service system were effected.

The Movement espoused, among others, the professionalization of the civil service. It soon resulted in the passage of the Pendleton Act of 1883, which brought about dramatic and sweeping reform in the American public personnel

management system. The Pendleton Act laid the foundations of the merit system, even if it then covered only 10 percent of federal jobs. In 1908, this increased to roughly 60 percent and today covers about 90 percent of jobs in the federal, state and local governments (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 95).

If the Progressive Movement brought to light the demands of civil service reform, it also crystallized in a way another movement, that of the call for a serious study of "the science of administration." In 1887, a young political scientist who was later to become the President of the United States, produced a paper which appeared in the *Political Science Quarterly* sounding out the call of not only separating administration from the realms of politics, but towards developing a science out of administrative practices. Woodrow Wilson, fired by the developments of his time, pointed out that "the field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics...." That being the case, serious attention must be given to the study of administration with the object of rescuing "executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid in stable principle" (Wilson, in Waldo 1953: 71). Echoing Tocqueville's sentiments, Wilson went far beyond the advocacy of the Progressive Movement for civil service reform, saying,

we must regard civil-service reform in its present stages as but prelude to a fuller administrative reform. We are now rectifying methods of appointment; we must go on to adjust executive functions more fitly and to prescribe better methods of organization and action. Civil service reform is thus but a moral preparation for what it is to follow. (Wilson, in Waldo 1953: 71).

This proposition, which in a way heralded the evolution of Public Administration as a discipline, would soon become the central theme for its establishment as a specialized field of study in the United States. It is not clear today whether the paper generated the response it aspired because Wilson's paper would remain unnoticed during the next four decades. As suggested by Martin, while Wilson's lectures on municipal reform were quite popular in the 1900s, his works, particularly "The Study of Administration" (1887) were apparently not widely read by other scholars until the publication of Leonard White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (1926), nearly forty years after.¹¹ White's textbook was acknowledged as one of the early materials that recognized Wilson's contribution to the field which remained unappreciated until the 1930s. In fact, Van Riper, in yet another review of the development of the discipline in the United States, observes that "none of the early scholars ever cited Wilson" (Van Riper 1983: 477; Martin 1988: 631).

Wilson's views however found popular expression in Frank Goodnow's *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government* (1900). Like Wilson, Goodnow advocated the idea of a politics-administration dichotomy. He defined the role of politics as having to do with the expression of the will of the state while

that of administration, with its execution (Goodnow 1900: 26). In espousing this view, Goodnow began to reinforce a tradition that would take hold of Public Administration and remain to be one of its most influential propositions. It was an appealing doctrine for it justified, as Stillman (1991: 107) says "the development of a distinct sphere for administrative development and discretion, free supposedly from meddling and interference of politics." Stillman continues, saying that:

... The dichotomy, which became an instrument for Progressive reforms, allowed room for a new criterion for public action, based on the insertion of professionalization, expertise, and merit values into the active direction of governmental affairs. . . .

Goodnow's dichotomy became a fundamental element in pre-World War II administrative thinking for it allowed public administration, as a whole, to emerge as a self-conscious field of study, intellectually and institutionally differentiated from politics. . . (Stillman 1991: 107).

A Science of Administration?

The politics-administration ideal, however, did not remain unchallenged. The years following Wilson, Goodnow and White witnessed rapid and remarkable shifts in the foci of the discipline of Public Administration. These doctrines, or what Stillman refers to as "theoretical images," evolved out of the belief that Public Administration cannot be studied and operationalized simply on a grounding based on a distinction between the work of politics and that of administration. A crucial question that emerged is that if there is such a distinction, and if a science of administration is at all possible, then what constitutes this science? What are its postulates? What are its principles? What are its techniques?

The alternative doctrine came in the 1930s when the belief that science and scientific processes must be applied to administrative processes began to gain currency. Two important books presided over the passage of this then emerging shift. The first was Luther Gulick's and Lyndall Urwick's edited collection, *Papers on the Science of Administration* (1937), which introduced the mnemonic device POSDCORB which stood for what was believed to be the managerial functions of *planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting* and where "principles" derived from scientific study could be laid out. The second was William F. Willoughby's series of books explicating administrative principles, *An Introduction to the Study of Government of Modern States* (1919), *The Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of Government* (1923), and the celebrated *The Principles of Public Administration* (1927), all of which emphasized managerial functions and duties. It was the time of the "high noon" of orthodox administrative science.

From this point, the issue of developing a science of administration has preoccupied the discipline. This would persist even to the present time. Another influence marked the trend. This was the scientific management movement at the turn of the century which popularized the application of science principles to work methods and offered the "one best way" approach of doing things. It can be noted that most textbooks in Public Administration even today generally refer to the scientific management construct of the engineer, Frederick W. Taylor as part of its foundations in explaining management theories. Taylor advocated the use of scientific methods of inquiry in understanding the problematic of wastage and inefficiency at the shop-room level (Taylor 1911). This influenced a continuing concern towards developing an administrative science, or at best "sciency" approaches to administrative practice.

This approach would continue with a stream of books and papers highlighting the functions of management and of administration. It could be roughly estimated that the 1920s to the 1930s saw the build-up of Public Administration as a discipline with the spate of propositions trying to figure out a science of administration or the application of scientific methods to administrative practice.

But even before the advent of the POSDCORB tradition, a notable number of articles came out echoing Wilson and Willoughby. The English scholar Garland (1929) argued the need to systematize knowledge in administrative studies, expressing the then emerging sentiment to use scientific methods in administrative inquiries. Among the other significant materials include the articles of F. Merson, which came out in 1923 under the title *Public Administration: A Science*; Luther Gulick's *Science, Values and Public Administration* (1937); and Cyril Renwick, writing in the *Australian Quarterly* who claimed that the study of Public Administration should be treated as a science (1944); Marshall E. Dimock's *The Study of Administration* which appeared in 1937 in the pages of the *American Political Science Review* and again made yet another published reference to Wilson's contribution; John Pfiffner whose *Public Administration* (1935) argued for good organization by advocating the use of such classical approaches as hierarchy, functional division of tasks centralized housekeeping activities and line and staff distinctions; and Harvey Walker's *Public Administration in the United States* (1937) which also emphasized centralization within the federal system and the executive branch.

These and similar studies looked at the quandaries obtaining in the profession, with an eye towards establishing empirically valid propositions in such concerns as the organization and processes of the federal, state and local governments, reorganization studies, administrative reform, municipal administration, centralization and decentralization, public finance and budgeting, and a host of interests that served to illuminate understanding of public affairs and processes which are too many to be cited here.

Edwin O. Stene, who would later serve as visiting professor and research consultant at the U.P. Institute of Public Administration, published a paper in 1940 discussing approaches to evolve a science of administration, suggesting that Public Administration knowledge could be enhanced by generating and testing hypotheses. He offered several "axioms" which focused on coordination of activities and performance with the coordination of decisions (Stene 1940).

But by the 1940s, many of these propositions had begun to be subject to reassessment. Part of these reflections articulated sentiments on the problematic of deriving scientific principles of administration that would have strong predictive values, that would truly account for the fluid nature of administrative phenomena and would be useful for all types of situations and organizations. Lyndall Urwick (1944) reexamined a number of administrative principles and pointed out that while scholars in the field may have been unable to develop a science of management, a technique of administration can be delineated. Robert Dahl (1947) again discussed the problems of establishing a science of Public Administration and cited such obstacles as the impossibility of excluding normative considerations from administrative inquiries, the concern for studying certain aspects of human behavior which limits the potentials of the field in employing scientific methods and the relevance to the social setting of scientific methods. Dahl criticized management theories as having insufficient grounding in research on the nature of man or in comparative studies of management (Garson and Overman 1983: 50fn). Still, he proceeded to exhort his colleagues to continue efforts to create a science of administration (Dahl 1947: 1-11).

The Critique of the Management Principles Tradition: Developing a Frontier and the Gathering Crisis of Thought

Herbert Simon perhaps made the most scathing and devastating critique of orthodox Public Administration theory in 1946 in his *The Proverbs of Administration*. He argued that commonly accepted administrative principles were inconsistent, conflicting and inapplicable to many administrative situations. He refuted the foundations developed for instance by Gulick on the classical approach to organization theory.

He boldly pointed out that administrative principles were actually "proverbs," where one proposition can readily be negated. The basic themes of this attack were to be included in a more expanded version of his book, *Administrative Behavior* which was first published in 1947. Simon's assault on orthodox administrative theory was perceived as a milestone that overhauled the set notions of administrative thinking. Instead, Simon advocated a systems-theory viewpoint that was built upon the work of Chester Barnard's *The Functions of the Executive* (1938). He argued vigorously that decisionmaking was at the heart of managerial processes and that POSDCORB did not epitomize the real managerial

functions. In doing this, he set the tone for incisive studies of the decision process which would later be reincarnated in studies of public policymaking.

In spite of this, the POSDCORB tradition continued to influence thinking in Public Administration. A content analysis, for example, of essays written between 1940 to 1952 in the *Public Administration Review* revealed that articles with a POSDCORB flavor continued to dominate scholars of the field, with personnel management "heavily over-represented" as against other areas like policy and political factors (Englebert 1953: 260).

But by the early fifties, this began to wane, as other propositions and questions on the nature, substance, scope and techniques of the field began to appear in the United States. While some of these continued the advocacy of searching for scientific methods, others increasingly shifted their attention from managerial principles to "general aspects of government, policy and politics, as well as human relations and the import of other disciplines (Garson and Overman 1983: 51). Sayre noted in this period that Public Administration cannot be narrowly confined to administrative principles and questions alone and that public administration had shifted "from the simple views of Gulick and Urwick to a new viewpoint that emphasized politics and norms" (Sayre 1951:9).

Illustrative of this trend was a new generation of textbooks that emphasized the political factors of Public Administration as represented by an edited collection compiled by Fritz Morstein Marx (1946) which heavily emphasized the political factors in the administrative process (Garson and Overman 1983: 50). In *Reflections on Public Administration*, Gaus (1947: 37) offered an innovative organizing framework quite dissimilar to POSDCORB and which addressed "ecological factors," i.e., social, political and technological concerns that influence administrative systems. This reinforced the systems viewpoint which Simon had proposed and which advocated the position that administrative systems cannot limit itself to the internal perspectives of public organization, but must equally address the environment in which it operates. In this perspective, the techniques spawned by POSDCORB were explicitly viewed as less important than the political roles of administrators (Garson and Overman 1983: 51). The then rising viewpoint perhaps can be summed up in Gaus's closing sentence in a celebrated article written in 1950: "A theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also" (Gaus 1950: 168).

This "political" orientation of the field, which Henry later described as the "Public Administration as Political Science" paradigm (Henry 1975), represented a focus of attention towards the political process and, in a way, disturbed the supposedly logically tidy distinction built by the politics-administration dichotomy tradition between Public Administration and Political Science. It is an orientation that would subject the discipline to vigorous scrutiny, to a number of unsettled questions that were then taking shape and were to gradually intensify two decades later.

In fact, as early as 1948, Waldo had already invited issues on the direction and thrust of Public Administration research in his book, *The Administrative State* (1948). In this book, which was a condensation of his dissertation, Waldo sought "to review and analyze the theoretical element in administrative writings and to present the development of the public administration movement as a chapter in the history of American political thought." Citing J.M. Gaus, Waldo observed that students of administration have become "more uncertain in recent years as to the ends, aims, and methods with which they should advocate" (Waldo 1948: 206). Waldo pursued this claim by noting that prevalent during that era was "a large core of 'orthodox' public administration ideology," that is accompanied by "a large measure of doubt and iconoclasm."

This trend continued intermittently in the fifties and did not seem to ebb. The definitional issue and the character of the field emerged as formidable questions, as scholars took turns in assessing what Public Administration is and what it is not. The character of the discipline was subjected to a series of stormy self-flagellation.

H. Stein advanced the view that administration is so complex and involves so many variables and intangibles that any highly systematic categorization becomes impossible (Stein 1952: xxv). Caiden, citing Stein, interpreted this as saying that

administrative situations are so unique, so inherently disorderly, so unlike the highly conventionalized discipline of law that 'public administration is a field in which everyman is his own codifier and categorizer, and the categories adopted must be looked on as relatively evanescent' (Caiden 1971: 14).

Mosher, on the other hand, decried that "public administration cannot demark any subcontinent as its exclusive province — unless it consists of such mundane matters as classifying budget expenditures, drawing organization charts, and mapping procedures." He lamented that "perhaps it is best that it not be defined," for it is more "an area of interest than a discipline, more a focus than a separate science" (Mosher 1956: 177).

The drift of these discontents would expand to the nature of methods and techniques in establishing basic and cardinal propositions. Such contributions as Waldo's attack on logical-positivist philosophy in Public Administration which appeared in a controversial paper, "The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration" questioned empiricist models in solving problems and understanding administrative situations (Waldo 1952: 81-203). Waldo's essay contained, in his words, "two factual premises, one that the American polity is a democracy and [the other,] the abandonment and decay of the politics-administration dichotomy tradition." He maintained that Public Administration must now be concerned with the application other than management principles alone of democratic norms and the achievement of democratic goals *within*

administration. It would seem, based on the verve of his arguments, that logical-positivism, the empiricist way of solving administrative problems, must give way to the upholding of these democratic norms (Waldo 1952). Here, one can discern the abandonment of the management principles tradition and the increasing concern toward democratic values and what relevance Public Administration may have in maximizing them.

The essay merited a sharp rebuke from Herbert Simon who accused Waldo of being "a normative, muddleheaded political theorist."¹² Waldo responded that he only attempted to distinguish between logical-positivist philosophy as against empirical research which to him can be separated as against Simon's position, at least during that time, that they were inseparable (Brown and Stillman 1986: 59-60).

These efforts were enriched by "think" pieces as Luther Gulick's "Next Step in Public Administration," presented at the American Society for Public Administration in 1955, and Waldo's monograph, *The Study of Public Administration* (1955) which continued the attempts to define the area of intellectual inquiry.

In his paper, Gulick proposed that Public Administration as a field of analysis needs to be more closely related to the study of business and other forms of administration. He also advocated the reexamination and reformulation of basic doctrines and practices of Public Administration with reference to the use and control of the expert in public and private management (Gulick 1955: 73). Waldo, on the other hand, continued to labor with definitional questions in the field, outlining the scope, boundaries and methodologies. He noted that "administration has been studied since the dawn of history, but seldom with much self-consciousness, and never with the scope and intensity of today" (Waldo 1955: 15). Along these lines, Edward Litchfield also took the effort to discuss the same problem in his *Notes on a General Theory of Administration* (Litchfield 1956).

In 1956, Waldo reinforced his position on his disenchantment with the empirical approach. In *Perspectives on Administration* (1956a), which was based on his lectures in Alabama, Waldo presented what he says is "a very strong personal statement — or rather reaction — to the predominance of the scientific method, and maybe even the arrogance of the natural sciences vis-a-vis the social sciences" (Brown and Stillman 1986: 69). He again took issue with the logical-positivists whose milieu, he claimed, has remained trapped in empirical methods. He argued that administration is so large a subject, and still in many ways so dark, that it should open itself to other methods, that all models and idioms have their respective virtues and vices, and there is no reason to flaunt one specific approach.

Then, in yet another work, *Political Science in the United States of America*, Waldo threw in another challenge to Public Administration scholars, saying that "the field of public administration in its earlier periods was decidedly 'anti-theoretical' in its orientation," and that in retrospect, public administration was not only able to avoid theoretical considerations; it also obscured them, leaving them implicit in action or discussing them in the guise of facts (Waldo 1956b: 72).

Public Administration as an Eclectic Field

If the orientation towards the political aspects of the administrative process created ripples of concern as to the identity, scope, boundaries and direction of the field, the interdisciplinary orientation of Public Administration that emerged towards the fifties heightened the tension even more. As Public Administration expanded in its concerns, it began to draw from the techniques and approaches of other disciplines. It began to incorporate methods and knowledge from such fields as psychology, economics, sociology, history and even operations research (Garson and Overman 1983: 51). Inputs from the fields of psychology and sociology for instance provided newer and fresher approaches to the study of organizations.

The psychological perspective took shape with contributions from social psychologists who sought to continue the tradition of the human relations movement of the 1930s that began with Elton Mayo's studies at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago in the 1920s (Mayo 1933; Roethlisberger and Dickson 1949). The works of Maslow (1954; 1959), Argyris (1953; 1957) and similar psychologists began to offer new perspectives in understanding the behavioral dynamics of the study of administration.

In sociology, much has been said and written about the problems involving bureaucracies and their performance. As early as the forties, sociological studies on bureaucratic behavior and performance gained prominence with sociological commentaries on administrative dysfunctions and bureaucratic culture in the United States. Talcott Parsons dissected Weber's bureaucratic model of capitalism and government and maintained it to be "a highly-developed, impersonal, rationalized mechanism for achieving objectives through routinized behavior that often seems far removed from its ultimate goal" (Parsons 1937; Martin 1989: 250). Merton popularized "the sociological argument that bureaucracy contains dysfunctions expressed through a reward system that encourages conformity to precision and rules," but refused to punish "those who applied rules and precise definitions to the extreme" (Merton 1940; 1949; Martin 1989: 251). Selznick, on the other hand looked at the problems of bureaucratization and the delegation of authority which he claimed leads to bifurcation of interests within the administrative system (Selznick 1943; Martin 1989: 251).

The wave of these contributions continued to the sixties and began to influence Public Administration as initiatives towards newer techniques of reforming public organizations began to surface. Approaches employing methods from other fields such as organization development (Bennis 1969; Golembiewski 1977), which emphasized behavioral science knowledge; the public choice model (Ostrom and Ostrom: 1971) which adopted economic theory in decisionmaking and operations research-based techniques, among others, served to highlight the increasing eclecticism of the discipline. This accentuated the claim that Public Administration is becoming a "befuddled invalid" dependent on other sciences on its methods.

What were the implications of this development of an interdisciplinary or eclectic approach on the study of Public Administration? For one, it heightened the tension of the problematic of scope and boundaries, for the field has become increasingly vast, lacking an organizing framework, one without focus, one that borrows from other fields with regard to its propositions, techniques and approaches, and one that is fastly losing its own identity and assuming the identities of other disciplines.

Kuhn and the Structure of Scientific Revolutions

With the publication of Thomas Kuhn's influential book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in 1962,¹³ a treatise meant for the physical sciences but quickly attracting the attention of social scientists, the wave of initiatives towards the examination of disciplinary predispositions and epistemological issues became extremely popular. Kuhn not only explained the anatomy of changes in moods and contours of scientific inquiries which he referred to as "scientific revolutions," he also customized a whole new outlook towards approaching epistemological questions and the investigation of a discipline's "elan." Kuhn's work would be associated with the notion of "paradigms" which can be defined as,

a constellation of values, beliefs and perceptions of empirical reality, which, together with a body of theory based upon the foregoing, is used by a group of scientists, and by applying a distinctive methodology, to interpret the nature of some aspect of the universe we inhabit (Kuhn, as cited in Hunt 1989: 2).

A paradigm then is an accepted model or pattern of approaching and explaining phenomena shared by a community of scholars. A dominant paradigm is one that is currently accepted by the scientific community as their subject of inquiry and is generally well received within a given period depending on the state of knowledge and values pervasive in that era. It is a vision of the nature of inquiry espoused by a scientific community and is changed or altered when new realities or competing interpretations of phenomena appear so as to generate perceived anomalies in a current scientific predisposition. An accumulation anomalies would result in the identification of a new paradigm.

Kuhn's propositions had a profound influence on Public Administration, which has for some time, wrestled over its foundations. The Kuhnian challenge renewed and accelerated the momentum towards establishing the character of the discipline and its impact can be seen in the way the discipline tried to review the paradigms that dominated the subject, of putting together and integrating the thoughts that have accumulated through the years as in the order of paradigms. Kuhn had in a way made the discipline "self-conscious" even if this consciousness began seeping even earlier.

Bailey, for instance, in 1968 propounded the objectives of Public Administration theory, saying that it should "draw together the insights of the humanities and the validated propositions of the social and behavioral sciences and to apply these insights and propositions to the task of improving the processes of government aimed at achieving politically legitimated goals by constitutionally mandated means" (Bailey 1968: 128). The assumption here is that Public Administration is a "borrowing" discipline, loosely adopting and integrating knowledge from other sciences, but confused as to where its area of competence really lies.

Public Administration: A Discipline in Search of a Subject Matter?

Towards the next two decades, the assessments began to multiply with the mood oscillating from those that are deprecating to the ones that are apologetic. Retrospective and prospective commentaries alternated to the extent that it seemed faddish to look back and beyond. Paradigm has become an operative word, and this, in a way enriched the approach towards understanding what Public Administration is and what it wants to be. American scholars in the field became increasingly conscious, searching and inquisitive about the state of their discipline which sent them scurrying into their past, structuring and analyzing their legacies, defining their terrain of inquiry, and offering new insights on the study of Public Administration. It appeared to be a renaissance of sorts designed to recover lost ground even if it seemed to be a race without a finish line. It felt good to be able to identify the problems, prepare a shopping list of solutions, and be besieged with what La Porte described as a literature that "has become a huge supermarket of possible theoretical edibles..." (La Porte 1971: 28). Certainly, this intensified, as the place of Public Administration in Political Science, to quote Waldo, "became increasingly anomalous in the post-World War II period" (Brown and Stillman 1986: 82).

But while this anomaly seemed welcome, it also introduced the problematic of what has been since referred to as the "identity crisis" (Waldo 1968a; 1975: 185) or the "intellectual crisis" (Ostrom 1974) in the field, which centered on the discipline's character or place in the social sciences. It is, in Waldo's terms, "a discipline in search of a subject-matter," which led him to exhort his colleagues

that "we try to act as a profession without actually being one and perhaps even without the hope or intention of becoming one in any strict sense" (Waldo 1968a: 2, 10). Ostrom represented a new breed of scholars who questioned the state of knowledge in the field and its import on the practice of the profession. He maintained very validly that "the practice of the profession depends upon the knowledge which its members profess." But unfortunately, he continues, "[M]uch of the research in American public administration has made little use of the predictive value of theory to derive hypotheses from theory and then [use the] evidence to support or reject the hypotheses as a test of theory" (Ostrom 1974: 3). In this sense, he pointedly asserted that Public Administration is suffering from an intellectual crisis. He advanced the observation that "the sense of crisis which pervaded the field of public administration over the last generation is a crisis evoked by the insufficiency of the paradigm inherent in the traditional theory of public administration..." (Ostrom 1974: 17).

This persuasion represented the increasing disenchantment of scholars over their field, although, it in a way, seemed also a defense mechanism to account for the performance of the discipline at a time when bureaucratic bashing and distrust for government had become extremely prevalent. It should be noted that this era was preceded by the angry mood of the sixties, the national disappointment caused by American misadventures overseas, in Cuba and Vietnam, while engulfed at the homefront with continuing racial tensions, widespread student agitation, unemployment, problems and increasing enclaves of poverty, among others. The sixties for America, and for a lot of other countries too, proved to be a turbulent period. And this turbulence had definitely affected the discipline of Public Administration.

From the morass of conflicts that pervaded that era, Public Administration as a discipline tried to find its way. The discussions shifted from redefining the discipline to examining the context where it operates.

Fred Riggs (1968: 348) invited attention to "extraordinary difficult dilemmas in which thinking public officials, both military and civilian, find themselves today." He maintained that the changing environment of the world then compels scholars to raise questions about governmental legitimacy but are handicapped by some fundamental conceptual ambiguities, especially the relation between a bureaucracy and its political context, the concept and organization of legitimacy, the American tradition of constitutionalism, responsiveness and responsibility in government and the revolutionary principle (Riggs 1968: 348-361). Waldo also discussed the responsibility of Public Administration in a volatile environment, "a time of revolution," as he proclaimed which does not necessarily mean the overthrow of governments by force, but of a changing social arena characterized by reverberations in ways of thinking and doing. He outlined changes — a revolution — in science and technology amid a growing reaction against what he perceived to be a cold, impersonal and dehumanized world aggravated by science

itself. In here, Waldo pointed out that Public Administration must "respond adequately to the revolutions of the day" (Waldo 1968c: 362-368).

Garson and Overman highlighted the situation succinctly, saying that:

The social ferment of the 1960s raised the cry for relevance. In civil rights, defense, the environment, and other areas, grassroots groups denounced bureaucratic inertia and preoccupation with detail. . . (Garson and Overman 1983: 58).

The stream of this compulsive recasting of problem definitions certainly found a patron in such mavericks as Dwight Waldo whose thinking perhaps characterized the ambivalence of the structure of American Public Administration scholarship. Waldo's preoccupation with Public Administration theory and its philosophical basis tends to be as episodic, as American Public Administration thought. He initiated provocative questions on the nature of the subject as he did in *The Administrative State*, got embroiled in controversy, indulged into self-criticism for the discipline, then receded momentarily to other interests in the practice of the profession or whiled away time in standard textbook projects such as in *The Study of Public Administration* (Waldo 1955) and his classic compilation of readings in Public Administration, *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration: A Book of Readings* (Waldo 1953).

After a lull, he started again, infecting other scholars, stimulating them to challenge orthodoxies in the discipline, much as what Simon did with Gulick's principles, and what he (Waldo) in turn did to Simon's logical-positivist construct. Public Administration, in a way, seemed to assume this mood, building knowledge which it would discredit later so that it could shift and find newer insights and outlooks that would nourish its appetite for knowledge.

In the context of the "turbulence" and social unrest that gripped the sixties, Waldo urged a reorientation of the discipline towards policy issues and concerns of a broader nature (Garson and Overman 1983: 58). He urged public administrationists "to be our own political scientists" and to focus on such issues as security, justice, education, science urbanism, and development (Garson and Overman 1983: 58; Waldo 1968b: 17-21).

The New Public Administration Movement: A Season of Grave Happenings and Urgent Problems

In 1968, after a series of popular essays on public organizations, the bureaucracy and Public Administration and culture,¹⁴ and coming at the heels of his strongest assault yet on the discipline, i.e., the "acting like a profession without being one" proposition, Waldo helped sponsor a conference of "young public administrationists" at the Minnowbrook site of the Syracuse University.

The symposium which was funded out of Waldo's Albert Schweitzer Chair in the Humanities at the Maxwell School in Syracuse University gathered together young scholars and practitioners in Public Administration in their "revolutionary thirties" and became later known as the Minnowbrook Conference.

The Conference generated a whole collection of essays that collectively identified what was wrong with the field, what it failed to do, what it was not doing, what its weaknesses were and how it should proceed. It was a powerful sentiment that reflected the dissatisfaction not only on the state of the discipline but on "grave happenings and urgent problems" that pervaded the sixties. The Conference not only raised definitional questions but attempted to overhaul the entire range of premises of the field.

It was a call for a "new Public Administration" and involved such heady and stormy concerns as the relevance of the field to raging problems of society, social change and adaptation of the discipline, the field's scientific and moral authority, as well as nagging questions in normative and empirical theory. Simply stated, "new" Public Administration was visionary, rejecting sacred and cherished values generally upheld in administrative thought, particularly such norms as efficiency, effectiveness and economy which until then served as banner philosophies of the administrative milieu. For "new" P.A., these values merely accentuated the impersonal nature of public organizations, for they attempted to be efficient and effective at the expense of understanding the needs and demands of their target publics. New P.A. also rejected the politics-administration dichotomy which had been a lingering concern among Public Administration scholars. Instead, it offered a whole new array of values which the field needed to embrace — those of relevance, equity, responsiveness and the proposition that Public Administration must not simply operate within the assumptions of a stable environment, but of a volatile, changing one.¹⁵

The "new" Public Administration construct generated controversy, as would be expected. Victor Thompson criticized it as an attempt "to steal the public interest" (Thompson 1975 as cited in Brown and Stillman 1986: 107) while another participant, Michael Harmon, later repudiated it as merely being "symbolic" and did not have as much as any real effects on the direction of the field.¹⁶ New Public Administration seemed to have created more problems than it solved but it more or less served as a statement of concern, a Public Administration manifesto of sorts on what should be addressed in the discipline.¹⁷

Public Administration and the Focus Towards Policy Analysis

Coming from the heels of the turbulent decade of the 1960s, Public Administration shifted its attention to policy issues and concerns. It was a shift dictated by the imperatives of allowing the field to gain a more solid footing on the problematic of policymaking, "to be our own political scientists," as Waldo

prescribed. Public Administration cannot confine itself to the execution of public policy, especially those that must address social issues and problems. It must assume a bigger responsibility than what the politics-administration dichotomy tradition had both prescribed and proscribed. The political orientation of the fifties perhaps served as the foundation for this shift, and by the 1970s, policy analysis "became the single most prevalent catchword and organizing framework for the study of public affairs and administration" (Garson and Overman 1983: 57-58). It became extremely popular because it also drew strength from the social movements of the sixties and the succeeding drive to apply social science knowledge to government.

The trend would continue to the eighties and perhaps to the present day, although a host of other claimants and aspirant propositions such as privatization, total quality management and contracting services would emerge to compete in an increasingly crowded and confused arena of concepts and propositions.

By the early 1990s, such propositions as "reinventing government" (Osborne and Gaebler 1992), which advocate the use of entrepreneurial methods in government programs, would crystallize and aspire to pave their way into becoming part of the "mainstream" doctrine of Public Administration.

Taking Stock of the Past

During the subsequent period following the New Public Administration movement, there emerged serious efforts to chronicle the growth of the discipline by assigning periods or models to describe the thinking that has become pervasive in a particular era. The review of the past and the prospects for the future of the discipline continued to attract scholars if only to account for the landscape of thinking in the field and how it should be shaped.

The study of distinct periods has since become a common preoccupation among American scholars and in a way, expanded the understanding of the heritage and vicissitudes of the field. They provide guidance for those who wish to consider the growth of the field. Nicolas Henry attempted to provide a sketch of the foundations and development by depicting five paradigms in the span from the 1900s to the 1970s, arguing that it is necessary to understand the locus or context of the field and its focus or the content (Henry 1975). He isolated basic periods to which he assigned an identifying label called "paradigms of Public Administration" to interpret the development of thought in the field and to image its direction. Henry's paradigms start with the politics-administration tradition from 1900 to 1926; continues with the principles of administration paradigm from 1927 to 1937; Public Administration as political science in the fifties to the seventies; Public Administration as management science emerging, again in the fifties, and lastly, the emerging paradigm of Public Administration as Public Administration which started, he claimed, in the seventies.

Golembiewski also identified four phases beginning with what he called the "analytic politics-administration" tradition which provided the setting, the stimulus and *raison d'être* for Public Administration study. This was transformed later into a "concrete politics-administration theme" which depicted a sharper and more distinct separation of politics from administration with the emergence of management principles in the 1930s. The third phase covered the science of management tradition which considered values of scientific management, human relations and generic management. The last phase he describes as the public policy approach (Golembiewski 1977).

Similar propositions have likewise been offered by Henderson (1966) and Frederickson (1976a). Earlier, Henderson (1966) also fashioned out an interpretation of the stages of development of academic Public Administration in the United States, with the hope of constructing what he calls as an emerging synthesis of thought in the field. Henderson proposed to analyze the development of the field in three stages, using the Hegelian framework. He suggested that the early strands of thought in the discipline represented a thesis stage which reflected concerns on the structural configurations of public organizations, their functions and processes and somewhat akin to the classical theory of organizations where interests and foci revolve around the confines of the organization; the anti-thesis stage centered on behavioral-environmental concerns evoked perhaps by studies on human relations started by Elton Mayo at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago; and the synthesis stage which focused on the systems model and philosophy.

In 1976, Frederickson considered a similar inquiry to put across the lineage of "new" Public Administration. Frederickson categorized five models of Public Administration which he maintained were the "lineage" of new Public Administration. These models are the classic bureaucratic, the neo-bureaucratic, the institutional, the human relations, and the public choice models (Frederickson 1976b). He assigned normative values for each model and appeared to follow Henderson's typology.

Subsequent literature continued the examination of not only the content and foci of the discipline, but its heritage. Fesler in 1982 extended his review not only on the discipline but of the profession as well. In an edited collection of papers on American administrative thought and practices, he and his contributors looked at the patterns of the past of American administrative thought and practices (Fesler 1982). He justified this preoccupation, as had been stressed in the first Chapter, as "a way of enriching our understanding, not simply in the discovery of "lessons" for present and future practice, but as "a civilizing and liberating influence, reminding us of the profession's roots and its development, identifying the major innovations that led to much that we take for granted, and highlighting problems unsolved then and unsolved now" (Fesler 1982: 2).

In 1984, Rabin and Bowman edited another collection of essays to commemorate the centennial of Woodrow Wilson's contribution to the study of Public Administration. The book, entitled *Politics and Administration: Woodrow Wilson and American Public Administration* (1984) consolidated articles that sought primarily to identify and review the role of Wilson in the development of the discipline, and secondly, to reexamine the roots of the field and, by extension, that of the profession.

In a way therefore, there may be differences in labels, but there appears to be growing consensus on the substance and it is in specific issues where distinctions can be abstracted. Towards the late seventies, the issue of the identity or the intellectual crisis seemed to have declined. This may be suggestive of the possibility that a synthesis may have evolved, as new arenas of concern begin to proliferate, i.e., the quality and direction of research, so much so that definitional questions may seem to have become less disturbing. But, it may also be incubating in the minds of certain scholars, who continue to decry the lack of theoretical development in the field (Daneke 1990).

If one were therefore to characterize the vagaries of American Public Administration thought liberally, it would seem that there is a propensity towards a syndrome of building-up of propositions, soon followed by a season of evaluation and self-criticism, sporadic as they may appear. It engenders initiatives in the development of premises conceptualized and abstracted from the horizons of the profession, or issues intrinsic in the discipline itself, consolidates these, and then subjects them to much scrutiny, examining their relevance and impact on the discipline. The result is that these premises soon serve as inputs to new thinking even if old controversies remain unresolved and shelved for future reference. In essence, there is a sense of history, a regard for the past, and this predisposition provides some continuity serving as it does, as foundations towards understanding the present.

In this sense, Henderson's use of Hegelian dialectics to explain the development of American Public Administration thought appears valid. This bent thus appears to be quite cyclical, a high tide - low tide succession, spiral in movement, with vistas and perspectives broadened with every turn, thesis-anti-thesis dialectics that aspires to provide some sort of synthesis. American scholars may object to this kind of interpretation but this pattern can be viewed as cathartic: the field is opened at a certain period for all sorts of propositions, academic and practical studies, as well as theoretical advocacies which will then be consolidated, analyzed, validated, refuted, upheld or ignored, as some kind of a self-imposed review. There, points of views and controversies on what had been said and done will sprout. This process, though not deliberate, provides the field with some sort of disciplinary memory for future use, providing a stockpile of knowledge that can be used to respond to the difficulties encountered in the contemporary period.

This quality may be manifested for instance in the substance and content of paradigm propositions or issues that have been prominently debated on for years. Paradigmatic labels vary considerably, but substantially, they follow similar thematic lines. While interpretations may differ in terms of assigning nomenclatures to periods of analyses, the typologizations come at some point to a confluence, mainly because they are drawn from the same well-springs. Henry's paradigms, for instance, begins with the politics-administration tradition, proceeds to the principles of management science schools and so on. In the same manner, Henderson and Golembiewski would have the same analysis. And so with Frederickson. The identity crisis has been used by Waldo and Caiden to describe the uncertainty of the discipline's scope, boundaries, methods, etc. Ostrom would say the same thing, but would call it "an intellectual crisis."

Summing Up

What are we then to make of all these perspectives that have developed for over a century? One can see that the legacies are rich, the heritage formidable and the dynamics even more challenging. This passing review aspired to provide the perspectives and foundations which have guided the development of the discipline of Public Administration for over a century.

Stillman offers a handy compendium of what he calls "theoretical images" which is useful and convincing in trying to account for what has been said and done. He points out that three contradictory theoretical approaches appear to have dominated and guided the field. They may be in the order of paradigms, for they have accentuated or continue to accentuate the thinking of a community of scholars even today.

First, is the administrative scientific approach tradition, or what Stillman characterizes as the "one best way" viewpoint highlighted in the works of Taylor (1911), Urwick and Gulick (1937) and similar scholars of the POSDCORB era and subsequent permutations which struggled to find and prescribe that elusive "science of administration" based on a single, specific, and correct view for doing and thinking about public administration (Stillman 1991: 9). This can readily be seen as the perspective of the inward-looking theme of Public Administration where emphasis has been placed on institution-centered concerns focusing on efficiency and effectiveness values of public organizations. They represent the thinking that by improving efficiency and effectiveness in public management, its impact on society can be improved. The focus however has been one that is closed, segmented or compartmentalized into the study of the internal operations of public organizations without significant evaluation of their import or spill-over effects on its clientele.

The second approach is the dualistic vision, or the "dialectical approach" where outcomes are determined by "a continuous clash of polar opposites," as can be seen in the politics-administration tradition, or in Simon's fact-value dichotomy proposition (Simon 1946). Dichotomous perspectives are vividly exemplified by attempts to analyze contradicting perspectives, as the scientific management approach in contrast to the human relations movement, the debate between Simon and Waldo on logical positivism as against post-positivism, or similar studies such as Herzberg's intrinsic-extrinsic model (Herzberg 1968) and Macgregor's theory X-theory Y construct (Macgregor 1960). Like Marxist thinking, this dialectical method approaches the subject through a clash of ideas, and "implicitly or explicitly assumes the ultimate victory of one perspective over another" (Stillman 1991: 11).

Third is the pluralist perspective which views that no one theory or approach is able to realistically represent contemporary administrative thought. This is the "let-a-hundred-flowers-bloom" philosophy where public administration is seen as a loose set of competing ideas, points of views and methodologies. They represent the persuasion that Waldo has so much emphasized, "that we should open upon [public administration] all the windows we can find, that all models and idioms have their virtues - and their vices" (Waldo 1956a: 49). In this category would fall the critical and angry persuasions on the state of the epistemology of the field and the demands for a larger societal perspective of relevance and social consciousness, as represented by new P.A.

Do these form the core theory of Public Administration? Can they be unified and treated as paradigms? Can they cohere and find some confluence as the field endeavors to improve its theoretical lens? What is the approach that we can expect of the future? There are no easy answers, but one thing is assured: Public Administration has exhibited much dynamism, much vigor and energy to the extent that its role in the direction of society cannot be underestimated.

As can be seen, the most striking feature perhaps of contemporary Public Administration thought is continuing intellectual ferment, one that cannot be laid to rest because the problems it seek to address cannot and will never rest. Public Administration evolved in the United States, and even in the Philippines for that matter, at a time of crisis, and therefore has since, thrived on crisis. Its subject matter seems uncertain and problematical today, in much the same way as the profession it studies remains uncertain and problematical. But this certainly sounds unfair to the many generations of scholars who have contributed to what Public Administration has become today.

It is in this light that studies of the formative era have evolved or are evolving, capturing a greater degree of advocacy for the past understanding of what public administration meant. In a sense, this signifies the interest of finding meaning in the issues that still seem relevant today in dated literature, of finding

paradigms, which may not offer ready explanations of distinct phenomena that beguile and intimidate the current generation of scholars, but allows them — us — to organize research, arouse and structure intellectual curiosity and provide an appropriate focus for the discipline (Martin 1993: XII; Janos 1986: 1). The weaknesses of the discipline have become its foremost virtues and strengths, gifting it with much intellectual promiscuity and inquisitiveness, but leaving it fiddling with its own epistemology, hanging and waiting on the roof.

Endnotes

¹Waldo (1948: 24) emphasizes that historically, at least in the United States, public administration has grown in a large part out of the wider field of inquiry, political science.

²Generally, most American academic institutions place Public Administration under Political Science Departments although in the late sixties, several universities have placed the professional curriculum outside of Political Science departments such as those in Harvard, Syracuse, and the University of Southern California. See Robert Presthus *Public Administration*, 6th ed., (1975: 232). See also Rayburn Barton and William L. Chappell, Jr. *Public Administration, The Work of Government* (1985). These authors point out that “[m]ost public administration curricula at the undergraduate level are offered within departments of political science [in the United States] and this pattern is also the most common for masters programs at the graduate level. Within a department of political science, public administration is usually one area of emphasis among several sub-fields of political science.” H. George Frederickson (1976a), these authors cite, claim that “approximately one-third of the master of public administration programs in the United States are offered within departments of political science, ‘the mother discipline of public administration.’” (Barton and Chappell, Jr. 1985: 257).

³We can cite among them Woodrow Wilson who was an instructor of Political Science before becoming President of Princeton University and later the United States, as well as Leonard White, Robert Dahl, Dwight Waldo, Herbert Simon, and Ferrel Heady.

⁴The subject of accountability of leaders has increasingly become a popular theme in the writings of scholars in both Public Administration and Political Science. This of course have been part of the liberal tradition in Political Science. For instance, a classic debate on the subject between Carl J. Friedrich and Herbert Finer reflects a distinct flavor of both Political Science and Public Administration. In this debate, Friedrich, “The Nature of Administrative Responsibility” in Friedrich (ed.) *Public Policy* (1940), argues that administrative responsibility is best assured internally, through professionalization or by the use of professional standards and codes; while Finer “Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government” *Public Administration Review* (1941), maintained that administrative responsibility should be effected externally through legislative and popular controls.

⁵Issues on legitimacy are in the forefront of the concerns of the discipline especially when we refer to Weber’s theory construct on the bureaucracy. Weber’s ideas will be discussed again in Chapter Six.

⁶See for instance such articles as Paul H. Appleby’s “Public Administration and Democracy” in Roscoe Martin (ed.) *Public Administration and Democracy* (1968: 333-347). Many Public Administration textbooks devote a whole chapter on democratic administration, such as for example, Jun Jong, *Public Administration, Design and Problem Solving* (1986).

⁷Again, there is an abundant literature on public policymaking both in Public Administration and in Political Science. In Public Administration, public policymaking generated much attention as early as the fifties in the United States so much so that it has earned for itself the label of “policy

science." This may have been spawned by Herbert Simon's proposition that at the heart of administration is the decisionmaking process. In the seventies, there again was a resurgence of interest on policy science so much that masters degrees in public policy began to be offered in some universities in the United States. The early materials on the subject are those of Carl J. Friedrich and Edward S. Mason (eds.) *Public Policy* (1950); Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell (eds.) *The Policy Sciences* (1951). Significant works also include Charles Lindblom, "The Science of Muddling Through," *Public Administration Review* 19 (Spring, 1959: 79-88); and Yehezkel Dror, *Public Policymaking Reexamined* (1968), and *Design for Policy Sciences* (1971).

⁹The discussion, and debate as to whether Public Administration is art or science is a standard fare in most P.A. literature. See for instance Dwight Waldo, *The Study of Public Administration* (1955: 3); and Jong (1986: 89-90).

⁹These are issues raised by scholars like Vincent Ostrom, *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration* (1974); and Caiden (1971).

¹⁰To be sure, there were already isolated views even earlier which interpreted Public Administration to cover not only the executive branch, but the other two branches as well, the legislative and the judiciary. For instance, in the United Kingdom, F.R.E. Mauldon as early as 1929 pointed out that the "whole field of public administration as a study is very wide" and advocated that other branches of government such as the legislative and the judiciary must be encompassed within its concerns. See Mauldon, "The Purpose of an Institute of Public Administration," *Public Administration* 7, (4) (October 1929: 317-322).

¹¹See the explanations of Daniel W. Martin, *The Guide to the Foundations of Public Administration* (1989: 220). This is indicated in Martin's annotation to Leonard D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (1926).

¹²The synopsis of this debate was mainly pieced out in the interviews with Waldo in Brack Brown and Richard J. Stillman II, *A Search for Public Administration: The Ideas and Career of Dwight Waldo* (1986: 59-60). This book is an extensive series of interviews with Waldo and documents the thoughts and works of this respected scholar. I admit that I am only getting here Waldo's point of view but I would like to believe that his is objective enough to substantiate the purpose of the present discussion. I tried to secure the original papers contained in Dwight Waldo, "The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration" *American Political Science Review* 46 (March-June 1952: 81-103). Unfortunately the UPCPA library has lost the copy, and at the risk of being accused of sloppy research, I readily acknowledge that I am unable to retrieve the citation for Simon's response.

¹³See Thomas Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). An enlarged edition came out in 1970.

¹⁴These articles include such classics as "Organization Theory: An Elephantine Problem," *Public Administration Review* 21 (4) (Autumn 1961: 210-235); "Bureaucracy," *Collier's Encyclopedia* (1962 Edition), IV: 732-739; and "Public Administration and Culture," in Roscoe Martin (ed.) *Public Administration and Democracy* (1965: 39-61).

¹⁵The essays are found in Frank Marini (ed.) *Towards a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective* (1971). It would take a whole Chapter to detail the various propositions and issues raised by "new" Public Administration movement and we admit that our brief discussion does not do justice to the thoughts of the conferees at Minnowbrook.

¹⁶Michael Harmon, "The New Public Administration as Symbol and Sociological Event," a paper prepared for the Annual Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Honolulu, Hawaii, March 1982, as cited in Brown and Stillman (1986: 107).

A review of the Minnowbrook Conference was held twenty years later in 1988 in Minnowbrook but did not seem to have attracted as much attention as the one in 1968. See the collection of essays in *Public Administration Review* 49 (2) (March-April 1989).

References

- Appleby, Paul H.
1968 *Public Administration and Democracy*. In Roscoe Martin, ed. *Public Administration and Democracy*. Syracuse: University of Syracuse Press. 333-347.
- Argyris, Chris
1959 *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper and Row.
1957 *Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between System and the Individual*. New York: Harper.
1953 *Personality Fundamentals for Administrators: An Introduction for the Layman*. New Haven.
- Bailey, Stephen K.
1968 *Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration*. In James C. Charlesworth, ed. *Theory and Practice of Public Administration*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. 128-129.
- Barton, Rayburn and William L. Chappell, Jr.
1985 *Public Administration, The Work of Government*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Bennis, Warren
1969 *Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins and Prospects*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Bozeman, Barry and Jeffrey Strausmann (eds.)
1984 *New Directions in Public Administration*. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Brown, Brack and Richard Stillman II
1986 *A Search for Public Administration: The Ideas and Career of Dwight Waldo*. Texas: A&M University Press.
- Caiden, Gerald E.
1982 *Public Administration*. (2nd ed.). California: Palisades Publishers.
1971 *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice*. California: Palisades Publishers.
- Dahl, Robert
1947 *The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems*. *Public Administration Review*. 7 (1): 1-11.
- Daneke, Gregory A.
1990 *A Science of Public Administration?* *Public Administration Review*. 50 (3) (May-June): 383-392.

- Dimock, Marshall
1937 *The Study of Administration. American Political Science Review.* 31 (February): 28-40.
- Dimock, Marshall, Galdys Ogden Dimock and Douglas Fox
1983 *Public Administration.* (5th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Dror, Yehezkel
1971 *Design for Policy Sciences.* New York: American Elsevier.
1968 *Public Policymaking Reexamined.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Englebert, Ernest A.
1953 *The Content of PAR, 1940-1952. Public Administration Review.* 13(4) (Autumn): 257-260.
- Fesler, James W.
1982 *The Presence of the Administrative Past.* In Fesler, ed. *American Public Administration: Patterns of the Past.* Washington, D.C.: The American Society of Public Administration. 1-27.
- Fesler, James W. and Donald F. Kettl
1991 *The Politics of the Administrative Process.* New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers.
- Finer, Herbert
1941 *Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government. Public Administration Review.* 1 (Summer): 335-350.
- Frederickson, H. George
1976a *Public Administration in the 1970's: Development and Directions. Public Administration Review.* XXXVI (September-October): 564-576.
1976b *The Lineage of New Public Administration. Administration and Society.* (August): 149-174.
- Friedrich, Carl J. and Edward S. Mason (eds.)
1950 *Public Policy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Friedrich, Carl J.
1940 *The Nature of Administrative Responsibility.* In Friedrich and Mason, eds. *Public Policy.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Garland, C. H.
1929 *Some Reflections on Administration. Public Administration.* 7 (1) (January): 43-50.
- Garson, G. David and Samuel Overman
1983 *Public Management Research in the United States.* New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Gaus, J. M.
1950 *Trends in the Theory of Public Administration. Public Administration Review.* 10 (3): 161-168.
1947 *Reflections on Public Administration.* Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Golembiewski, Robert T.
1977 *Public Administration As A Developing Discipline.* Parts 1 and 2. New York: Marcel Dekker.

- Goodnow, Frank J.
1900 *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*. New York: Russel and Russel.
- Gulick, Luther
1955 Next Steps in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 15 (2) (Spring): 73-76.
1937 Science, Values and Public Administration. In Urwick and Gulick, eds. *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration. 191-195.
- Gulick, Luther and Lyndall Urwick (eds.)
1937 *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Harmon, Michael
1982 The New Public Administration as Symbol and Sociological Event. A paper prepared for the Annual Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Honolulu, Hawaii, March.
- Henderson, Keith M.
1966 *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration*. New York: Asia Publishing House.
- Henry, Nicholas
1989 *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
1975 Paradigms of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 35 (July-August): 378-386.
- Herzberg, Frederick
1968 One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*. (January-February): 53-62.
1966 *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: World Publishing Co..
- Hunt, Diana
1989 *Economic Theories of Development*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Janos, Andrew C.
1986 *Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Change*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Jong, Jun
1986 *Public Administration, Design and Problem Solving*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Inc.
- Kettl, Donald F.
1990 The Perils - and Prospects - of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 50 (4) (July-August): 411-419.
- Kuhn, Thomas S.
1970 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- La Porte, Todd
1971 The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Administration. In Marini, ed. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton: Chandler. 17-48.

- Lerner, Daniel and Harold D. Lasswell (eds.)
1951 *The Policy Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles
1959 The Science of Muddling Through. *Public Administration Review*. 19 (Spring): 79-88.
- Litchfield, Edward
1956 Notes on a General Theory of Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1(1) (June): 3-29.
- Martin, Daniel
1993 Foundations of Public Administration: Introduction to the Symposium. *International Journal of Public Administration*. 16 (2) (February): xi-xiv.
1989 *The Guide to the Foundations of Public Administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.).
1988 The Fading Legacy of Woodrow Wilson. *Public Administration Review*. 48 (2) (March-April): 631-636.
- Marx, Fritz Morstein (ed.)
1959 *Elements of Public Administration*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Maslow, Abraham
1954 *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
1959 *New Knowledge in Human Social Values*. Scranton: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Mauldon, F. R. E.
1929 The Purpose of an Institute of Public Administration. *Public Administration*. 7 (4) (October): 317-322.
- Mayo, Elton
1933 *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- McGregor, Douglas
1960 *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merson, F.
1923 Public Administration: A Science. *Public Administration*. 220 (1): 251-265.
- Merton, Robert K.
1949 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
1940 Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. *Social Forces*. 18: 560-568.
- Mosher, Frederick C. (ed.)
1975 *American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
1956 Research in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 16 (Summer): 170-182.
- Mushkin, S.J., F. H. Sandifer and S. F. Milton
1978 *Current Status of Public Management Research Conducted by or Supported by Federal Agencies*. Washington, D.C.: Public Service Lab, Georgetown University.

- Nigro, Felix A. and Lloyd G. Nigro
1977 *Modern Public Administration*. (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Ostrom, Vincent
1974 *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler
1992 *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Ostrom, Vincent and Elinor Ostrom
1971 Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 31 (March/April): 203-216.
- Parsons, Talcott
1937 *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pfiffner, John
1935 *Public Administration*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Presthus, Robert
1975 *Public Administration*. (6th ed.). New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Rabin, Jack and James S. Bowman (eds.)
1984 *Politics and Administration, Woodrow Wilson and American Public Administration*. New York and Basel: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Renwick, Cyril
1944 Public Administration: Towards a Science. *The Australian Quarterly* (March).
- Riggs, Fred W.
1968 Administration and a Changing World Environment. *Public Administration Review*. 28 (4) (July-August): 348-361.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. and W. J. Dickson
1949 *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenbloom, David H.
1986 *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*. New York: Random House.
- Sayre, Wallace
1951 Trends of a Decade of Administration Values. *Public Administration Review*. 11 (Winter): 1-9.
- Selznick, Phillip
1943 An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy. *American Sociological Review*. 8 (February): 47-54.
- Simon, Herbert
1947 *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Process in Administrative Organization*. New York: Macmillan.
1946 The Proverbs of Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 6 (Winter): 53-67.

- Simon, Herbert, D. W. Smithburg and V. A. Thompson
1946 *Public Administration*. New York: Knopf.
- Stene, Edwin O.
1940 An Approach to a Science of Public Administration. *American Political Science Review*. 34 (December): 1124-1137.
- Stein, H.
1952 *Public Administration and Policy Development: A Case Book*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Stillman, Richard II.
1991 *Preface to Public Administration: A Search for Themes and Direction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
1976 *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*. Boston and London: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Taylor, Frederick W.
1911 *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Thompson, Victor
1975 *Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de
1840 *Democracy in America*. Volume 2, as reprinted in 1945, New York: Knopf.
1835 *Democracy in America*. Volume 1, as reprinted in 1945, New York: Knopf.
- Urwick, Lyndall E.
1944 *Elements of Public Administration*. London: Harper and Brothers.
- Urwick, Lyndall E. and Luther H. Gulick
1937 *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.
- Van Riper, Paul
1983 The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders—An Unorthodox View. *Public Administration Review*. 43 (November/December): 477-490.
- Waldo, Dwight
1975 Education for Public Administration in the Seventies. In Mosher, F. C., ed. *American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press. 181-232.
1968a Public Administration. In Marian Irish, ed. *Political Science: Advance of the Discipline*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
1968b Scope and Theory of Public Administration. In J.C. Charlesworth, ed. *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1-26.
1968c The Study of Public Administration. In David Sills, ed. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. 13. New York: Macmillan. 145-155.

- 1968d Public Administration in a Time of Revolutions. *Public Administration Review*. 28 (4) (July-August): 362-368.
- 1965 Public Administration and Culture. In Roscoe Martin, ed. *Public Administration and Democracy*. New York: Syracuse University Press. 39-61.
- 1962 Bureaucracy. *Collier's Encyclopedia*. IV: 732-739
- 1961 Organization Theory: An Elephantine Problem. *Public Administration Review*. 21 (4) (Autumn): 210-235;
- 1956a *Perspectives on Administration*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- 1956b *Political Science in the United States of America*. Paris: UNESCO.
- 1955 *The Study of Public Administration*. New York: Random House.
- 1953 *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration: A Book of Readings*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 1952 The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration. *American Political Science Review*. 46 (March-June): 81-103.
- 1948 *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York: The Ronald Press.

Walker, Harvey

- 1937 *Public Administration in the United States*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

White, Leonard Dupée

- 1955 *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*. (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Willoughby, William F.

- 1927 *The Principles of Public Administration*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- 1923 *The Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- 1919 *An Introduction to the Study of the Government of Modern States*. New York: The Century Co.

Wilson, Woodrow

- 1887 The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly* II (June) as reprinted in Dwight Waldo, ed. (1953). *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book, Inc. 64-75.