

21653

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY:
Considerations on the Theory and the Discipline of
Public Administration

A Ph.D. Thesis Presented

by

Yılmaz Üstüner

21653

to

the Graduate School of Social Sciences
of Middle East Technical University
in Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

June, 1992

21653

I certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of PhD. in Public Administration.

Aykut Polat

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Aykut POLATOĞLU
(Supervisor)

Ümit Berkman

Prof. Dr. Ümit BERKMAN
(Examining Committee
Member)

Süleyman Türkel

Prof. Dr. Süleyman TÜRKEL
(Examining Committee
Member)

Şinasi Aksoy

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Şinasi AKSOY
(Examining Committee
Member)

Raşit Kaya

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Raşit KAYA
(Examining Committee
Member)

Certified that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

Sabri Koç

Prof.Dr. Sabri KOÇ
Director
Institute of Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY:

**Considerations on the Theory and the Discipline of Public
Administration**

ÜSTÜNER, Yılmaz

Ph.D. in Political and Administrative Sciences

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aykut POLATOĞLU

June, 1992, 294 pages

The discipline of public administration lives in a 'crisis of identity'. The dominant paradigms/schools of thought of past and today have not been able to overcome this crisis. One of the reasons of this situation is perhaps the erroneous definition of such a crisis. Prevailing definitions of the crisis usually have 'epistemological nature'. In this study, the definition of crisis is attempted to be based on an 'ontological' nature. In this respect, the objective and the scope of the academic activities should be re-considered. It is claimed that the primary objective for these activities should not be set as giving 'prescriptions' for the 'practitioners' and their particular problems and needs (defined as technology of public administration), but rather, a scientific analysis of 'universal' definitions and explanations of the phenomenon of public administration, being a common experience of contemporary mankind and specific social formations. This is proposed as the main way of overcoming such a crisis.

Keywords: Public Administration, Theory of Public Administration, Identity Crisis in Public Administration, Ontological and Epistemological Re-evaluation of Administration, Methodology of Administration.

Science Code: 217.03.01

ÖZ

KİMLİK ARAYIŞI:

Bir Disiplin Olarak Kamu Yönetimi ve Kuramı

ÜSTÜNER, Yılmaz

Doktora Tezi, Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Aykut POLATOĞLU

Haziran, 1992, 294 sayfa

Kamu Yönetimi disiplininin bir 'kimlik bunalımı' sorunuyla karşı karşıya olduğu söylenilebilir. Geçmişte ve günümüzde etkili olmuş belli başlı yaklaşımlar ve düşünce ekolleri bu sorunun aşılmasını sağlayamamışlardır. Bunun nedenlerinden birisinin sorunun belirli bir biçimde algılanılması ve buna göre tanımlanmasıdır. Varolan tanımların bir çoğu 'epistemolojik' niteliktedir. Bu çalışmada Kamu Yönetimi disiplininin 'kimlik bunalımı' sorunu 'ontolojik' bir sorun olarak algılanmakta ve tanımlanmaktadır. Böyle bir tanımlama ve tanıma bağlı çözüm önerileri bu alandaki akademik etkinliklerin niteliksel ve amaçsal yapılarının yeniden gözden geçirilmesini zorunlu kılmaktadır. Çalışmada bu etkinliklerde birincil belirleyici unsurun, alanın uygulamacılarının sınırlı ve bireysel yönetsel sorunlarına 'çözüm önerileri' ('Kamu Yönetimi Teknolojisi' olarak tanımlanmaktadır) üretmek değil, insanlığın ortak bir toplumsal deneyimi olan kamu yönetimi olgusunun evrensel boyutta bütün yönleriyle incelenmesi, açıklanması ve alternatif deneyim biçimlerinin kurgulanarak geliştirilmesi olduğu tartışılmaktadır. Kimlik bunalımı sorununun çözülmesinde bu tür bir yaklaşımın ilk adım olduğu savunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu Yönetimi, Kamu Yönetimi Kuramı, Kamu Yönetiminde kimlik bunalımı, Yönetimin ontolojik ve epistemolojik yeniden değerlendirilmesi, Yönetim metodolojisi.

Bilim Kodu: 217.03.01

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Aykut Polatođlu and members of the examining board for their invaluable suggestions and critical comments.

I am also greatly indebted to Fahriye Üstüner for all the sharing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	i
CHAPTER 1	
THE CRISIS OF IDENTITY.....	1
The Early Years.....	3
Comparative Administration.....	23
Minnowbrook.....	29
General Evaluation.....	35
CHAPTER 2	
CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:Visioning the Crisis.....	42
After New Public Administration:	
A Search and Crises of Paradigms.....	45
A.VINCENT OSTROM AND DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.....	47
B.GEORGE FREDERICKSON AND CIVISM IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.....	73
Hart's and Ventriss's contribution.....	83
C.PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT: PUBLIC MANAGEMENT APPROACH.....	94
D.MINNOWBROOK REVISITED:MINNOWBROOK II... ..	122
E.CRITICAL THEORY REVISITED.....	134
Dunleavy and O'Leary.....	135
Dunn and Fozouni.....	152
F.THE BLACKSBURG "MANIFESTO".....	179
General Evaluation.....	193
CHAPTER 3	
OVERCOMING THE CRISIS.....	201
A.The Experience of Public Administration.....	202
a.collectivities.....	202
b.social constructs.....	208
c.professionalization.....	212
B.The Academic Activity and Research in Public Administration.....	220
C.Ontological and Epistemological Re- Evaluation of Public Administration....	243
CONCLUSION.....	277
BOOKS AND ARTICLES.....	282

INTRODUCTION

Broadly speaking, there are two main interrelated objectives in this study. The first one is based on the assumption that 'there exists a crisis of 'identity'' in the field of public administration. Relevance of this assumption is going to be examined, in a historical perspective, by evaluating major schools of thought that determine the research agenda. Special emphasis is going to be made on the ways of overcoming such a crisis, as formulated by different schools. The second objective is related with a 're-evaluation' of the major ontological and epistemological issues in the theory of public administration. Without such an analysis, the commonly shared thought of the 'crisis' may neither be diagnosed nor treated. In other words, what this field needs is more studies devoted to its own existence, examining vital questions about its own framework. This study is one of such attempts.

With these main objectives, the first chapter is devoted to what may be called as the 'classical' or 'mainstream' formulations. The reason these are separated from other schools is the assertion that these constituted the basis of this field and become highly influential upon

the following. Recent schools that came after these and which are going to be evaluated in the second chapter, despite their important contributions, were not able to go beyond the borders set by the classical ones. Further, these were away from providing alternatives to the definition of the identity crisis and prescriptions for its treatment.

The third and the last chapter may be evaluated in two parts. In the first part, emphasis is going to be on the 're-definition' of the crisis of identity. This is needed, because our assumption there is today we encounter an 'illusory' definition of crisis, concentrated on the 'methodological' dimension. The main way of overcoming the crisis, as formulated by most of the evaluated schools, is given as 're-definition' of the 'borders', making an 'expert' and 'compartmentalized' field of study. On the contrary, we have the assumption that the 'real' crisis is not an epistemological one like this, but rather, an 'ontological' crisis stemming from the relationship between the practice and theory of public administration. Once the crisis is defined in this fashion, the last section, being the second major part of the third chapter, is devoted to prescriptions on the way to overcome this crisis. The essential argument in this respect is that the 'technique'

or the 'technology of public administration' which is related with the ongoing practice and which has a 'particular' nature should be distinguished from 'public administration as the academic field'. The latter must be at least equally oriented towards the 'philosophy of administration' with 'universal' considerations. This is essential for not only for overcoming today's crisis, but prospecting for, thus, changing the future as well.



CHAPTER 1 THE CRISIS OF IDENTITY

In an article written in 1968, Dwight Waldo, still one of the most quoted and the most quoted figures of public administration wrote about a "crisis of identity for public administration" (Waldo, 1968, 5) According to him this crisis emerged in 1930's, and reached to a peak just after the Second World War. The crisis had two dimensions: the practical and the theoretical. At the practical level whole administrative mechanism was subject to criticism in respect to inadequacy and failure of the methods and principles in coping with dynamically transpiring various social problems. The existing methods and principles of administration meant the POSDCORB or shortly, the 'principles'. Broadly speaking, the propositions of the structuralist school not only were considered as inadequate in providing solutions but even provoking the emergence of certain organizational and social problems. At the theoretical level, hitherto dominant 'science of administration' thesis had also become the target of criticisms by the birth of "intellectual challenges". Challenge was oriented towards 'claim for science', probably as a result of 'incompatibility', that is, incompatibility with a certain definition of 'science'. As a result of these developments:

"The effect of the complex new tasks plus the critical attacks was to create a crisis of identity for public administration. Both the nature and boundaries of subject matter and the methods of studying and teaching this subject matter became problematical." (Waldo, 1968, 5)

Waldo further noted that after two decades this crisis had not been resolved satisfactorily. According to him, it was the evidence of the crisis that it was almost impossible to say "what public administration is", "why we should study it" and "what are its methods and tools". So identity crisis as formulated by Waldo is essentially an epistemological problem. The definition of the subject matter and the ways to study or understand it are very ambiguous. This is of course a relevant and adequate justification for the claims about the existence of such a crisis.

This way of understanding a crisis of identity for public administration is common for many theoreticians of the field. In this first chapter of the study, the main objective is going to be to discuss and argue two observations. First, I shall try to show that the current crisis of identity for public administration is not temporally bounded. Second, despite the apparent differences among different manifestations of the crisis, there is what may be called as a 'unilinear' understanding or conceptualiza-

tion. Our search will continue in the next chapter with the evaluation of contemporary approaches. In the third chapter, the argument is going to be the irrelevancy of such an understanding of crisis situation and the difficulties of overcoming it once identified in that fashion. Along with this argument, the third chapter will also be examining some crucial and critical points that should be evaluated and taken into account on the way to overcome this 'problem' of the discipline of public administration.

The Early Years

The 'official' emergence of the discipline of public administration goes back to the beginning of this century. Max Weber, Frederick Taylor and Woodrow Wilson were three important persons involved in the genesis. It is interesting to note that, despite the difficulty of identifying the emergence of any discipline with a single event or a definite point, there exists a consensus among theoreticians upon the official birth of public administration: Woodrow Wilson's efforts to establish it. It is just at this point that one may trace back the existence of the identity crisis for public administration (despite Waldo's claim that it was a product of post second world war period). (Waldo, *ibid.*)

Wilson's famous article printed in Public Administration Review in 1887 (Wilson, 1887, 3) is a highly influential one. From time to time one may find its 're-reading' or 're-analysis' in the literature.¹

The importance of Wilson's essay from our point of consideration is its being an attempt of justification for the claim that field of public administration was something different from political science and issues of law. Awareness of this need for justification is itself another evidence of the existence of an identity crisis. It may be soundly claimed that the emergence of public administration as a discipline is strongly associated with a claim for determination of its boundaries. As it will be further stressed in this study, 'claim for boundary' or the 'boundary problem' is a solid indicator of the existence of such a crisis.

¹ One of the interesting examples is after approximately 100 years, the argument that "The field of administration is a field of business" (Wilson, 1887, 5) has been used for justifying the view that public administration is not something different than 'public management' (Perry and Kraemer, 1983, 1). The second interesting note about this article is that there are differences in the reprinted forms. In Perry and Kraemer's (Perry and Kraemer, 1983) and Shafritz and Hyde's (Shafritz and Hyde, 1978) versions the differences may be easily noticed. This is perhaps because of the fact that due to wide influence of the article among the theoreticians it became a common way to 'interpret' it so as to find grounds to support various opinions by emphasizing various parts of it.

Among the various paradigms or perspectives of public administration theory the structuralist school that came with the genesis seems to be the least problematic one about the crisis of identity. It should be immediately mentioned that this does not mean the structuralist school was able to overcome this crisis. The point is that 'crisis' was not the primary concern for this school. Under Weber, Taylor and Wilson's influence theoreticians of this school took it as given that public administration had a definite identity of its own. Wilson set the tone that it was different from politics and the law, once the 'locus' was set, it was the time for the 'focus'. The focus was not a difficult problem to cope with since Weber and Taylor had already offered the grounds. The key word was the 'organization', which was taken as the most important, if not the core aspect of public administration and this helped to overcome the boundary problem up to a certain degree. As the main concern of this task was to differentiate the field from the political science and law, organizational studies were helpful when linked with Taylor's claim for 'scientific management'. Scientific management was a form of 'social engineering' oriented to find the most efficient and the effective way of 'organizing' the collectivities. It provided in return, 'the principles of administration'. 'Science' was the

magic word to solve the identity problem in one sense since:

"Through science and the scientific spirit man has freed himself, at least in his material existence, from the complete domination from habit." (Gulick, 1928, 101)

Making an analogy, science could 'free' public administration from the complete domination of other fields. This is because, being a 'science' meant after all a pre-defined 'object of study' along with methodology to cope with it and the 'scientific community' to 'own' it. It should be added that the conceptualization of science was very similar to 'science of the nature' with its determination, both for the ontological and the epistemological levels. In other words, it was an attempt to apply, if not to use, the positivist, determinist and empirical method of the natural sciences for inquiry of social 'events'. A seemingly obvious solution to the identity crisis but, perhaps, after a certain time period, only toughens the validity of the claims that the crisis problem still holds.

With the advent of economic and social crises of late 1920's and 1930's the structuralist school was seriously criticized for its being inadequate in explaining and solving these crises. The conceptualization of administra-

tion as a 'science' and the rationality of 'one best way' were heavily attacked mainly from two angles. First, developments in psychology and social-psychology, specifically initiated by a number of empirical studies such as Elton Mayo's Philadelphia Textile Mill and Western Electric Company research brought forward another type of crisis of identity. Second, beyond the organizational perspective, theoreticians of public administration such as Simon and Dahl heavily criticized the structuralist school and its contributions to the theory.

In terms of the first aspect above, the crisis of identity showed itself as an incompatibility problem. Critics claimed that the structure of the organization just like its theory, was so determinist, consistent and rational that they neither fit into the 'real' conditions of work nor explained it relevantly. The important point to mention here is the identity crisis was not in the form of the 'boundary' problem there, but rather it was associated with the 'content'. Put in other words, since the locus of public administration was taken for granted, rarely questioned, it was the focus itself that was thought to cause the crisis. This is perhaps one of the most important reasons that the human relations perspective when attempting to replace the structuralist school was not able to overcome the crisis. It was a mere attempt

of shift in the content or the form, without questioning for example, the 'concept' and the practice of 'organizations'. Organizations were also taken as 'given', only the focus was to be changed. This would mean to try to find a new answer to the old problem: to increase the efficiency and the effectiveness (although differently defined this time: to be able to reproduce the system in a different manner following serious crises).

The second aspect of criticisms towards the structuralist school is somehow more important for the scope of this study. In this aspect, the criticisms were directed towards the theoretical stances of this school and the assumption that public administration was a distinct field. Two major examples are articles written by two prominent figures of this field; Herbert Simon (Simon, 1946) and Robert Dahl (Dahl, 1947).

Herbert Simon is more famous for his contributions to the theory of organizations. However, he is also a very important contributor to the discipline of public administration as a whole. In this respect, the article he wrote in 1946, titled "The Proverbs of Administration" (Simon, 1946) contained serious critique of both the structuralist school and the public administration as the discipline as formulated by the 'founding fathers'. His criticisms to-

ward the structuralist school were centered on questioning the validity of the 'administrative principles'. According to him those principles always came in "mutually contradictory pairs" and as a result of this;

"For almost every principle one can find an equally plausible and acceptable contradictory principle" (Simon, 1946, 107)

Simon took some of the principles of administration of the structuralist school, such as the ones related with 'specialization', 'unity of command', 'span of control' and 'centralization versus decentralization' and tried to show one by one that these were neither relevant nor valid. What's more, he stated that some of these principles were contradicting each other such as the case of 'specialization' versus 'efficiency' or 'unity of command' versus 'specialization'. He argued that those principles were neither consistent nor scientific, they were only results of 'armchair speculation' that could be reached by anybody using his or her intellect rationally. This was why perhaps, he entitled his article as the "proverbs of administration". As it is generally known, proverbs are mostly intuitive and do not always necessarily be internally consistent.

Simon's criticisms toward the existing conditions of the discipline of public administration started at that point. According to him it was very difficult to talk about the existence of a 'true' science of administration. Reason for this was not the case that administrative matters were not amenable to scientific treatment. On the contrary, there could be a science of administration if the meaning of the science was to be understood differently, (different especially from the way it was defined by the classical school). Simon stated that even though the classical school was built upon the concept of 'scientific management', neither the principles laid by it nor the methods they utilized were scientific, despite the persistent claims in the opposite direction. For him; "before a science can develop principles, it must possess concepts." (Simon, 1946, 116) This point gives us the first clue for understanding his meaning of a 'true' scientific method. Following the positivist-empiricist tradition he accepted that 'organization' being the basic unit of analysis the 'scientist' had to utilize the ways and methods of natural sciences. Starting by the 'concept definitions', then making the 'measurement', continuing with other techniques of 'observation' to reach to general conclusions, if not 'universal laws' of the science of administration. Obviously, these were to be devoid of values and other forms of intuition (unfortunately, as often done

in the classical school). Therefore, for Simon there was not a single problem with the structuralist school when it declared (especially Taylor, Gulick, Urwick and Wilson) that there could be a separate discipline of administration in general, public administration in particular, using the method of natural sciences. It was only a difference of the conceptualization and mere 'application' of that method, not the content of the method itself. Simon's own education and career may have played an important role on this point².

Just like other theoreticians discussed in this section, Simon also believed in what may be called a "social engineering". This meant application of the philosophy and methodology of natural sciences onto social events as a potential way to overcome the 'identity crisis' of administration. Our assertion that such a perspective makes it difficult to overcome the crisis of identity in public administration will be discussed in the final chapter of this study. For the neo-classical school of administration

² Herbert Simon is famous not only for his administrative-organizational studies, but also in fields like mathematics, computer science and economics in which, in 1978 he won a Nobel prize. The following quotation further supports this point "(Simon)...has maintained memberships in professional associations in the fields of political science, economics, psychology, sociology, computer science, management sciences and philosophy...is a man of catholic interests and a "social scientist" in the truest sense of the term" (Fry, 1989, 184)

this 'social engineering' problem was extremely important because we find that not only Simon but others like Mayo and Follett also discussed and defended it. Mayo, stressed that as a result of developments in science and technology 'natural skills' of men (mastery over nature and natural events) have developed considerably. However the same was not true for "social skills" (mastery over social events, by explaining and prescribing them). In the event of this, what a social "scientist" had to do was to try to develop these skills with the guidance of the "scientific method". However at this point Mayo, Simon and other members of the neo-classical school had to encounter a crucial and inevitable problem. The empiricist-positivist tradition that they commonly admired was essentially based on a sense and quantification problem. Whereas it is generally convenient for the objects of the nature, inconvenient for the objects of social relations. To be able to overcome this epistemological problem the neo-classical school had to (and they did so in reality) concentrate on a unit of analysis that was suitable for sensing and quantification: the human 'behavior'. Human behavior (whatever its direction and shape) was taken as a positive phenomenon in the sense that it was observable and even 'measurable'. Perhaps with the motivation of the idea that it also may be 'generalized', then came the 'flood' of psychological and social psychological studies (if not 'experiments').

Elton Mayo was one of the pioneers of this and especially as a result of popular 'Hawthorne experiments' (1927-1932) and his studies in "The Philadelphia Textile Mill" (1923) many researchers were influenced and tried to carry on with these types of work. Thus, it may be sound to claim that whereas Simon and Follett contributed to the philosophy of this new tradition, Mayo constituted the grounds for 'empirical' dimension and opened new horizons in that respect.

The position and contributions of Mary Parker Follett deserve separate analysis. Mary Parker Follett was an American woman who lived between 1868 and 1933. She was critical towards the scientific management movement and she built this upon a certain understanding of 'social change'. Scientific management by trying to find 'the best' method of doing a job was disregarding a very important dimension: the fact of change and social change. Something 'best' for today may not be the best for tomorrow. Everything is constantly changing, as a result of which, universal generalizations (or things like administrative principles) may be correct for one moment, but subject to change in the next. When something is created it "is forever and forever being left behind us" (Follett, 1923, 98) But according to her one thing was not changing easily: dynamics of human relations. When two persons get

into a relation, they obtain a new identity in themselves and also generate a new and usually completely different one. This is one of the reasons perhaps why she was completely against the notion of 'expertise' and/or specialization. One may never speak about an expert of a field (or virtually anything), since his or her expertise would mean nothing in itself. The knowledge should be 'shared' (or interacted) as a result of which, probably, it will take a new form. If we have to extend this philosophy to organizational life, first it would be very difficult to overcome the crisis of identity by simply establishing a "science" of administration as proposed by previously mentioned theoreticians. Second, organizational life is so relativistic that it would be impossible to universalize. Each organization (which is accepted by her as a useful thing for common purpose and progress of human beings) together with its members, is a whole and it is the individuals (and their interactions) who constitute an organization. It is not the structure and the associated principles. All these make one to think that Follett had a critical standpoint that was never radical. She made important contributions to administrative matters especially in respect to her denial of existence of administrative principles and rejection of a sort of 'administrative expertise'. This view may be extended to the point that attempts of finding, if not discovering universal guides and

recipes for organizational life are not fruitful. This is an important aspect of identity crisis in public administration and will be subject to further discussion in the final chapter of this study. For our purpose now it is sufficient to state that despite her major contributions she was not also able to solve the crisis. This is perhaps because of the fact that her standpoint, just like that of the neo-classical school of organizations, was far away from providing a radical point of view (if not a 'shift of paradigm') to the original problem it posed: what should be the epistemological aspects of administration. Simon and forthcoming 'behavioralist school' found (or thought to find) the answer in 'scientific analysis' (with the unit of analysis of human behavior inside the organizations). This meant not altering but perhaps just expanding their predecessors. Follett thought the answer could not be provided by the 'scientific method', but only as a result of human interaction, naturally, within the same, predefined organizational borders.

. In 1947, Robert Dahl through a highly influential article published in the 'Public Administration Review' participated in the efforts to 'give' an 'identity' to administration in general, public administration in particular. (Dahl, 1947) He was probably cognizant of writings of Simon, Follett and Mayo and this is apparent in his pref-

erence to follow a very similar path: He was also against the 'principles' of administration thesis. He started by criticizing the conventional understanding of 'science' as applied to public administration:

"The effort to create a science of public administration has often led to the formulation of universal laws or, more commonly, to the assertion that such universal laws could be formulated for public administration"(Dahl, 1947, 122)

Due to 'universalization' attempt common in the sciences, Dahl stated that this was a fruitless effort to apply the method of natural sciences to the administrative issues. Accomplishment of this objective would give an identity to public administration: a 'science'. This would mean, of course, a solution to the crisis of identity. However Dahl was against this kind of a solution.³

According to him three important points make this thesis irrelevant: a)normative values, b)human behavior c)the social setting. These three problems if not 'obstacles'

³ He was even against a variant of this thesis which asserted that principles would not come to mean 'universalization'. In a broad framework principles of administration could be established without any universality, always taking into consideration the varieties (perhaps due to spatial and temporal locations). He called this view as "surely more modest assessment"(Dahl, 1947, 123) but stated that it would not be an answer to the problem as well.

also guided us to the establishment of 'real' science of administration. Put in other words, a science of administration had to tackle with and also find answers to these problematical issues. Public administration should consider normative values: It is false to assume that the practice of public administration (perhaps as a result of the 'neutral state above the society thesis') continued in a 'value-free' environment and that public administrators were impartial. Related with this, it is also false to assume that theoreticians of public administration (perhaps being a result of the understanding that science as an 'objective' activity and the scientist being impartial) live with a value-free state of mind. Public administration should also take into consideration the study of "certain aspects of human behavior". At the final analysis both the state and its environment is composed of individuals. Dealing with organizations means dealing with human beings both as the members and the clients. However, Dahl stated that this was a very difficult task. The field of psychology could help us but there was a substantial difference between psychology and public administration:

"What marks off the field of public administration from psychology or sociology or political institutions is its concern with human behavior in the area of services performed by governmental activities" (Dahl, 1947, 126)

This quotation along with being a good example of an indicator of the identity crisis in public administration also indicates its dependence of and independence from other branches of social science. Public administration is dependent on other branches because of the fact that it is yet another aspect of 'human interaction'. It is at the same time independent, in the sense that since its own borders are determined and has its own identity, it should develop its own inquiry. This problematic also will be further discussed in the third chapter. However it should be stated at this point that this kind of 'independence from other fields of inquiry is highly problematic in itself. There is, at least theoretically, no exact 'location' for its independence. In other words, psychology, sociology, political science and the other fields also should be integrated into it. If we take into consideration the magnitude of the existence and permeation of the state in contemporary societies the interventionist nature in almost all aspects of social life, a 'science of public administration' has to include almost all branches of sciences even including the natural sciences. The state intervenes into almost all aspects of individual life and the public administrator plays a crucial role in the intervention process. Can the 'independence be easily maintained under this circumstance? Second, 'compartmentalization of sciences in this way will only

create further problems. For instance if we say that 'psychology' is the 'compartment' in 'charge' of making inquiry of human behavior, will a topic like 'organizational psychology' be the major concern of psychology or administration? Human beings, as they 'enter' the organizations do not leave their psychological characteristics aside and bear or use a set of different characteristics (or roles) peculiar to the organizational life. The structure (of the organization) naturally effects this individuality but this does not mean that we have a different identity, different in important aspects. He or she is the same person coming to the organization with his or her own personality shaped and formed by the conditions of the society at large. Organizations should not be conceived as stages in which members are actors playing their organizational roles. Therefore not the organizational roles that make up the organizations but individual personalities located within organizations should constitute the unit of analysis in this respect. Under these circumstances, the 'artificial' and strict separation or compartmentalization of aspects of individuals and the inquiry of these will bring important epistemological problems and strains. Contrary to Dahl's statement, view that public administration having a concern with human behavior in the area of services performed by governmental activities, does not give us sufficient condition to talk about

a justification that field of public administration marks itself off from those fields. These points and the need for not formulating this matter in this fashion, rather defining the 'crisis' differently will be discussed later.

The last 'obstacle' mentioned by Dahl was the 'social setting'. By the term social setting he meant different and unique environments of administrative systems in different parts of the world. Their existence is a potential threat for the relevancy of universalization and setting up principles. At the same time it showed everybody that there was a need for carrying out 'comparative' studies of public administration. In an effort to support this view empirically, Dahl discussed the differences between English and American 'administrative classes' and how this was reflected upon systems of administration of both countries. As a result of this he stated that:

"Generalizations derived from the operation of public administration in the environment of one nation-state cannot be universalized and applied to public administration in a different environment" (Dahl, 1947, 132)

The result Dahl derived was that "we are a long way from a science of public administration" (ibid,133). This constituted another manifestation of the existence of 'identity crisis in public administration'. When we come

to his way of answering the problem three things may be taken into consideration; a-that the science of public administration cannot and should not neglect "the place of normative values", b-that it cannot and should not neglect the factor of "nature of man", especially predicting his conduct in public administration and, c-that the knowledge accumulation in this field should be richened by carrying out 'comparative' studies in order to be able to establish principles "and generalities that transcend national boundaries and peculiar historical experiences" (ibid, 133)

In Dahl's analysis it is possible to see common themes of criticisms oriented towards structuralist school as well as the common problems of the critics. Just like Simon, Mayo and Follett he was also against formulating principles. However, he also inevitably faced a common problematic: universalization problem. The definition of the concept of science becomes important here. If the concept of science is understood as something akin to natural sciences including its methodology and products, then universalization is an inevitable and indispensable end-product. If making universalizations (principles) in a science of administration is extremely difficult due to reasons mentioned earlier, then how to cope with this problem? For Mary Parker Follett this was not a problem at all because

she denied the existence of principles from an ontological standpoint. She was critical towards the conventional understanding of science applied to social events, an object of study that is extremely dynamic, unpredictable and relativistic due to the nature of its creator: the human being. However, Dahl was not in the same standpoint. For him the problem of science was not an ontological one but an epistemological one. Through the article one cannot see any investigation or questioning on the existence and necessity of 'science'. On the contrary, whole article is devoted to developing a 'science of administration'. The basic problem then, from the epistemological standpoint, is how to do this or how to solve the crisis of identity. Herbert Simon was also in a similar position. His criticisms towards principles were not because he was against setting principles, but he thought principles of the classical school did not have internal consistency and that they were mere products of "armchair speculation". Simon thought the solution would be studying human behavior, especially at the moment of decision making since he identified organizational life with the cognitive act of decision taking. This opened the door and guiding the positivist-empiricist neo classical school. Dahl did the same only with the difference of extending the unit of analysis from micro to macro, from individual to the environment, thus opening the door and guiding the 'comparative admin-

istration school'. The result was more or less the same: that administrative affairs can be treated by the utility of conventional understanding of science. This means that we can have a distinct field of administration similar to many other branches of social sciences. He criticized principles (macro approach) and preferred comparative organizational studies each considering peculiarities unique to that organization (micro approach), doing all this without leaving aside the need and necessity of a science of administration (back to macro approach). As his epistemological position (just like the previous theoreticians) could not break this circle, despite his important contributions to the field, he was not able to provide a relevant and realistic solution to identity crisis, only reproducing it again at a different level this time. Rather than questioning the upper level problematic itself (at the ontological level), he preferred to question the content (at the epistemological level) and as a natural outcome of this, the existence of the crisis (at the theoretical level) continued.

Comparative Administration

Ferrel Heady, a prominent figure of the 'comparative public administration school' in his famous book titled 'Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective' (Heady,

1979) emphasized the importance of Dahl's article as follows:

"Those who are attempting to construct a science of administration recognize that this depends, among other things, on success in establishing propositions about administrative behavior which transcend national borders. This requirement was pointed out by Robert Dahl in his influential essay, "The Science of Public Administration". (Heady, 1979, 4)

Three points should be underlined in the above quotation. First "success in establishing propositions" meant another claim for the "science of administration". Second, those propositions to be "about administrative behavior" to mean the neo-classical approach should not be abandoned. Third, "transcending national borders" to mean having a comparative perspective, getting to know other cultures. Three points well summarize the position of the comparative school that was to emerge in the history of discipline of public administration.

The comparative administration school was very influential during 1950's. In my opinion, the importance of this school comes from the fact that from the epistemological point it was crucially different from previous schools. The difference is related with conceptualization of the unit of analysis. Both the classical and neoclas-

'organization' as the main unit of analysis. For the majority of the theorists in those traditions, administrative analysis meant an analysis of organizational life from different angles. This created an advantage for the attempts to establish a science of administration. After all, this meant a definite borderline that was extremely important for a definite science. It was not the "locus" problem since the concept of 'organization' was providing a ground for overcoming it. However it was the "focus" problem that mattered and, from school to school that varied. The comparative administration school helped to go beyond this analysis, at least its research findings showed and prompt the theoreticians towards this direction. Of course, this does not mean that there were theoreticians who kept their units of analysis within organizational borders. On the contrary, especially with the influence of 'systems approach' that was imported from biology to social realm and continued influence of neoclassical school along with the rhetoric of 'administrative behavior', the comparative analysis continued. The influence of the systems approach and administrative behavior may be considered as one road of the comparative administration school and may be found in the works of theoreticians like Heady, Riggs, Meyer, Presthus and Braibanti. However the other 'road' was more influential and that road meant and prompt in the change of the unit of analysis. There, com-

parative administration was associated with the modernization school.

The need for a change of the unit of analysis emerged when the dimension of modernity was added to the comparative analysis. The dichotomy of modern/traditional covers more than 'sub-systems' of societal life like organizations and/or administrative practices. It is a higher level discourse to include the total way of living. Put in other words, the reasons for organizational and administrative systems to become and remain traditional may not be explained only by using intra-organizational variables. The causality goes usually in the opposite direction, that is, the traditional society causes the traditional sub-systems. When this is the case, for most of the administrative analysis the subject is not limited by narrow borders:

"The way forward was this. Using the concepts of the sociologists Talcott Parsons and Marion Levy, the new wave of comparative politics scholars began to study not political institutions (administrative and organizational ones may also be included) but societies or 'cultures'-wholes made up of parts kept together by mutually beneficial interaction" (Dunshire, 1973, 137) stress mine)

Despite its utilization of broad approach the comparative public administration school was not also be able to

provide an adequate solution for the identity problem. In my opinion, there are two main reasons for this. First, most of the studies remained at descriptive level. Efforts were usually oriented towards 'discovering' the differences between modern and traditional administrative systems in respect to aspects like bureaucracy, organizational structuring, links between political power and administration and administrative behavior. Since the research findings were rarely associated with theory through time, people began asking questions like:

"What is the subject of this field? Is it comparison per se? If so, does comparison imply similarities or differences or both? What is the purpose of the field - to increase rationality in American technical assistance programs: to understand why administrators behave as they do in different cultural settings: to describe the variety of administrative laws, rules, regulations around the world: to find a language about administration that it enables one to talk in the language used by modern American social science or what? If the field has more than one purpose, has the relationship between the purposes been adequately articulated?

Is this a scholarly or professional field-and is such a distinction valid? Is it both?" (Heaphey, 1968, 248)

This quotation is another manifestation of the existence of an identity crisis in public administration that still continued following the comparative administration movement.

The second reason of this school's failure to overcome the crisis is perhaps its being too much 'ethnocentric' in nature. This is inherent in modernization thesis. Prescriptions for modernization, by definition, are inevitably ethnocentric. The concrete definition of modernity is identical to the existing structuring of the modern or developed societies. Since it is a 'unilinear' development, the direction as well as the target is evident: follow a determined path to reach there. The path is the one once followed by the modern. When this is the case, despite the fact that the unit of analysis became relatively larger with the introduction of comparison at a higher level, the object of study remained bounded. It was bounded with specific administrative experience and fruitless attempts to universalize these. Therefore Keith Henderson was realistic when he wrote that: "1. Public Administration as an academic field is undergoing a serious identity crisis of its own", but unfortunately he was so unrealistic as he continued: "2. Comparative Public Administration reflects an intellectual rigor lacking in the broader field..."(Henderson, 1971, 245). Perhaps the 'rigor' existed, but its direction was uncertain.

Minnowbrook

In 1968, the convention of "young Public Administrationists" (Waldo, 1971, xii) in Syracuse University marked the emergence of a "new school" in the discipline of public administration. A general evaluation of this school reveals that as a whole, its members agreed on the existence of an identity crisis in public administration. In fact, the propositions of this school constituted an attempt to solve this common problem. The existence (and acceptance) of the identity crisis may be best exemplified by Larry Kirkhart's article.

In order to show the existence and the importance of such a crisis Kirkhart wrote:

"There are few problems in Public Administration more difficult to cope with than the question of what Public Administration is and where it fits into the theoretical landscape of social science. This problem is particularly acute because one of the most striking features of Public Administration is its lack of conceptual boundaries." (Kirkhart, 1971, 128)

According to him the crisis of identity is more acute in respect to the problem of "conceptual boundaries". Kirkhart thought that the boundary problem could be solved by the importation and adaptation of developments

in other fields, especially in sociology. He stressed the potential that lies within a "newly emerging" perspective, that was "phenomenology". Edmund Husserl, a member of the phenomenology school criticized the earlier logical positivist tradition on the grounds that there existed an "objective sense data" that could be explained rationally and subject to conventional "scientific treatment". Contrary to this point, Husserl thought that if there exists any determination at all, it is not related with the object of inquiry but the inquirer, i. e. the subject and his or her ideas. He "argued that only ideas can have certainty; facts are always contingent" (ibid., 135). If this is correct, scientific inquiry primarily should be oriented towards the subject, or the "consciousness".

Kirkhart did not try to elaborate in detail what phenomenology and existentialism could bring to the theory of administration. He emphasized the contributions of theoreticians who remained within that tradition and mentioned the works of Husserl, Colin Wilson, Gurvitch, Schutz (ibid., pp. 134-142) and indicated that "changes in social sciences—assuming that the phenomenological and existential influences actually represent potential changes—will have implications for organizational theory"(ibid p. 143.). In fact, this epistemological position well de-

scribes the whole New Public Administration School: critical to the existing theory, wishful for the future.

New Public Administration school reflected the conditions that prevailed at the time of its birth. It was a critical as well as a normative formulation. The critical position had its both macro and micro levels. At the macro level the international politics and foreign policy of the United States that resulted in painful Viet-Nam War was crucial. Criticisms toward the policy and the war gained momentum in academic circles;

"Their assessment of what was happening in Viet-Nam received widespread support in academic circles, and college campuses became centers of antiwar sentiment. From the early 1960s through about 1966 most opposition of the war was largely confined to campuses. During the last years of the decade, however, people from all segments of society actively opposed the war. The antiwar movement had become a mass movement." (Hunt, 1978, 140)

This movement may be considered as a reflection of these conditions and mood to the field of public administration. The demand was from the state and the message was very clear: turn your attention away from the world and strictly pursuing American interests abroad (which brought undesired results) to internal problems of the country:

"People were weary of social conflict and hopeful that a peaceful, tranquil mood would come to prevail in United States. The Watergate revelations and subsequent disclosures of widespread, illegal operations of the American CIA and FBI showed Americans how far their government would go to crush political criticism at home and to maintain the world-wide American empire." (ibid., 154)

At the micro level, this normative mood was extended to reformulate the practice and theory of public administration. First, for both realms, the politics-administration dichotomy, which was strictly proposed by defenders of 'administrative science' thesis was rejected. Despite the acceptance that the state apparatus was a technical structure it was not conceived outside the politics. Public administration had its political mission: to maintain the social equity. The power of its 'autonomy' came from both its political mission as such and its 'technical expertise'.

It is interesting to note that in New Public Administration school this normative-critical attitude was directed towards many established 'classical' practices and structures of the society. For example Frederickson thought that the experience of 'pluralism' was one of the main sources that resulted in 'inequality'. A pluralistic government usually favours a certain segment of the society. This segment is generally called by members of this school as "specialized minority clientele" (Frederickson,

1971, 311) However the point of interest of this school was not on these segments but the others that were not favoured. They were the groups lacking economic and political resources or again as commonly called by this school, the minority groups. The existence of such groups redefines the (normative) political mission of the public administration:

"A Public Administration which fails to work for changes which try to redress this deprivation of minorities will likely be eventually used to repress those minorities"
(Frederickson, *ibid.*, 311)

Despite this criticism of pluralism and reformulation of the position of public administration, one may generally consider this school as 'theoretically conservative'. Conservatism comes from the fact that the theory of administration in its classical-rational form was almost never questioned. It was not the inner mechanism of the administrative apparatus that made the unfavored social inequality real: it was the social-political system of the whole society. The point of interest was on the political structuring, not the generator but the generated. When this was the case, it is very difficult for us to consider this as a 'radical' school. There was a chance for this, the political objectives were (attempted) to be reformulated, so could be the theory of administration, but this was never

realized. This is perhaps most decidedly expressed by Frederickson himself:

" The rationale for Public Administration is almost always better (more efficient and economical) management. New Public Administration adds social equity to the classical objectives and rationale". (Frederickson, *ibid.*, 311, (original stress))

That original stress (of more efficient and economical management) reveals us the problem with this perspective. An identity crisis was assumed, a reformulation was attempted, but unfortunately, the basis for this crisis was reproduced. It was thought that the classical public administration theory was relevant. At least it showed us the institutionalization process of public administration. This is why perhaps Kirkhart, as mentioned earlier, thought new developments in social sciences could lead to developments in administrative science, but ended up by discussing Max Weber and merits of his classical theory in seventeen pages. (Kirkhart, 1971, pp. 145-162) The conformity of this school with the classical formulation is further revealed in the following quotation:

"The last generation of students of Public Administration generally accept both Simon's logical positivism and his call for empirically based organization theory....New Public Administration advocates what could be best described as "second-generation behavioralism". Unlike his progenitor, the second generation

behavioralist emphasizes the public part of the administration. He accepts the importance of understanding as scientifically as possible how and why organizations behave as they do but he tends to be rather more interested in the impact of that organization on its clientele and vice versa." (Frederickson, op.cit., 315)

If the roots of the crisis was seen in the 'first generation behavioralism', its reproduction as the 'second generation' only by 'refocusing' the content (an epistemological problem) without questioning the object itself (an ontological problem) was, unfortunately, inevitable.

General Evaluation

The chronological - analytical evaluation of early schools of thought in public administration ends here. The indicators of the omnipresent crisis of identity as well as attempts to overcome naturally continued after the New Public Administration. As these constitute the contemporary status and knowledge accumulation of the discipline of public administration, these will be analyzed separately and in detail. The contemporary theories constitute the content of the second chapter. However, before closing this one, a general evaluation should be made. Foregoing analysis reveals that when we evaluate paradigms/schools of thought and/or individual theories of public administration from the methodological point of view, we find holistic formulations as well as atomistic ones simultaneously. These are holistic in the sense that they repre-

sented unified bodies of thought and were developed accordingly. In other words, different schools constituted relevant examples of what Thomas Kuhn called "normal science" if not "paradigms". (Kuhn, 1970, 10)⁴ They express a totality and an internal containment in this respect. They are also atomistic to mean that if we take the concept and practice of administration as a generic process experienced in almost all human societies in different forms, then at the theoretical level it constitutes a totality. However, perhaps unfortunately, these different paradigms had an atomistic standpoint, despite the holistic nature of the object of study. Put in other words paradigms (perhaps as a result of the definition of a "paradigm" itself) were self-contained. They were limited or bounded with usually well defined segments of that generic process. In my opinion there exists a number of reasons for this situation, the primary one being the 'compartmentalization' problem of both the practice and theory as an attribute of contemporary social life. This

⁴ Kuhn's work had the natural sciences as the unit of analysis. His concepts such as "paradigms", "the normal science" and "scientific revolutions" were all designated for study of natural phenomena. Aware of this fact and having the reservation that as a whole his approach is problematic when tried to be applied to social events directly due to differences between the objects of studies, I find his formulation of scientific paradigms relevant to social sciences. Especially in public administration, as also tried to be shown in this section, Kuhn's definition of paradigms well fits to explain, if not make an analysis of historical development of the field.

is unfortunate because the parts of a totality, especially for the process of administration, may have an analytical value in themselves but only mean something when they are tried to be associated with both the other elements and their totality. This is why for example, structural-formal school in administrative science constituted an internally consistent , functional and operational paradigmatic achievement. However, it was unable to solve the crisis since it was oriented towards a well defined part of the whole, the structure, rarely trying to link it with other parts and the whole itself. This compartmentalizing position will be further discussed in the third chapter.

The existence of an 'identity crisis' for any specific field of inquiry has both advantages and disadvantages. It is advantageous mainly because of the fact that in one sense, such a crisis may play a "motor role' for progress. The existence and awareness of an identity crisis prompt the scientific community to continue the search for novelty. This is in fact similar to the relationship stated by Thomas Kuhn between the existence of "crisis" and the "emergence of scientific theories" (sometimes the "emergence of scientific revolutions") (Kuhn, *ibid.*, pp. 66-91). If we think that social change and change in administrative practice is endemic, dynamics in the theory provided by search for overcoming the crisis becomes nec-

essary. Looked at this angle, one may think that a solution for the identity crisis should not occupy a priority in the agenda, the field may go on living with it. At least at the theoretical level this may sound reasonable, but at the practical level an over extended existence of this problem may result in a series of problems. This brings us to the disadvantages of an ongoing crisis of identity. Public administration, like most other fields of inquiry, has a well defined and concrete reference in reality: a profession based on the general division of labour in social life. It is almost impossible today to visualize a society (today and in the past) that did not and does not experience a specific form of public administration. Practices change temporarily and spatially in content, but the essence remains the same. Especially with the emergence of contemporary state and its apparatus, the profession of public administration was born. On the other hand, again in contemporary societies, a 'stateless society' remains as a generally desired project left to the future. Contrary to this, the intervention of the state, just like its own existence is becoming ever and ever more widespread. Put in other words, in practical terms, "the end of public administration" (as proposed by James Stever⁵ as a high

⁵ see James STEVER, The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-

probability occurrence), does not seem to be likely in the near future just like the less intervention and permeation of the state into social life. This being the case, the crisis or the gap between the theory and practice leaves the profession lack of support that may be provided by the theory. Stever (op.cit.,19) finds this support to be primarily in the form of maintaining a ground for "legitimatizing" the profession that is a 'desperately needed' situation in the contemporary practice of public administration.

Another disadvantage comes from the issue of function of any scientific inquiry. A crisis of identity, especially in the form of a discrepancy between the ongoing practice and the theory, may play an adverse role on the status of science. If theory remains, so to speak, continually in a position to 'follow' the dynamics of the experience, it is bounded to remain usually at the descriptive level, rarely going beyond to the explanatory level, and almost never to the prescriptive one. Any branch of social science should assume a prescriptive nature. Social events do not take place as themselves or as a result of operation of unexplained or unknown forces. They are the

Progressive Era, New York:Transnational Publishers, Inc., 1988.

result of human relations and interaction. Social action in this sense is guided, guided by human interaction and scientific activity is also a human interaction. Science should be here to explain and equally important, to guide. This is especially relevant for public administration, which is by its definition, a guided action. Unfortunately again, the problems in the science, most acute in the level of identity negatively effect this necessary function of it.

Finally, a crisis of identity plays a negative role in the development of the theory or the field. Just like in the profession of the practice, in the profession of the theory as well, members may get into despondency about the future and this may lead to two consequences. First, resources of the field including human resources and material resources (such as the share it receives from total financial support) may be depreciated. For relatively less people this field may preserve its attractiveness. Second, under the influence of such a mood and situation search for genuine knowledge accumulation may loose its impetus just to give way to dominance of outdated paradigms (sometimes called as "mainstream public administration"). As a result, the rational-positivistic understanding of public administration, which, as it is going to be discussed in the following chapters, continues to be the main

dominant perspective despite its negative effect on the augmentation of individual alienation in contemporary social life.

In summary, a crisis of identity in public administration simultaneously developed and cohabited since the emergence of the field. This was accepted by almost every school and/or theoretician concerned, and again almost every school/individual tried to solve this problem from his or her theoretical standpoint. Unfortunately, at least within the scope of this chapter, until the beginning of 1970's, it was difficult to say that it was solved. Different 'paradigms' took administrative matters from atomistic standpoints, despite the fact that most of them showed a holistic stance, that there were internal consistencies and unified bodies of thought which perhaps contributed to knowledge accumulation process about the mechanisms of parts but could not provide a totalistic, macro perspective. When this is the case, a crisis of identity is likely to reproduce itself (with its relatively more important negative effects). In the following chapter the contemporary situation and contributions to the discipline of public administration in respect to the identity crisis will be attempted.

CHAPTER 2
CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:
VISIONING THE CRISIS OF IDENTITY

Main objective in this chapter is two-folded. On the one hand, I shall try to review in an analytical fashion the recent developments in the theory of public administration. For each theory/theoretician evaluated special emphasis will be made in respect to the prospects for the crisis of identity: the indicators, attempts to overcome, its reproduction (if exists). On the other hand, while doing these I shall try to underline the inadequacies that emerge as the result of the 'compartmentalization problem'. The compartmentalization problem refers here to a discrepancy between the ontological status and the epistemological characteristics related with the object of inquiry. One may talk about three 'levels' related with the compartmentalization problem. At the higher level, there exists a compartmentalization of inquiry in social events. This is evident in the separation of various aspects of social life into specific 'branches' of 'social science' based on division of labour-specialization process of a specific social formation. At the middle level, once 'public administration' gained its identity and compartment, further divisioning in itself, or further specialization so as to inquire different aspects of public ad-

ministration as a specific social phenomenon (which is the common practice in public administration theory). Finally, at the lower level, the compartmentalization of the scientist/theoretician himself/herself, visioning the public administration, its further branches and his/her own identity as distinct, unrelated, and bounded realm (technical 'expertise'). The compartmentalization problem at all levels contributes to the identity crisis in public administration. This is going to be discussed in the third chapter. A discrepancy between ontological status and epistemological positioning may be solved when it becomes possible to talk about a one-to-one relationship between the object of inquiry and the way how scientists/theoreticians establish their visions about it. In other words, this is a very serious methodology problem. One thing should be stressed here. This way of looking at the problem may give one the false impression that we assume a separation of the object of study and the subjective treatment of it. This constitutes another important methodological problem. This is a positivist-rationalist vision and also implies so to speak, an 'alienation' of the 'scientist' and an attempt to distinguish 'science' as a social interaction. Seemingly posed differentiation between the object and subject here is only for the purpose of identification. In other words, the epistemological and/or methodological problem also may substantially cover both the object and

the 'scientist' as a whole, without necessarily making any difference between them. However, unfortunately, in much of public administration inquiry, object/subject differentiation together with the compartmentalization problem may be seen very clearly. This point will also be taken into consideration while we evaluate specific theories/approaches.



**AFTER "NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION":
A Search and Crises of Paradigms?**

A general evaluation of the period that follows the 'New Public Administration' reveals that a new dimension was added to the crisis in public administration theory. It was mentioned earlier that despite the evident 'atomistic' nature in respect to the epistemology problem it was possible to talk the existence of a 'holistic situation' as well. This situation meant that inside each 'paradigm' or school there exists an internally consistent, more or less unified body of thought generally shared by the members. In post 'New Public Administration' period this 'holistic nature' of the theory and/or paradigms ceased to exist. In other words, this means a lack of "paradigmatic" development as well⁶. Aware of the

⁶ It is interesting to note that the usage of the concept 'paradigm' is very common in various evaluations of history of public administration theory. However, most classifications based on 'paradigm' concept show substantial differences. Authors consider and collect many different schools/theories under paradigms. For example, according to Nicholas Henry (Henry, 1989, pp.20-47) there exists five paradigms in public administration theory, namely: 1. Politics/administration dichotomy (1900-1926), 2. The Principles of Administration (1927-1937), 3. Public Administration as Political Science (1950-1970), 4. Public Administration as Management (1956-1970) and, 5. Public Administration as Public Administration (1970-?). On the other hand, according to Richard Stillman II (Stillman, 1984, pp.5-25), substituting the word 'paradigm' by the word "pattern", mentioned these: 1. The Classical Administration Pattern, 2. Romantic Administrative Pattern, 3. Neo-classical Administrative Pattern. These patterns have their both late nineteenth-early twentieth century examples and late twentieth century 'revival' versions.

fact that it may be too early for such a conclusion since labels like 'paradigms' are best attached following a certain experience, or after a certain time pass. Evaluating the period that continues on may sometimes generate unhealthy conclusions or generalizations because of a blur in the image. However when we look from a 'comparative' perspective, it is really difficult to talk about the existence of a deeply rooted, influencing and much debated/criticized paradigms such as the classical and neo-classical public administration school. Rather, this period is marked with a kind of 'atomism'. Generally the approaches remain within their own boundaries (compartments). Inside their borders, from their point of view, schools discuss and propose on various and interesting dimensions of public administration. However, due to many methodological limitations, approaches oriented towards macro explaining and prescribing on the totality of the concepts and experience of contemporary public administration are very rare. In the event of this one may, perhaps, also talk about the existence of a contemporary 'paradigm crisis' for public administration theory as well. Specific evaluations of the contemporary approaches follows.

A. VINCENT OSTROM AND "DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION"

In 1973, Vincent Ostrom, a professor of political science in Indiana University wrote a book titled "The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration"(Ostrom, 1973). This book and his other writings were highly influential in the field as it can be seen in the following quotation:

"Another popular and controversial Public Administration treatise in the early 1970s was Vincent Ostrom's The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration. In his book he assaults...(the model) which he terms the Wilson-Weber paradigm. In behavioral language reminiscent of Herbert Simon a generation earlier, Ostrom proposes its replacement with a new paradigm, one which he calls 'democratic administration'" (Stillman, 1984, 22., my stress)

This remark shows that Ostrom was another theoretician who thought that it was the time for a 'paradigmatic change'. This also means another manifestation of both an identity crisis and discontentment from the existing situation. Another similar remark about Ostrom was made by Peter Self:

"Another American writer, Vincent Ostrom criticizes the 'scientific administration' tradition founded by Woodrow Wilson for believing

that political authority should be concentrated at a high enough level to set the goals for an otherwise self sufficient system of administration which could be operated according to independent techniques and principles of efficiency...The alternative, claims Ostrom, is the tradition of 'democratic administration' to be found in the Federalist Papers and in de Tocqueville.." (Self, 1982, 12)

A claim for the change of any paradigm logically starts with a critical attitude towards the prevailing one(s). Especially shortcomings and inadequacies are stressed mostly to be able to show their irrelevancy. New paradigms, contrary to Kuhn's idea that they emerge mostly as scientific revolutions (in natural sciences) born from within previous ones. Ostrom's approach was not an exemption to this.

Ostrom considered mainly two paradigms. One of them was as he called, "classical paradigm", and the other was "Simonian challenge". By the classical paradigm he generally meant Wilson's approach that carries a heavy influence of Weber. The main point he criticized was related with an understanding of a 'universal science'. A claim for a universal science of administration, according to him, would have two major implications:

"First, a theory or science of public administration is applicable to all political regimes; and second, a theory of administration is a general theory as distinct from the limited theories inherent in the ideological preoccupa-

tions of political theorists. Administration is an invariant relationship in all systems of government and thus a science of administration has universal applicability to all political systems." (Ostrom, 1973, 27)

It is this 'universality' principle that 'he criticizes. According to Ostrom, the classical 'principles' of administration may not easily find an equal applicability to 'all' systems on the world. This is not because of the existence of many social variables such as history, culture, economy etc, but one single factor: the existence of different political regimes. Ostrom is mainly against the politics/administration dichotomy. Politics and administration are so related that the classical assumption "governments may differ in the political principles underlying their constitutions but principles of good administration are much the same in any system of government" (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 26) is entirely irrelevant. Different political regimes are likely to give way to different structures of administration and as a consequence, universal principles (of a universal science of public administration) will be irrelevant. It should be noted at this point that a rejection of the concept of 'universality' in this fashion is usually associated with and followed by a 'normative' proposition. This is another form of humanism, in the sense that if the traditional dichotomy of objectivity/subjectivity is considered, a universalistic understanding of science is usually linked with the objectivity

(probably under the influence of dominant conceptualization of natural sciences). Objectivity in this sense, prompts the individual to 'free' himself or herself from his or her own very humanly characteristics: own viewpoints. Impartiality, valueless, biasness become the keywords. Contrary to this, when people reject objectivity, those humane characteristics are more emphasized and usually being 'normative' prevails. This was the case for Mayo when he rejected 'principles', to substitute 'human being' together with his subjectivity. The same is valid for Follett when she rejected universalism to substitute 'change based on sharing (interaction)'. This is also true for Vincent Ostrom, when he tried to substitute a concept of 'democratic administration' which is, at its essence, normative in nature as well. However, before discussing his approach in detail, his second major criticism directed toward the early paradigm and his criticism of the other paradigm (Simonian challenge) should also be considered.

Ostrom's second major criticism of Weberian-Wilsonian paradigm is related with the problem of 'centralization'. Ostrom thought that one of the basic propositions of the Wilsonian paradigm (congruence exists here with Weber's theory of bureaucracy) was: "there will always be a single dominant center of power in any system of government; and

the government of a society will be controlled by that single center of power" (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 28). He mentioned that traces of a similar viewpoint could be found in the writings of Thomas Hobbes and Bagehot from whom Wilson was strongly influenced (*ibid.*, 75). It is this "absolute supremacy" idea that Ostrom strongly opposes. Both Bagehot when he analyzed English government system and Wilson when he did the similar for the American system, thought that characteristics of the systems prevent internally one single authority to dominate in full. In the United States this was to be maintained primarily by the 'federal system of government' and in England by strongly established constitutional system. However Ostrom thought both were, as he called "some anomalous threads of thought". This is mainly because Hobbes-Bagehot and Wilsonian 'triad' would inevitably result in and also create a strong centralism since structural hierarchy and strong discipline were the main themes. This is why perhaps; "Wilson could conceive of a theory of democratic government but not a theory of democratic administration" (*ibid.*, 27)

When we come to Ostrom's analysis of Herbert Simon, we find a sympathetic and critical attitude simultaneously. Ostrom is sympathetic towards Simon mainly because he thinks Simon 'bravely' challenged Weberian-Wilsonian

paradigm (mostly by showing the irrelevancy of principles). He is critical because he thinks Simon (just like Wilson) reduced his theory to the 'intra-organizational' level. This is crucial for Ostrom because when Simon saw organizations as 'products' left to "principal designers" (legislatures) and concentrated his efforts on the 'product' not the producers and the relationship between them, he was readily accepting (and reproducing) the politics/administration dichotomy. On the contrary, according to Ostrom; "Administrative behavior is bounded by institutional constraints other than those internal to "the organization". Public administration requires reference to more than the theory of a firm" (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 47)

It is interesting to note that Ostrom did not accept the 'classical' classification of the administrative paradigms. He thought those two paradigms were the major ones and others were all born if not derived from them. However, it is also interesting that as the above paragraph reveals, at a certain point, two paradigms converge, leaving us with one single paradigm: the one that is concerned with inside organizations. This paradigm has the efficiency as the ultimate purpose, has a purposive ends/means rationality, and (perhaps indirectly) isolating itself from the rest of social interaction. In fact, this may be the main reason for Ostrom to see and label the ex-

isting situation in public administration theory as an "intellectual crisis".

Thus, again we find a manifestation of a crisis. Despite the fact that this time the word 'identity' is replaced with 'intellectual', the designation and the nature of this 'crisis' is the same. Something had to be done to remedy it:

"I am now persuaded that the major task in the next decade will be to lay new foundations for the study of public administration" (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 5)

When we look at his own vision about this crisis his proposition may be generally called as 'democratic administration'. As I have already mentioned, Ostrom finds elements and results within Wilsonian and Simonian paradigms that may make administrative systems essentially undemocratic. By proposing a 'democratic administration' a critical standpoint is adopted. The ultimate objectives of previous paradigms were maintaining 'administrative perfection', but such a perfection, according to Ostrom, contradicts with the principles of democracy. It is interesting to note that his alternative vision is not built upon future, or new (as it is a usual for most critical standpoints) but rather, built upon the past, and the most commonly known: Democracy as formulated by two 'founding fa-

thers' of the United States, Hamilton and Madison. The specific point discussed by Hamilton and Madison in 'the Federalist' papers and underlined by Ostrom is the 'federal administrative system'. Under a federal system, before all, 'overlapping jurisdictions' is realized and according to Ostrom this is contradicting with the 'principles' of bureaucratic, perfectionist Wilsonian (and Simonian) paradigm.⁷ Only if multiple sources of authority that control one another exist (as in the federal system) than a true democracy may be established:

"fragmentation of authority among diverse decision centers with multiple veto capabilities within any one jurisdiction and the development of multiple overlapping jurisdictions of widely different scales are necessary conditions for maintaining a stable political order which can advance human welfare under rapidly changing conditions" (Ostrom, 1972, 112)

Pluralistic themes may easily be seen in Ostrom's approach with a special emphasis on "polycentricity, and not monocentricity" (ibid., 81). This polycentricity is not necessary only for building the structure but for

⁷ Here, especially the 'unitarist' principles are questioned. Unity of command principle both to mean that "everyone serves but one master" (Ostrom, ibid., 41) and a specific division of labour so as to avoid "overlapping jurisdictions" as much as possible in order to reach to administrative perfectionism and rationality are criticized.

the benefit of the individuals as well. This is mainly because of his thought that individuals who have been given the 'right' to exercise the power related with their posts are "no more nor less corruptible than their fellow men." (ibid., 111) Given that opportunity, anybody may abuse the authority, but only if a system is formed in which there are more than one center to control each other, problem may be solved effectively. This is a system of 'checks and balances', a democratic system both at macro and micro levels, having its specific form of plurality, all commonly proposed or claimed to be the American system of government. The concept of a 'democratic administration', like many similar normative proposals, is too narrow and too wide at the same time. It is narrow in the sense that its borders and the content is well defined. Ostrom's approach, by showing at least theoretically, that Weberian-Wilsonian paradigm is not compatible with democracy and by drawing a 'logical-chain' starting from 'public choice theory'⁸ coming to the criti-

⁸ Theory of public choice as formulated by Ostrom is centered around three main elements: a) the individual, who is searching for own interest by making rational choices, b) the public good, produced by public agencies in response to demands from citizens and be available to be used by everybody, and c) decision structures that guide both the individual interest-seeking individuals and the production of public goods. The main idea is that the decision structures, if necessary conditions such as people who "are potentially affected can be contained within the boundaries of an appropriate jurisdiction"(Ostrom and Ostrom, 1971, 211) (which means centralization) may be operated with a substantial

cism of a centralist bureaucratic model displays a 'contingency' and consistency in its own. Despite this point, however, his approach remains too wide maybe because of the fact that his proposal for the solution of an identity crisis, in my opinion, is not a solution that is directly compatible with the problem he posed himself as a 'crisis' in public administration. 'Democratic administration', is too wide that it does not specifically oriented towards administrative process per se, but towards all other social processes as well. By the definition of 'being democratic' a specific 'way of life' is described, not only for administrators and administrative mechanisms, but for everybody and every social structure alike. For specifically administrative process, what 'democracy' would mean is not clearly elaborated by Ostrom. We have only three sets of 'clues' in this respect. First, the 'classical' bureaucratic administrative structures (which are going to be preserved, perhaps only to be reformed) at every level would be so designed that confrontation of power will never be allowed; "a theory of democratic administration does not preclude a theory of bureaucratic

autonomy (decentralization). (For Ostrom's evaluation of 'public choice' approach see, Ostrom and Ostrom 1971) Thus we find that under these conditions decentralization or autonomy is essential and this is the point from which Ostrom passes to the concept of "democratic administration".

administration." (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 112). Second, public administrators will bear a normative attitude that they will not be passive (or neutral) 'servants', rather they will be guided by 'common interests', Third, theoreticians of this field will be "prepared to reject Wilson's theses and fashion a new theory of democratic administration appropriate to the organization of diverse public enterprises in democratic societies". (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 133)

The second point mentioned above is interesting for us in the sense that it shows the similarity with the 'new public administration' approach. If we replace the 'common interests' with the 'social equity' or the 'new' with the 'democratic' administration we have the two highly similar, normative standpoints. They both have a specific vision about the state and the rest of social formation: the state 'above the society' view. Although both approaches criticize Weberian understanding of bureaucracy, with differing degrees and ways, none of them can go beyond it. This is because the apparatus of state is conceptualized as a passive and/or neutral structure with purposive rationality specialized on both utilizing the ends and means associated with that purpose: maintaining the social equity in one of them and maintaining democracy on the other. The existing structure, i.e. the machinery of administration is not questioned in its essence, de-

spite the fact that Ostrom goes one step further. However, his questioning (in terms of democratic administration) is only related with the form, not the essence. This is why perhaps a vicious circle is formed, starting with a crisis of identity, expressing the need for making changes radically but remaining 'preservationist' in the end. Again this is why, in my opinion, it is extremely difficult to see these approaches as radical, despite especially in Ostrom's case, the claim that this (his approach) would be a "historical starting point for a new course of human development" (Ostrom, 1973, 133) and, what's more, that this is going to be a "new American revolution" (ibid., 133). However it takes more than a critical attitude to make a revolution of this sort, a problem common to all similar critical standpoints.

Another problem associated with Ostrom's approach is related with the epistemological characteristic. As I have already mentioned, one of the major criticisms of Ostrom towards Wilsonian approach was his proposal for a 'universal' administrative science 'applicable to all governments alike'. He went further to mention that "his theory would be appropriate for understanding and reforming the French and Prussian political systems or those having similar structural characteristics" (ibid., 110). The positivist conceptualization of science within the context of

'refutation' is evident here. We have the generalization, also we have the individual bodies to which generalization is applicable, but we find cases which 'refute' the generalization. This position is sound and understandable but only if it is consistent with the whole body of thought. Ostrom, rejecting a certain generalization proposes us yet another one: a specific 'way' or 'form' of administration applicable to all 'democratic societies' alike. What's more, as already mentioned, this would be a revolution or a starting point for a new course of development for humanity, which is indeed another level of generalization in itself. His search and/or wish for a generalization if not universalization is evident in the following quotation:

"A new political science is needed for a new world if the human potentials of democratic societies are to be realized through a system of democratic administration. Success depends upon a knowledge of both the capabilities and limitations of diverse organizational forms which can be used to minimize the power of command and yield services to enhance the welfare of people" (Ostrom, *ibid.* p.132)

Abandon the old generalization, start searching for a new one to 'replace' it! If this is not a 'reformulation' of modernity (to guide the undemocratic societies this time), certainly it is an attempt of justification of a specific social formation, that an "American revolution" to spread universally. This brings us to another problem

related with Ostrom's solution for an identity crisis in public administration.

The ethnocentric attitude in Ostrom's approach, is evident. I have already mentioned his rather preservationist evaluation of American system of politics and government and attempts to idealize them. A social scientist lives and thinks within a specific social formation, if not a culture. His theory is shaped by it and this is not only natural but perhaps necessary as well. At this point a 'social science' comes close to 'ideology' that in fact, may not be entirely separated. When defined like this an 'ethnocentric attitude' of this kind does not constitute a point of criticism that may be directed to a scientist. On the contrary, it may well be an integral part of his/her work naturally. However, ethnocentrism in Ostrom's work seems to be somewhat different and difficult to justify.

Probably well aware of this ethnocentrism problem, Ostrom was very cautious to bound himself with his own social setting. This is evident in the first place, in the title of his book: The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration. (my emphasis). As already mentioned, in many parts of the text he insistently mentioned that this was a crisis of American administration, to be solved by again "American students and practitioners of

public administration" (ibid., 133). This is a 'justified' ethnocentrism. However the problem begins when he tries to extend the borders and consider (his approach) as a "historical starting point" for a new course of human development" (ibid., 133, my emphasis). What is more, quoting Jean-Francois Revel who wrote: "The revolution of the twentieth century will take place in the United States. It is only there that it can happen, and it has already begun. Whether or not that revolution spreads to the rest of the world depends on whether or not it succeeds first in America" (ibid., 133) Ostrom expressed his point that both the American practice and theory has a leading and guiding position. Our emphasis of a "historical starting point" and a new course of "human development" is deliberately done to indicate this point. We can obviously see a similar ideological standpoint here which we have already seen when discussing the 'modernization or development school'. Ostrom's approach may be considered as a 'new course of a new sort of modernization', to start and mark a new historical point for the benefit of mankind. This is with only one condition that first this revolution should be successful in America, than spread it to the world. This is not only 'ethnocentric' in the negative sense of the word, but internally inconsistent for Ostrom when we remember his criticism towards Wilsonian standpoint being universalistic. The result is not only a science of admin-

istration for "all the governments alike", but also one 'way of administration' (principles of administration) for all the mankind alike!;

"Perhaps the American experiment -predicated upon the capacity of mankind for self government-has only begun to realize its potential" (Ostrom, *ibid.*, 133)

Whether this 'potential' is realized or not is unclear at this moment. However, the 'capacity of mankind for self-government', if it is a relevant argument at all, does not and should not necessitate an 'ethnocentrism' of this kind.

As already mentioned, the normative approach of Ostrom as he formulated in his book did not give us much about the 'content' of a 'democratic administration'. Later, in an article written in 1982 and titled "The Theory and Practice of Public Administration as a Science of the Artifactual" (Ostrom, 1982) he elaborated his points. The evaluation of this article may break the historical (or at least chronological) integrity of this section but this may be necessary for having an integrated evaluation of Vincent Ostrom's position.

In the above mentioned article it is possible to find two major differences from Ostrom's original standpoint.

First of all, ethnocentrism seems to be completely abandoned. His explanations and proposals are not bounded with his own cultural setting but he tries to make a 'universal' analysis of the theory and practice of public administration. Second, in one sense related with the first point, Ostrom this time does not seem to be strictly against the 'principles'. On the contrary, he is in search or claim for a "science of the artifactual". Naturally, this 'science', as to be discussed soon, is somehow different from the one he criticized heavily in his book, but with this claim he admits, at least, the possibility of such a 'science', or a 'universalization'.

According to Ostrom, social phenomenon is something that is 'artifactual' in nature. Administration, being a part of the same phenomena is also artifactual.

"Artifact is anything created by human beings by using learning and knowledge to serve human purposes" (Ostrom, 1982, 40)

Related with this point, then, administrators are the 'artisans' who not only create or produce this artifact but also 'utilize' it by using certain materials and tools. The act of administration is a "craft" which involves "a complex pattern of relationship between artisans and their creations" (ibid., 40). The basic tool of this

craft is the organization which are subject to creation and design, not necessarily to be used by their original creators, but utilized by people who are well aware of the logic behind and ways of using them.

The reason Ostrom proposes 'artifacts' is clear enough. The relationship between an artifact and an artisan is two-folded. An artifact may be created only when the creator has adequate technical 'knowledge' about it. Put in other words, this is an expression of a kind of 'purposive rationality'. Technical knowledge or a purposive rationality of this sort is essential. However, this is not the only thing required. There also must be a 'sensory' dimension as well. This is mostly expressed by the existence of both a conception (of the artisan) about the purpose of that artifact and its evaluation made on the basis of the feeling about "what constitutes a good artifact". In other words;

"An artifact can be both a practical utensil and a thing of beauty. Both are built into the nature of an artifact. One value need not detract from the other." (Ostrom, *ibid.*,40)

Here we have a guideline for the students of administration. A pure 'scientific' treatment of organizations akin to the study of a physical object (perhaps to find its universal rules in the end) would be irrelevant for

the organizations and administration. Rather, 'value' side should also be taken into consideration which makes things even more difficult and complex. This is the reason that Ostrom takes 'value' as a 'problem' and especially concentrates on whether different values in a society can be reconciled or not. Despite the fact that he admits the existence of 'conflict', his conclusion is we have the grounds and experience to find (and develop) "common value for distinguishing right from wrong, the just from unjust, the true from the false, and the beautiful from the ugly"(Ostrom, *ibid.*, 42)

It is interesting to note that Ostrom's discourse in this article is highly influenced by the earlier mentioned 'critical theory' based on 'phenomenology'. Here, 'interpersonal relationships' are important and they are determined by the "use of words" which are used to formulate rules to be applicable for everybody (just like for the organizational life). Just like phenomenology rejects the conventional understanding of 'sense-data' which are rationally organized, objectively collected and may be explained lawfully (and also exist outside the scientist) Ostrom is also critical on the possibility of an organization (or administration) science that has 'objective', 'rationalist', 'orderly' subject matter. Rather, subjectivity is the key word together with 'values', 'meanings'

or 'words'. It is admitted that there are rules, but these rules (organizational rules) are mutually established for the "mutual productivity" and "mutual benefit" of people in organizational life. In other words, these rules, just like the other aspects of organizational life are the products of 'artisans', themselves being other 'artifacts' and should be treated accordingly. This way of conceiving the organizational (administrative) life, in my opinion, leads us to what may be called as the 'locality' perspective. If there exists 'n' administration situations on the world past and present, 'n' of them would have different quality, shaped and determined by particular social conditions (that especially include "common belief systems" or sources upon which individuals reconcile or not). This results in a 'micro', 'local', and 'unique' discourse that has to reject universality. Here we can find a logical consistency in Ostrom's approach and his above mentioned "democratic administration" thesis. If we have to make an analogy, this is a type of 'decentralization' and it is essential for a 'democratic administration'. The localities should have their 'freedom', 'originality', 'autonomy' and power'. They should not be 'controlled' centrally, there should be no 'unitarianism', multiplicity is the key word. According to Ostrom, why not to apply this to for the administrative "science"?

It should be immediately mentioned that this is a specific conceptualization of science and administrative science and may be (and also needs to be) discussed and elaborated. However, Ostrom in both of his works mentioned here did not stop at this standpoint. As I have already mentioned, he gets into an internal inconsistency when he tries to 'universalize' this 'micro' approach, and relate it in the end with a 'determinate' and specific social formation to give it as an omni-present truth. Thus he gets into a contradiction. This position is reached through the following arguments:

According to Ostrom in an administrative setting, the determinant interpersonal relations take place between rulers, ruled, and the rules. Historical analysis reveals two main categories of this type of relationship. The first category is a 'unitary' one in which there is a strong central authority which is the common source of law that governs the relationship. Ostrom is in the opinion that this resembles to Hobbes' theory of sovereignty. In that structure there is an evident inequality of power between the rulers and the ruled. In fact, he comes to mean that this (distortion) is a result of absence of 'common' fundamental values derived "from a common source of intelligibility" (ibid., 42) and may in one sense create a kind of 'anomaly' in respect to interpersonal relations based

on both "facts" and "values" and be concrete by the utilization of words (or language). However, there is also a second category. According to Ostrom there is no need to theorize or imaginatively design this second model. This is mainly because of the fact that we have in our hands the concrete form of it: Society designated in 'Federalist' papers and the discourse of 'Founding Fathers' of the United States. (ibid., 44). This one is "based on presumption that rules for the organization and conduct of government can be specified as a fundamental law" (ibid., 44). No need to say, this is the constitution and the system of constitutionalism. In such a situation a 'control mechanism' can be established over the ones who rule. The ruler's authority is not absolute but only limited, -limited by the constitution. Governments are not free to change that ultimate law;

"A system of enforceable constitutional rule is based on a presumption that people in such a society can draw upon a common body of understanding reflected in a common theory of constitutional choice, commonly accepted moral precepts and metaphysical presuppositions. So long as such understandings are shared in common and citizens take decisions that are consistent with the maintenance of limits in the organization and conduct of government we can consider democracies to be a viable form of government in the sense that people can be said to rule: 'demo'=people, 'cracy'=rule. If such limits are abandoned a democracy ceases to exist and gives way to the iron law of oligarchy where few rules the many" (Ostrom, ibid., 45)

Ostrom's specific (and macro) designation is this second model to be concretely found in the American experience. One point needs to be emphasized here. We have already mentioned that his is a 'normative' approach based upon a certain kind of criticism of positivist and rationalist understanding of administrative science. Again, I have already mentioned that he thought the latter perspective brought the study of public administration into a state of an "intellectual crisis". When this is the case it may be claimed that the criticism of 'inconsistency' is unjust, he may naturally have such a vision and preference. However the important point is the fine and delicate separation between a "science" and "ideology". His preference may also be taken as a certain 'ideology' and if this is so, his arguments and proposals about for example organizations being artifacts, interpersonal relations based on values and language easily turns into 'justifications' or 'legitimizations'. Legitimizations are 'sine qua non' for each ideological discourse (despite the fact that these may have a certain scientific value sometimes). To express ideology in the form of a 'universal' science may yet be another kind of 'ideology'. In other words "the science of the artifactual" (which may be very interesting in itself) does not have to be the science of a certain experience (which may not be so interesting). The internal consistency about the 'micro' and the 'macro' or 'unique'

and the 'universal' could be maintained again if Ostrom, for instance, did not try to universalize a particular understanding of democracy or democratic administration despite the fact that from an ideological standpoint this may be extremely consistent and even favorable. However, as already mentioned science and ideology converge here and what's more, sometimes replaced one another. This is especially seen when ideology is formulated as an universal truth despite the fact that Ostrom was against such 'universal truths' (and principles).

Another point to be mentioned in Ostrom's approach is related with the practice problem. Ostrom tried to solve (in his own way) the 'identity crisis' of the study of public administration, not primarily concerned with preparing guidelines and recipes for the practitioners. Peter Self criticized this point in the following fashion:

"This theory (Ostrom's approach) certainly open the windows of administration to the political environment. But how it is to be applied?...It is perhaps significant that Ostrom derives his model from the Federalist Papers and De Tocqueville, ideas conceived at a time when the problems of large, diverse, technologically advanced societies and of 'big government' were unknown and unforeseen" (Self, 1972, 12)(my stress)

Related with this problem is the problem of compatibility of 'democracy' with 'bureaucracy' in practical

grounds. We have seen that despite the fact that Ostrom criticized administrative principles, he had no much criticism oriented towards 'bureaucratic theory' and bureaucracy. As mentioned by Norberto Bobbio (Bobbio, 1988, pp. 69-72), in contemporary complex societies bureaucratic mechanisms have to be filled by technical experts who are highly specialized. There is a potential threat that popular control of the bureaucrats by the lot (mostly unspecialized people), which is a necessary condition of democratic process, could turn out to be practically impossible. Thus there can arise a contradiction between democratic principles and practice and bureaucratic experience. Ostrom did neither mentioned this point nor proposed his solutions for this potential compatibility problem.

A similar (but this time implicit) criticism about Ostrom's standpoint also may be 'sensed' in Stillman's remark as well:

"Ostrom hid a lusty enthusiasm for that old time religion of romantic Jeffersonianism" (Stillman, 1984, 22).

However all these and previous criticisms do not and should not conceal the fact that Ostrom saw the existence of an identity crisis in public administration and positively contributed. His contribution came especially when

(as also indicated by Self above) he attempted a 'macro' approach considering administration as a part of and related with political process along with his remaining out of the so called "mainstream" theories and attempts for new visions for public administration. This is desperately needed and should be appreciated in this field.



B. GEORGE FREDERICKSON AND "CIVISM IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION"

George Frederickson, one of the prominent figures of the 'New Public Administration' movement wrote an interesting article in 1982 published in the Public Administration Review. (Frederickson, 1982) Just like other similar works, Frederickson also started with criticizing the existing situation of public administration and tried to express his alternative vision. The existence of a kind of 'identity crisis' in public administration for him is evident in his opening statement:

"Something is wrong. Virtually all of our institutions seem to be in trouble. ..Government is at the center of virtually all these problems. The people, the citizens, are very perceptive and know that something is wrong. Survey research indicates a sharp decline in confidence in government as well as most of our institutions." (Frederickson, 1982, 501)

Frederickson's main concern is related with certain social problems and their augmentation in contemporary life. He includes, for example, 'deterioration in family life', 'problems in education and education institutions', 'crime', 'racial, economic, ethnic, demographic, sexual divisions', 'privatism, greed, self interest, self indulgence' and the like. The interesting thing is that

Frederickson, although indirectly, puts the blame for these on public administration. He thought conventional way of administering proved to be inadequate in coping with these problems, if not solving them. This is a real 'crisis' situation for public administration as a whole.

What should be done?, How to cope with these problems? Frederickson's answer is a need for 'restructuring' which may also be called as a new 'identity' for public administration. It should be immediately added that one must be careful in using the word 'new' here. This is mainly because of two reasons. First, as Frederickson mentions, this is not a new identity, but an old one 'recovering' in itself. Second, as we shall see shortly, very little is different from the approach that was evaluated in the previous pages.

Frederickson calls this approach as 'civism in public administration'. It is not easy to give a simple definition of this notion. However, perhaps, the most distinguishing feature of it is an emphasis on the 'public' dimension of public administration. In the public side we find democracy, citizen participation, justice and individual freedom.

"Public administration needs to sharpen its creative abilities and its capacity to develop

alternatives. Where innovation, change and responsiveness occurring, it tends, in my judgement, to be associated with what is called here "a new civism". The effective public administration of the future should be immediately tied to citizenship, the citizenry generally, and to the effectiveness of public managers who work directly with citizenry." (Frederickson, 1982, 502)

Before getting into detailed discussion of this 'civism approach', first why Frederickson considers this as a 'recovery' should be mentioned. The author thinks that civism was born together with the early attempts of Woodrow Wilson to formulate the field. In Wilson's popular essay (Wilson, 1887) one of the most important thing was to show the direct link between the sovereign (the people) and the public administration. "Wilson was likewise concerned with the great questions of maintenance of a democratic polity"(ibid., 502). The influence of Wilsonian approach which stressed the 'public side' continued with early practice and began to be dissolved with the emergence of the "principles of administration". Especially through 1930's 'public dimension' was left aside with the priority on 'expertise', 'management techniques', and what's more, the issue of 'politics-administration dichotomy' came into agenda whereas earlier it was almost impossible to separate them.

In my opinion, just like Stillman called Ostrom's approach as "romantic Jeffersonianism", it is possible to

call Frederickson's approach as a "romantic Wilsonianism". However, there is a rather different interpretation of Wilson here. As I have tried to discuss in Chapter 1, Wilson's proposals for solution of an identity crisis in public administration should be associated with attempts of establishing a 'distinct' field in which 'scientific methods' could be utilized so as to form a 'universal' science "applicable to all governments alike". It is a fact that Wilson repeatedly emphasized the direct relation between politics and administration, however, it may be wrong to distinguish Wilson's position from the 'principles' approach. Wilson's (along with Weber's and Taylor's) influence upon POSDCORB can not be denied. Frederickson thinks POSDCORB was the good example of drifting away from Wilsonian days (ibid., 503) which is, in my opinion, not a fair interpretation. If one has to blame 'principles' as the reason for getting away from 'civism', Wilson can not be put away as well, so as to not make 'romanticism' an 'idealization'.

It is interesting to note the similarity between the theoretical standpoints of 'new public administration', 'democratic administration' and 'new civism'. In my opinion, what is common for all the three, among other points, is a sort of 'critical', if not 'protesting' position against the state in general public administration in par-

ticular vis a vis the rest of social formation. Here, there is an implicit assumption and acceptance of bureaucracy being 'unresponsive', 'unjust', 'anti democratic' and 'authoritarian' towards the citizens. For the 'new public administration' a kind of causality can be sustained when one considers the international and internal politics of the United States at the time just before its emergence. But for Ostrom and especially Frederickson, such a link formation is not an easy task, despite the fact that looking from one angle, practice of the so called 'new-right policies' could well be one of the reasons of such a 'protest'. For Frederickson's case one can find two major 'evidences' for such kind of an argument. First, as already mentioned, among the "troubles" of contemporary social life as pointed out by Frederickson, we can see the ones which are usually associated with the experience of 'new-right' policies. For example "privatism", "greed", "self-interest", "self-indulgence" are all such 'negative' consequences. Also, "the economy sputters, managing to violate Keynesian notions of the relationship between inflation, unemployment, and interest rates."(ibid.,501). These qualities again, may all be associated with 'new-right' policies, especially manifested 'destroying' of 'Keynesian' economics thesis. Second, Frederickson himself expressed the lack of 'civism' continued through "late 1960s and early 1970s" during when

"questions of democratic theory and questions of ethics in government were less often asked." (ibid., 503) I shall further deal with the relation between new-right and public administration within the context of 'public administration-public management' issue in the next section. Whatever the nature and reasons of such a 'protest' were, in the end;

"Public administration was experiencing an identity crisis as were most institutions and the citizens were in the early stages of declining support for most of the institutions in our society. Civism was lost from public administration. The recovery of civism will help provide the anchor that both the practice and study of public administration need, not only to find its identity but to be effective once again." (Frederickson, 1982, 503) (my stresses)

Thus, again we are back to the beginning. There is a 'crisis of identity', there is also a proposal for the 'recovery'. The question at this moment is, what is the proposal in concrete, how to 'give' the field its identity?

Frederickson's proposal has two dimensions. The first one is related with democracy and the second is with the organizations. According to him, an effective democratic administration may be built upon three pillars. First, public bureaucrats should be responsive to citizens and their participation must be well established. This would

mean, in the first instance, bureaucrats should not be dominated by their own needs, interests and concerns. This would make them submissive to citizenry. Second, 'justice' should become an integral part of administrative life and administrators. In other words, 'justice' should not be left to 'jurists' and/or 'political philosophers', so that "those who are responsible for administering government agencies must be acquainted with these concepts and have a commitment to the notion of fairness" (ibid., 304) Third, the issue of 'freedom that comes to mean two things; ensuring the personal freedoms of citizens, and, attempts of the public administration not to 'infringe' upon these freedoms.

When we come to the organizational aspect of his 'proposals', we find that he thinks two points should be reconsidered for the 'recovery of civism'. First, the concept and practice of "'orderliness" does not have to be necessarily associated with contemporary organizations. Rapid changes in the environment which can be identified as 'uncertainty', do not allow organizations to operate inside fully rational (and predictable) settings (which makes us to remember Mary Parker Follett again). According to Frederickson the most important result of this is the 'elimination' of 'monolithic' authority centers since the change in the environment is so rapid and since to be able

to cope with that unsettled environment, decision making structures have to be decentralized. Put in other words, it is the 'hope' (or perhaps prediction) of Frederickson that rapid changes in the environment (political situations, technology and the like) will give way to more 'decentralization' in organizational life and this will (as one expects to find this conclusion) be in consistency with what he calls a democratic administration, indispensable for recovery of civism. The second aspect of organizational life is somehow indirectly related with the first point above. The dominance of 'rational model' in the administrative science gave way to a sort of 'overemphasis' on 'technical' issues that he calls; "policy sciences or programs in policy analysis". As a result of this; "the curriculum.. tends to be rational, technical, mathematical, and analytical. The assumption is that with the right data and a proper analysis, the answer will be clear and that answer will make government better."(ibid., 306) However these are not adequate. Successful policy making incorporates these along with normative elements such as a "clearer perception of democratic values", effectiveness of the elected officials, responsiveness towards citizens and the like.

In my opinion, essentially 'normative' approaches like this one is extremely difficult to evaluate. This is per-

haps because of the fact that being normative inevitably brings with it a level of 'personification' problem. Normativeness incorporates personal values, feelings, judgements and ideology. Although normative formulations are themselves social facts (in the sense they are products of human minds) they do not necessarily have to be in agreement with other individuals normativeness. In other words, such manifestations may not be easily 'verified' or 'refuted' since these operations are based upon a certain understanding of rationality. Elements that constitute normativeness are not 'rational' from an ontological standpoint. When we look at Frederickson's approach his normative themes such as citizen participation, justice, democratic administration and the like are 'shared' by lots of people on the world, past and present. 'Sharing of feelings' does not have to result in or give way to their 'realization'. This is an environment of struggle, mostly shaped by conflicts and realization of such 'ideals' is a thing dependent to temporary and permanent 'results' or outcomes of this eternal process. If one conceives social science as an arena in which this 'struggle' (shaped by conflicts of many kinds) is carried out at a certain, pre-determined level, then in Frederickson's approach one may find a good example of it. However even Frederickson himself seemed to be in aware of this highly critical and

delicate point that he had to start his conclusion like this:

"One should not assume that what is described here is speculation about a preferred, or even likely, future. In fact, much of what is described here is presently underway. The civism movement is gaining momentum across the land. In many cities, so called public-private partnerships are developing whereby business, civic, and political leaders are working together on civic problems" (Frederickson, 1982, 306)

This shows us that at least in the eye of 'the scientist, (perhaps as a result of dominance of a certain understanding of science itself in the arena of 'scientific struggle'), it is not adequate to generate and defend normativeness. Scientists generally think it is necessary to support it, if not, justify, empirically as well. Perhaps this is the dimension which is somehow easier to 'evaluate'. Despite the fact that I have a certain 'evaluation' of the content of Frederickson's approach empirically (essentially based on too much exaggeration of both the 'idea' and its consequences), it is beyond the scope and objective of this study. However, when an evaluation is made in terms of a 'solution' to problem of 'crisis of identity' in public administration and in terms of its constituting a 'paradigm' in itself or not, one can hardly be optimistic. Perhaps we also can find 'empirical support' for this. In the literature of

public administration Frederickson's approach could not initiate much debate and support, whereas these two conditions are crucial elements of maintaining a new paradigm. What's more when one considers the difficulty of showing the differences between 'New Civism' and 'Democratic Administration', even if it (and Frederickson) was able to maintain a paradigm, it would be extremely difficult to name it as a 'new' one. Our exploration continues with some recent contributions to this perspective.

Hart's and Ventriss' Contributions

The most important contribution, to 'civism in public administration' approach came in 1989. In March/April issue of Public Administration Review two articles were published on the topic. The interesting point is that in neither of these articles Frederickson was mentioned nor quoted. Despite this fact, however, discussions in both articles resembled to Frederickson's formulation and especially the second one constitutes a major contribution to his points. The first article belongs to David Hart and is titled "A Partnership in Virtue Among All Citizens: The Public Service and Civic Humanism" (Hart, 1989). Hart's position is very similar to Frederickson in many respects.

Both articles begin with the criticism (or protest) of the existing situation, both are based on a normative approach, both continues the 'nostalgic'⁹ mood, both are "romantic Jeffersonianism", both advocate democracy and citizen participation. The novelty of Hart stems from two points. First, his heavier criticism of the present displays a more 'pessimistic' and rather 'blaming' attitude towards public administration. Second, perhaps due to his relatively much 'optimistic' mood for the future, he assigns public administration (and thinks it is capable of) the arduous but possible mission of 'saving the society' from its current situation. Naturally, again with a 'recovery' of 'civism', this time labeled as a 'civic humanism'.

The pessimism of Hart of the existing situation, along with his 'nostalgia' may be seen in these words;

"These heightened times call for the highest qualities of civic character from both leaders and citizens, but sadly, the obligations of democracy have apparently taken a second distant place to a rampant morality of personal advantage. Lost in the hedonic scramble are the Founding values and the vision of the good society they were to bring about." (Hart, 1989, 101)

⁹ The literal meaning of the word 'nostalgic' is 'homesickness'. However, here its popular meaning is used to denote "yearning for the past".

Pessimism of Hart continues to the point that he is afraid of 'corruption' and 'authoritarianism' may one day prevail the administrative systems if the neglect of basic values of democracy and civism continues like this. This is mainly because of the fact that "hedonic scramble", common to all in the society effects public servants as well. It is interesting to note that public sector which has its own share in the emergence of such a situation is also seen by Hart to be the 'saver'. According to him public administration can accomplish this task more likely because of mainly three reasons. First, "there is still a lingering respect for the political philosophy of its tradition, and, hence, the discipline does not automatically reject suggestions from it as impractical.", Second, public administrators (who 'still' choose this field as a profession) are idealist persons who always have the desire to serve the interest of the public. Third, the 'continuity' principle of public administration, its omnipresence despite the changes in the environment gives it the possibility for accomplishing a substantial reform.

Our repetitive question of 'so far so good, but how to..?' is answered by Hart around four major proposals. He calls these as 'civic obligations' (of public administration). The first one is "to encourage civic autonomy" to

mean maintaining individual autonomy and eliminating any form of coercion. Public servants will do this basically by forming and expressing "independent moral (and technical) judgements about the work they do" (ibid., 103) and by exercising "discernment" rather than a routine application of rules and regulations. If these two conditions are met by public servants civic autonomy may be maintained. Second, "to govern by persuasion" should be the rule. Power must always be linked with persuasion, "thus, all who have power have a rhetorical obligation to persuade both citizens and colleagues to do the right" (ibid., 103). This would inevitably bring the necessity of a 'dialogue' between parties and a sort of 'mutual understanding'. The third point or proposal is related with "to transcend the corruptions of power". Hart sees corruption as a very important threat for civism. He intends especially the "tyranny of expertise" (ibid., 104), a problem already mentioned relevant for contemporary state and nature of democracy and bureaucracy. Like the previous ones, according to Hart, this will also be overcome by the 'will' of public servants in a way, which we may call as an 'auto-control'. The fourth and the last proposal of Hart on the way to civic humanism is public servant being "a civic exemplar". "Without self-aggrandizement", (public officials) must make it clear that they not only understand the entailments of virtue, but that they be-

lieve in and practice them. Particularly, they must demonstrate their fidelity to Founding values"(ibid., 105)

As these proposals reveal, change in public administration, (whatever the direction) in this approach is expected to be basically initiated by the public servants. As again already mentioned, this necessitates the existence of mainly two conditions. First, an awareness and desire on the part of public officials to initiate change in that direction, second, material conditions for the realization of such a change. It would be oversimplification of social phenomena to think the first condition may be easily attained. Such an awareness and desire may not be taken as if they are 'independent variables', independent of many factors that determine social life in general and organizational life in particular. Again as already mentioned, these are normative sets that cover values and values are not enough in themselves to shape the social environment. There should always be material grounds for change in values, one may easily get into doubt why public servants have to share these values when they still live under a certain form of material environment. If corruption is the common practice, a 'belief in the elimination of it will not be enough to get rid of it. There are reasons (or material conditions of it) and when they begin to change for one or another reason, then one may expect the

elimination. If the practice of a certain economic policy is blamed for the emergence of the existing unwanted social situation, to change it should be the first mission, rather than attempting to change the values, attitudes and norms towards it. As the policies (material conditions) change, values, attitudes and norms probably will be changing, otherwise 'idealism' would be prevailing. It is interesting to note that, once again, probably aware of this point, Hart felt it necessary to mention that;

"All of this is admittedly idealistic, even old-fashioned. but previous generations of public servants have held sacred the concept of civic obligation" (Hart, 1989, 104)

Perhaps, they did. But one should also admit that they had almost entirely different environment and material conditions. Without the existence of such material conditions it will be indeed idealistic and perhaps romantic to expect the same values and norms to be shared. This is similar to expect this temporally and spatially bounded approach to be a paradigm to solve the crisis of identity in public administration for the present and future generations.

The second major contribution to civism in administration approach was made by Curtis Ventriss, in his 1989 Public Administration Review article titled "Toward a

Public Philosophy of Public Administration: A Civic Perspective of the Public." (Ventriss, 1989) Despite the fact that in respect to the content and final analysis this article also displays similar arguments, there are very important and positive differences here. First of all, the content of the justification used for convincing the readers that there is a real need for 'civism' in administration (this time formulated as a 'civic public philosophy') is essentially different and is based on firm and sound analysis of the existing situation. As already mentioned, in previous two formulations the criticisms toward the existing situation (in differing nature and amount) were made on a basis of 'describing' and attempting to show the negative values of the writers about it. This time it is different, for Ventriss not only attempts these but goes on further to establish, in a sense, a 'causal' relationship between specific economic policies of Reagan administration, the new 'order' and the existing problems. Reagan's (and many new right theoreticians) evaluation of public administration was based on the idea of attacking "alleged deleterious effects of social programs that Reagan said had produced a government too big, too intrusive, and too expensive, and which gave too much power to faceless bureaucrats" (Ventriss, 1989, 174) As a result of this;

"Needless to say, Reagan's public philosophy made many in public administration increasingly nervous and defensive, and with good reason". (ibid., 174)

To put it in other words, it was the public administration that was blamed for a good portion of the existing crisis in American society. What's more important, according to Ventriss, "fostering managerial efficiency and economy", made bureaucracy further away from the 'public' and its public philosophy.

This argument and other points in the article reveal that Ventriss is against attempts for eliminating the gap between 'management' and 'public administration', which was a major issue of new right policies. This point will be further evaluated in the forthcoming section. It is interesting to note that this policy is not seen by the author as the sole responsible factor for the crisis in public administration. Along with this development, the condition of theory also played a negative role. Ventriss wrote that, "the field lacks a coherent theoretical foundation, thus borrowing theories and analytical approaches that more or less sustain public administration's pragmatic appeal"(ibid.,174) One of the important consequences of this situation was that a "tendency by public administration to emulate the presumed efficiencies of business administration". The disadvantage of such a situation,

which forms the causal link between new-right policies, crisis of the discipline and the existing negative situation, is that methods and objectives of business administration are not compatible with "the field's public purpose" (or philosophy).

The second major (and perhaps positive) difference of this article from previous ones within this trend is related with an epistemology problem. We have already evaluated some of the previous approaches as 'normative' and this was not explicitly mentioned by their authors. This time the author not only indicates that his is a normative approach, but (perhaps unprecedentedly radically) claims that a 'normative approach' is something which is needed in public administration (both in practice and theory) to be able to cope with existing crisis situation. Need for normativeness comes from the need for 'formulating a public philosophy' which should be the primary and basic concern for public administration rather than identifying itself with items such as 'rationality', 'effectiveness', 'productivity', all erroneously augmented by the introduction of methods, applications and techniques of 'management' (both in practice and theory). For the theory, this would mean the consideration of three important points: 1- turning away from "scientization of social science" towards a "public social science" which is not free

from normative elements, 2- Academic discourse bounded with only academic circles should be abandoned, and scholars being "public scholars" generating knowledge that is relevant to public interest, and finally, 3- turning away from what Ventriss calls a "Cartesian educational perspective that is manifested in economics and some management programs"(ibid., 178) which is also qualified by him as generating "myopic assumptions" which are not relevant for public philosophy. All this would be done with one main and final purpose: to reach for "democratic citizenship in search for human dignity" (ibid., 178)

Our earlier criticism toward an understanding of 'civism' in public administration is valid for this case as well. However, from the methodological standpoint, due to reasons mentioned above, Ventriss' article can be considered as a major and important contribution to both the 'civism' approach and the knowledge accumulation in contemporary public administration theory. That of its being against 'scienticism' in public administration and the negative impact of new right policies and their consequences on the ongoing crisis (which will be evaluated in the next section) may all be considered as crucial contributions.. Now we may turn our attention to another contemporary perspective in public administration theory which

also, in its own perspective, tries to vision and formulate alternatives to the crisis.



C. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT= PUBLIC MANAGEMENT APPROACH

With this section in Chapter 2, we come to a shift in the locus and focus of public administration. The approaches or perspectives included in this chapter, up to this point, were the ones which attempted to vision the public administration (and its identity crisis) mostly from a 'political' standpoint. Both the 'democratic administration' thesis and 'civism in public administration' perspective in respect to their basic units of analysis and epistemologies emphasized the importance of political relations in shaping or, so to speak, determining the administrative phenomenon. At the theoretical level the effect of this was mostly visible in the common utilization of concepts, notions, and definitions frequently used in 'political science'. The examples are 'democracy', 'citizenship', 'participation', 'sovereignty', 'civism', 'social equality' and the like. Therefore both at the level of practice and the theory, politics and the political science were accepted as 'generic' bodies from which to derive an identity for public administration. Now, a similar but somehow also different situation becomes our concern: the practice and the study of management and public administration. One thing should be immediately

stressed here. As already mentioned, classifications that use the notion of 'paradigms', especially when they attempt to classify contemporary period, may easily meet difficulties. Usually the identification and merits of the approaches (also disadvantages) are better understood in 'a posteriori'. This is why perhaps it would be more relevant if such classifications are associated with a historical analysis. In this chapter evaluated perspectives may only be labeled as 'claimant' paradigms, and the prospects for their turning into 'true' paradigms is going to be evaluated. In other words perspectives included here are temporally bounded and highly specific. To make these words concrete the relationship between politics and administration may be given. As already mentioned, politics and administration are two phenomena whose interrelation goes well before the emergence of the field of public administration.¹⁰ But it may not be convenient to consider 'politics' as a 'paradigm' in itself for public administration. Rather, perhaps we can talk about the 'politics/administration' dichotomy, which has a universal validity and not bounded with limited temporal dimension

¹⁰ Dunsire (Dunsire, 1973) indicated that the roots of the term 'administration' goes back to the writings of Cicero and Ceasar in ancient Rome who used the Latin word 'administrare' to mean almost the same thing as we use today. In fact, it may not be wrong to think that (naturally in varying nature) 'administration existed in the lives and minds of human beings as early as they began to form collectivities.

of a specific paradigm. However, it is possible to talk about the existence of (either 'claimant' or 'true') paradigms of public administration which basically centered (and discussed) on this dichotomy, such as the case for 'New Public Administration', 'Comparative Public Administration', 'Democratic Administration' and 'Civism in Administration'. In all these, 'politics' is placed as one level of human interaction and one way or another linked with the administrative process, itself being another level.

A similar thing is valid for the administration/management dichotomy. Despite the fact that 'management' is relatively younger when compared with the politics, being a practice and concept peculiar to emergence of capitalism as a social order, when it comes to 'linking' them to each other one has to go to earlier times. Just like the case for politics/administration dichotomy, common issues and relationships can easily be found in the dichotomy of management and public administration. As a result of this, since the emergence of 'management' the attempts for the 'linking process' did not cease to exist.

Consequently, due to reasons to be mentioned below, it is difficult to accept Nicholas Henry's (Henry, 1989) con-

sideration of 'management' as being another (in fact, the fourth) paradigm of public administration. As to determine the temporal location, Henry stated that the fourth paradigm of 'management' for public administration took place between 1956 and 1970. (Henry, *ibid.*, 34) Just like we cannot limit, for example, politics in administration with a paradigm and time, it is very difficult to limit 'management' and public administration in a similar fashion.

As the example for a specific paradigm that is centered on 'management/administration' dichotomy, we can suggest the perspective of 'public management' which born (contrary to Henry's classification) in late 1970s and early 1980s. In this part, the emphasis will be on this specific formulation, whereas remarks and evaluations about the link between management as a generic process and administration will also be attempted especially in respect to the 'crisis of identity'.

The mentioned specific formulation on the dichotomy of public administration and management is generally called 'public management'. The term public management has both the practical and the theoretical dimensions. The attempts are oriented towards establishing it both as an administrative practice and philosophy along with a specific

'branch' or a new discipline of the social study. At the practical level, the perspective is relatively simple and clear. In a broad sense basic arguments may be summarized as follows.

Although the quality and the quantity vary from society to society and time to time, contemporary state is the 'capitalist' state. This has two meanings here. First the state is placed at the middle of a capitalist 'environment' or social setting which continues its existence under determined (and generally known and justified) rules or 'rules of the game'. By using another jargon, in respect to external conditions, the position of state is somehow 'determined' in one respect. On the other hand, the state is not only a passive body just standing still in the midst of a capitalist environment. Especially because of the fact that it is also another material producer of both goods and services, it also interacts with that environment actively. In other words, it also 'determines' the conditions of the environment. The problem starts just at this point. Since the state is another actor in the stage, it must also play its part according to the rules, otherwise the whole play (including the civil society) may be ruined and the 'order' may be damaged or broken. This necessity, in fact, comes from the

life, also called as 'market conditions'. Due to the rules of the economy, the deficit in the state budget has negative impact upon the whole system. The well known negative impact is on the increase of inflation rate together with the adverse effect onto the investments. Economy gets into a crisis situation, recession begins, unemployment figures increase and profit rates get lower. The state, in other words, should 'manage' its own budget so as to make ends meet, keeping budget deficits as small as possible. To manage means here, above all, considering the state as a whole, as another 'enterprise'. Especially this is relevant for its direct production tools, generally known as state economic enterprises. The state enterprises therefore should be 'managed', this means taking 'rational decisions', successfully and effectively applying them, just like the objectives of other enterprises or actors on the stage.

It must be denoted that the arguments related with the practical dimension of 'public management' are very similar, if not the same, with the arguments used by the so called 'new-right' perspective. This is especially relevant for explaining the reasons of 'crisis' emerged as a result of 'Keynesian policies' or the welfare state. This is not a coincidence, for, in my opinion, there is a 'causal' relationship between 'new-right' policies formu-

lated as an 'alternative' to the ongoing 'crisis' of capitalist order and public management thesis. That link is related with efforts of legitimizing and overcoming the crisis situation. It should be added that 'public management' approach is not only associated with eliminating the deficit in the state budget, but equally important, making that budget as small as possible. In other words, this means 'decreasing' the state presence in the economic life as much as possible. 'Less government' is the principle, concentrating the state activity on specific areas such as internal and external defence, less profitable (or non-profitable) services and productions such as national education, health, infra-structure investments. In these areas subsidies should be eliminated at all, the state should find and secure the resources before getting into action, and the prices of these services should be 'realistically' determined and collected. These are all the operations of the 'enterprises', which should be executed by professional managers with the philosophy and requirements of entrepreneurship. Also since the state activity should be minimized, some 'traditional' services and goods produced by the state should be 'privatized'. This will not only shrink the size of the state but also will be used as a 'yard-stick'. If a specific production, because of various reasons, cannot be sustained by the state in conformity with the requirements of the 'rules of

the game', in order to prevent adverse effects on the economic life, it may be 'reconstructed' or 'rationalized'. On the other hand, at the theoretical level, public management idea is formulated in the following fashion.

James Perry and Kenneth Kraemer of University of California wrote (edited) a book in 1983 titled 'Public Management: Public and Private Perspectives'. (Perry, 1983). The purpose of the book may be summarized in one sentence: To formulate and initiate the existence of a new 'science' of 'public management'. In this context, some major characteristics of this 'new' field is formulated like these:

- a- "Its primary purpose is to develop an understanding of how public, primarily governmental, organizations may accomplish the missions charged to them" (Perry, 1983, xi),
- b- The core (or the main unit of analysis) is the 'executive function', (not the legislative and judicial functions), "and executives and managers in public organizations are the predominant clientele of this applied field" (ibid., xi),
- c- "discovery of differentiated knowledge, tools and techniques for more effective executive management is a key" (ibid., xi) to create a 'competence' among public administrators,
- d- "Intersector and interorganization comparison is a critical method for definition and advancement of the field". (ibid., xi) Before further

elaborating this perspective a few remarks should be made on the these characteristics.

The point marked as 'a' above gives us the impression that this 'new' field is, in fact, the 'old' field of public administration. Classical definition as to the boundary of public administration is repeated here, what's more, following the 'reductionist' pattern public administration is limited to (public) 'organizations'. We have already discussed this 'narrow approach to public administration'. The classical understanding continues when the 'task-oriented' nature is emphasized, in other words public administration is reduced to a 'mean', a 'tool', or a 'problem-solver', with the omni-present goal of 'accomplishing' the tasks.

At point 'b', the limitation process continues, further to a specific area, the executive, which is also another well known and generally accepted classical theme for the field. However, two points are important here. First "executives and managers are the predominant clientele", in an effort to bring a new 'insight' to the classical formulation of 'bureaucracy', and second, that this is an "applied field". The consistency is evident here with point 'a' above, that this is a field of problem

solving, going one step further, problems of the daily life faced by 'executives and managers'.

Point 'c' is related with the methodology or the epistemology of the field, and gives us two major clues in this respect. First, 'differentiated field' may come to mean a specific field having not only its identity but its characteristic methods of knowledge acquisition, second 'discovery' of this differentiated knowledge to indicate a certain and positivist understanding of science.¹¹ Another interesting thing about this item is the mentioned 'competence' among public 'managers' put as one of the objectives for the field to maintain. Naturally, this is related with the market situation, since classically 'competition' among different entrepreneurs is given as one of the main motivations of the market life. This should also be extended to public management.

The last item indicates a further epistemological standpoint, and it is in consistency with the previous one. It states that both the sectors and different organizations should be included in the unit of analysis, since the organization was the key concept and practice, its va-

¹¹ Despite the fact that the authors were extremely careful not to call this perspective as the 'science' or a branch of the social sciences. For most of cases, they prefer to call it just a 'field'.

rieties and different experience (and its analysis) become inevitable and indispensable for this 'new' 'field'. In my opinion, this perspective, as formulated in this way is far from obtaining a solution to the identity crisis of public administration. The merits it brings, unfortunately, are extremely limited when compared with the problems, difficulties and ambiguities carried along. These problems will be evaluated as our analysis of this perspective continues. Crucial point about this problematic of management /administration is related with a problem of 'identification'. If it becomes possible to identify the phenomena of public administration with the phenomena of management, then the grounds for justification will be attained. This necessitates, at the first place, a kind of comparison between the units of analysis of both realms, done with the aim of showing the distinction between them as being a 'false' one. It is interesting to note that the dominant way in the literature is making intensive comparative analysis of this kind, rather than questioning this method itself. As examples we can mention Graham T Allison's famous article "Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? (Allison, 1983)¹² ,

¹² Another interesting thing about this article is that it was published in three different books on public administration (Stillman, 1983, Perry 1983 and, Lane, 1990) The interesting title of the article is a quotation of Wallace Sayre who worked for establishing a new school

Michael Murray's article "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay" (Murray, 1983) and Rainey, Backoff and Levine's article titled "Comparing Public and Private Organizations" (Rainey, 1983). All of the above mentioned articles are oriented to give elaborated list of both the similarities and differences of public administration and management.

According to Allison similarities between two realms are consisted of the 'principles' of administration. Beginning with 'POSDCORB' he stated that all management, public or private, has to cope with three sets of variables: strategy, managing internal components and managing external constituencies. Establishing objectives and priorities for the organization and preparing operational plans are parts of strategy, whereas organizing, staffing, directing and personnel management, controlling are parts of internal components. Finally, dealing with other organizations that are also subject to the same authority, dealing with independent organizations and, dealing with the press and the public are parts of 'external constituencies'. The similarities, according to Allison are

of Business and Public Administration in Cornell University. His conclusion was: "Public and private management are fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects".

consisted of these points (and these occupy only one page in his article). On the other hand, when it comes to the differences, Allison prefers a different method. Rather than mentioning his own view, he attempts to enlist differences indicated by other authors who previously made similar comparison. The result is a list of 16 items showing differences (which occupied four and a half pages). They include items such as 'measurement of performance, time perspective, equity and efficiency, role of press, career system, legislative and judicial impact' and the like. (Allison, 1983, pp.76-81). His conclusion is as follows.

"The debate between the assimilators and the differentiators, like the dispute between proponents of convergence and divergence between the U.S. and the Soviet Union reminds me of the old argument about whether the glass is half full or half empty. I conclude that public and private management are at least as different as they are similar, and that the differences are more important than the similarities. (Allison, 1983, 87)

We find that even in this most famous article that is usually reprinted and used for justifying that there really exists a field of public management, there are no sufficient and satisfactory arguments to support this idea. The question is, once again, (even if we leave for now, the relevancy of making a comparison like that) whether this small portion of similarities all related

with 'internal' dynamics of generic topic 'administration' are adequate for proposing that public administration is equal to public management. An answer to this question should always take into consideration that such similarities are inevitable due to the fact that both the public sector and the private sector operationalize the practice of administration inside 'organizational settings'. The basic structuring for contemporary organizations, emerged as a result of a certain accumulation of historical events and material conditions shows very clear and unquestioned resemblances. As long as organizations exist, (or people exist to call these structures as 'organizations') resemblances will also exist. Public administration cannot be reduced to organizations alone, even if for management, this is much more likely to do. Public administration practice as well as its theory is as a matter of fact, inevitably so 'rich' that, if such an 'integration' (or 'reduction') is seen as a solution for the 'identity crisis', no 'identity' will be left and naturally no crisis. However, this may constitute a further crisis in itself and probably will solve nothing at all.

Despite the fact that a similar method was employed by Murray, (Murray, 1983), his findings are different. Comparison problem is stated by Murray in this fashion:

"the key substantive issue is whether there is an inherent conflict between the rational, private management model with its criteria of economic efficiency and the political public management model with its criteria of consensus and compromise." (Murray, 1983, 61)

This statement is self evident, in the sense that if the characteristics of both realms are defined in this way, an inherent conflict would be inevitable. This is because consensus and compromise do not always equate with economic efficiency. Despite this fact, Murray (somehow ignoring the substantial differences found in his article) concluded that; "Public and private management procedures, operations and goals cannot be viewed as separate processes"(ibid., 70)

Now the question to be asked is if the ontological status of both realms are different, why to insist on the possibility of integration of the method of inquiry about them? Even Murray himself (despite his position mentioned above) had to mention this point of 'divergence' as the "apples and oranges syndrome of comparing unlike objects"(ibid., 69) Put in other words why to insist on comparing apples and oranges?

A number of different types of answers may be given to this question, but, in my opinion, one thing may always be remembered. As already mentioned, public management perspective may be taken as a consequence of a certain stage of development in the capitalist structure. The advantage it may provide is more related with an ideological standpoint, rather than practical. If we turn back to "key substantive issue" as formulated by Murray, to ignore the conflict between rational model of private management and political public management would mean what may be called as 'rationalization of the political'. When 'management' is introduced to the public administration, in an indirect fashion, political decisions made by that body could be attempted to be rationalized as much as possible. This may be seen as a positive contribution at the first instance, but it should be always remembered that 'rationalization' here has a specific meaning. Rationality in management has come to be equated with 'profit maximization' (be in the short or long run). A state in search of profit maximization (to whoever that profit may belong to) above other things, would mean a reproduction of the existing structure, an equation with the profits and interests of those who have material benefit in the reproduction of it. The state should always represent the general interest, whereas 'rationalization' of this kind inevitably repre-

sents private interests in the end. Similarly, rationalization of political decisions would always come to mean 'consensus and compromise' (in one sense, these would also mean 'efficiency'), disregarding the conflict and dissensus, only to maintain 'harmony' in social relations, if not again, the reproduction of the system as a whole. However, this should not mean, a complete 'divergence' of both fields. In this respect, 'unificationist' perspective should be abandoned, knowledge accumulation of management especially in respect to intra-organizational aspects (methods and tools) may well be applied to public administration. This would not mean that a holistic integration is needed, since this specific formulation, as argued above, is limited with certain developments and ideology. This makes it difficult to universalize to settings outside those boundaries. The public management approach, outside the United States, has been very popular in the United Kingdom. During 1980s so called '3Es' became one of the 'dictum' of British governments. '3Es' represented 'economy', 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness' ¹³ . The

¹³ It should be mentioned that 3Es in neither peculiar to England nor a new thing. 'Double E movement was developed in the United States long ago in the end of 1880s and early 1900s. Emmette Redford described this period like this: " The spirit of Progressivism, the revelations of the muckrakers, the new ideal of scientific management, and the formation of reform and professional organizations (National Civil service Reform League in 1881,.. and the New York Bureau of Municipal Research in 1906) led to the efficiency and economy movement, which was in the main a movement for reform on the administrative side of

British experience was naturally reflected to theory as a result of which in 1991, an interesting article was published in 'Public Administration' sponsored by Royal Institute of Public Administration. As the foregoing analysis reveals in the history of contemporary administrative studies non-American contributions are extremely rare, a point to be evaluated later. This article, in this respect also, is an important contribution to both the public management approach and to the field as a whole.

The article is titled "A Public Management For All Seasons?" and the author is Christopher Hood (Hood, 1991, pp., 3-19). The English version of 'public management', is called 'New Public Management'. This may at the same time, be an expression of (and support for our previous argument that) the inadequacy of 'public management' approach as formulated above. The word 'new', as it was the case for 'New Public Administration' before, is generally used to express a position against the existing one, without disregarding major premises of it. Again, as already mentioned for 'New Public Administration', 'new' does not indicate a substantial or radical change.

government" (Redford, 1975, 3) Efficiency and economy movement was associated with public administration reform as '3Es' is associated with the same by Hood.

According to Hood; "the rise of 'new public management' over the past 15 years is one of the most striking international trends in public administration" (Hood, 1991, 4). He admits that 'NPM' is a 'loose' term but also has a practical meaning. It is an experience including similar administrative "doctrines" that were dominant in administrative reform movements in OECD countries during that time. Hood stated that NPM is directly linked with what he calls as "administrative megatrends":

"(i) attempts to slow down or reverse government growth in terms of overt public spending and staffing,
(ii) the shift toward privatization and quasi-privatization and away from core government institutions, with renewed emphasis on 'subsidiarity' in service provision,
(iii) the development of automation, particularly in information technology, in the production and distribution of public services,
and,

(iv) the development of a more international agenda, increasingly focused on general issues of public management, policy design, decision styles and inter governmental cooperation, on top of the older tradition of individual country specialisms in public administration. (Hood, *ibid.*, 3)

This lengthy quotation is important in the sense that we can find evidence for our previous thesis that there is a direct (and even causal) relationship between 'new-right policies' and public management. For this reason above points will be evaluated one by one.

"Attempts to slow down or reverse government growth", as mentioned earlier, was one of the most important claims of the new right. It was thought that under Keynesian Welfare State, too much public expansion and spending was the number one reason for economic crisis. 'Decreasing the government' was the key for crisis solution. Related with this point was the "privatization" taken as the basic 'tool' for decreasing the government, with an advantageous 'by-product'; enriching the private sector through resource and capital transferring. As a general observation, 'automation' was a common objective and experience in most countries under new right order, with special emphasis on communication technologies and networks. This was necessary for the continuation of the system in the form of continuing exercise of central power (which was supposed to be reduced in size, but needed to be as much stronger as possible), and 'internalization' in the form of sharing individual experiences where these policies were implemented. Citizens who live under the influence of new right policies (also including our country) in one way or another experienced these practices. To think that there is a link between these and the emergence of 'public management', 'new' or 'old', is to support the thesis that it is limited and bounded by certain developments and period, which puts its 'universality' in question.

Now, I shall try to show, how (new) public management approach potentially threatens democratic process both at the organizational level and the societal level. Hood made a classification of the different, as he calls, 'doctrines' of new public management, their meaning and how they are justified by the advocates. I shall try to show that along with constituting a potential threat to democratic process, some of these 'doctrines' are contradicting with one another.

Let's take the first doctrine. It states that "'Hands-on professional management in the public sector'", to mean "active, visible, discretionary control of organizations from named persons at the top, who are 'free to manage' ". This is justified in this fashion; "accountability requires clear assignment of responsibility for action, not diffusion of power" (Hood, 1991, 4)

The operational result of this point is a clear concentration of power at the center of the organization and further enforcement of hierarchies. 'Free to manage' can be identified with 'free to choose' whereas both may come to mean the smallest amount of 'control' or 'regulation'. This is, in the last instance done by citizens in the public sector. 'Named persons' at the top (technocracy) will

be in total control of the organization, having the source of their power or sovereignty not from the 'public' but from their individuality. This is characterized by their having 'expertise' or knowledge accumulation. It should be immediately stated that this perspective is completely consistent with new right policies and 'less government' principle. In contemporary society, due to permeation of state activity to almost all spheres of life, and due to omni-present need for justifying the presence and activity of the state in the eyes of the citizens, 'less government' principle must always go hand in hand with the principle of 'more governance'. Put in other words, there is always a need for a strong, centralist state for the success of new right policies. The state would be in a position to control both its own physical existence and its justification process. The second point gets even more important when one takes into consideration the potential social opposition that may be oriented against these policies and negative burdens these may bring to the certain segments of the society. This opposition may only be faced with and reproduction be maintained via a strong (and less controlled), centralized and authoritarian administrative structures. No need to say, this is incompatible with the generally agreed principles of democracy and popular control and mass participation of the civil society to the administration.

On the other hand, in the second 'doctrine' formulated by Hood we find a stress on "explicit standards and measures of performance". This means, "definition of goals, targets, indicators of success, preferably expressed in quantitative terms, especially for professional services". This is justified as "accountability requires clear statement of goals, efficiency requires 'hard look' at objectives. "Explicit standards and measures of performance", seen from one angle necessitate a strict regulation and control of the administrator. Standards are made to measure, measure means comparison and in total all of these mean 'control'. At the one side there is going to be central, less regulated power centers and users. These will act within predefined borders set through standards and their performance again will be controlled (by whoever have further power to establish these standards and norms) forever. This reveals that there is going to be a continuous command chain under such a system, despite the fact (and perhaps the illusion) that the administrators will be "free to manage".

Another doctrine of new public management thesis is formulated this way: "shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector" to mean, "break up of formerly 'monolithic' units, unbundling of U-form management sys-

tems into corporatized units around products, operating on decentralized 'one-line' budgets and dealing with one another on an 'armslength' basis. This doctrine is justified as "need to create 'manageable' units, separate provision and production interests, gain efficiency advantages of use of contract or franchise arrangements inside as well as outside the public sector"(Hood, *ibid.*, 5) It is interesting to note that whereas the first doctrine discussed above was related with 'centralization' in administration, this is definitely related with 'decentralization'. One may soundly ask the question how to cope centrally governed structures controlled by 'free to manage' technocrats with decentralized, separate budgeted, operating on inside contract or franchise basis units. Put in other words, how to coordinate these decentralized bodies by 'free to manage' experts who hold and use up to the last instance their power and autonomy stemming from their position and expertise?

The illustration of these internally inconsistent and undemocratic proposals of public management approach may easily be extended, but the examples given above are sufficient to show its exact nature. This is further determined by the last doctrine, especially by its 'meaning' as formulated by Hood:

"Stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use", to mean, "cutting direct costs, raising labour discipline, resisting union demands, limiting 'compliance costs' to business", which is justified as "need to check resource demands of public sector and 'do more with less'. In fact, this is a good example of consequences of seeing public administration from the vintage point of private sector management and trying to identify both with one another. When particularized interests organize, it is natural that the maximization of that interest is going to be the ultimate objective. A historical analysis on contemporary private organizations reveals these organizations, in their essence, were formulations of maintaining this objective especially by way of 'controlling' the material and immaterial presence of people who, for this or that reason, became members for those organizations. Further, these members try to orient their physical and/or mental labour toward the same objective. This analysis also reveals that for most of the time, not the harmony, but the conflict was the situation between the 'controllers' and the 'controlled'. We cannot directly apply this to the public sector where the individualistic interests get into marginal state and 'public' interests become the main motivators. In contemporary state those public interests are usually met through production and distribution of 'services' to be consumed totally and (as

much as possible) equally by people. If the managers have the right to 'manage freely,' people who utilize these services should have their right to 'control' both their production stage and the distribution, so that they are 'free to control' their own administration and administrators. Proposals like 'cutting direct costs', 'raising labour discipline', 'resisting union demands', all remained in the past, in the struggle of 'control' in private production, though these were successful in one sense (that such organizations and the system in which these structures were dominant continued their existence until now). These were unsuccessful in another sense since those struggles resulted in major 'progress' in the general and work conditions of the 'controlled people', especially compared to older times in history. Such a struggle should not take place between people who control the state apparatus and people who work for the state, for in real sense, those laborers of the state apparatus (themselves being citizens) should have a word on its (and their own) administration.

The above argument shows again the necessity of evaluating public administration also from a political perspective, but contrary to this, Hood claims one of the characteristics of NPM which make it universal or "a public management for all seasons", is its having "political neu-

trality" (Hood, *ibid.*, 8) Claim for universality (if it is relevant at all) would mean a solution for the problem set and elaborated in this study; the identity crisis. This is because;

"First, much the same set of received doctrines was advanced as the means to solve 'management ills' in many different contexts-different organizations, policy fields, levels of government, countries. From Denmark to New Zealand, from education to health care, from central to local government and quangos, from rich North to poor South, similar remedies were prescribed along the lines of ... (the doctrines mentioned earlier). (Hood, 1991, 8), (my stress)

No crisis of identity under such circumstances. No 'politics' as well, because;

"NPM was claimed to be an 'apolitical' framework within which many different values could be pursued effectively...purported to offer a neutral and all-purpose instrument for realizing whatever goals elected representatives might set" (Hood, *ibid.*, 8)

It is both irrelevant to think all administrations and societies to be alike and public administration can ever be 'free of politics' simply being a neutral 'problem-solving' instrument. It has a political identity, and sometimes, rather than trying to solve problems, being a part of societal life, it 'creates' them. That may only be understood by visualizing it in its exact location (the social structure, politics being only one dimension of

it). It may not be wrong to conclude that this formulation is a specific attempt of specifying the particular as if it was the general solution. It may only be relevant and meaningful within its own cultural, temporal and spatial boundaries. It should be once more stated that taking 'management' as a generic process and trying to get the benefit of its knowledge accumulation and experience and trying to adapt it into operational form for public administration is not objected here. Identifying both realms with each other and mainly doing this for an ideological purpose and to propose that this is a 'scientific' 'key' to solve the crisis of administration is, in fact, the real objected and rejected point.

D. MINNOWBROOK REVISITED:Minnowbrook II

Sixty-eight scholars and practitioners of public administration came together in September 1988, at Minnowbrook Conference Site of Syracuse University, 20 years after the first Minnowbrook conference where the 'new public administration' was born. Among the 68 conferees 32 persons were the ones who 'entered the field' in 1960s and most of them were the ones who attended Minnowbrook I. The other 36 people, 'entered the field' in 1980s. The purpose was clear: to discuss the change in public administration basically by comparing and contrasting the ideas and perspective generated in Minnowbrook I with those of the 'young generation'. The results and related reports of the meeting were collected in the form of individual articles, abstractions and responses in March/April issue of Public Administration Review. In my opinion, there exists substantial differences between two meetings despite the fact that in most of the articles of the collection, the opposite was suggested. In fact, it may not be wrong to say that the most evident similarity between these is the continuing stress on the existence of an 'identity crisis' in public administration and demands (and formulations) to overcome it. Other than these, despite minor and marginal convergence on some issues, there is a substantial divergence which is important for the

scope of this study and this chapter. Below is an analysis of the divergence along with a general evaluation of Minnowbrook II.¹⁴

The environmental conditions that prevailed the Minnowbrook I conference and that led to the emergence of the New Public Administration movement have already been discussed. These were reflected to the general mood as a protest movement especially toward the internal and foreign policies of the United States government. The 'new public administration' was both 'protesting' and 'normative', perhaps, as a result of that 'political connection'. When we examine the initial thoughts and expectations of the organizers of the second conference (who attended the first one as well) we find that a similar 'political' environment was experienced. The prominent person of both conferences, (as well as 'new civism movement') George Frederickson summarized the 'political environment' for 1988 in this fashion:

¹⁴ The totality of ideas and perspectives generated in the first meeting was called 'new public administration'. However, this time, no such labeling and a hesitation to identify it as a 'new' approach. This is a good point for starting to contrast two events because in the first one, as already mentioned, the normative, pioneer and somehow naive mood (despite the existence of problems about the content) up to a certain degree, could justify the use of the word 'new'. However, in the second one, due to many reasons to be discussed here, such mood seems to be lacking and if a labeling had to be used, perhaps, 'not so new' public administration would be more convenient.

"That year marked not only the end of the Reagan Administration, but, if the 1988 elections were a measure of developments, it was likely the closing of an extended period of bureaucracy bashing. The values of individualism and commerce which had been dominant in the preceding decade were becoming subject to question. Cynicism toward government had become somewhat less effective as a means by which to run for and hold public office." (Frederickson, 1989, 95)

We see that surrounding change was twofold. First the actual change in the administration and 'way of administering', second, change in the dominant values, at least a "questioning of individualism and commerce". Public administration or public bureaucracy, being at the center of these changes, it was expected that a similar 'political' attitude to be prevailing at the second Minnowbrook conference. It is very interesting to state that in almost all of the evaluations or comments on the results of the conference such a mood was not only lacking, but also pro-conservational and pro 'apolitical' themes were common. We can illustrate this by discussing a number of themes.

First of all, in the first conference, the concept of 'social equity' was introduced as something missing in social life and as a 'norm' to be continuously looked after by public administration. This time, that notion was not even emphasized, because; "No significant disagreement was

voiced over the importance of this issue and the concomitant sense that social equity is much closer to reality than it was in 1968. The vitriolic nature of the dissatisfaction with the status quo that engulfed Minnowbrook 1 was absent at the 1988 meeting" (Guy, 1989, 219) . "No significant disagreement" on the importance of the issue is not problematic, but, on its being closer to reality and its acceptance without disagreement constitutes the first sign of 'apolitical' and rather conservational mood when compared with the first conference. There is a dilemma here, because Guy also mentioned as a conclusion that there was a common acceptance of "diversity in society", identified "in three main contexts: the issue of generalists vs. specialists; racial, ethnic and sexual diversity; and gender diversity" (ibid., 219). These diversities are in fact, related with the notion of 'social equity', which also could make it as the central theme once again, at least, not giving way to 'optimistic' (and apolitical) attitude of seeing it as more closer to reality.

Second, one of the views that gave way to the political identity of the first conference was a 'trust' and 'thrust' condition about public bureaucracy. It was thought that public sector was capable of initiating a predetermined and normative attitude (that included equity and responsiveness to citizens sustained through radical

reforms in public bureaucracy) thus inciting social dynamics and promoting social change. This time it is noted that there was no such perspective;

"Government is no longer seen as the train on which people want to ride. Privatization is taken for granted in many enterprises. Public servants now function more as conservators than as social agents." (ibid., 220)

The last sentence of the above quotation is a good indicator of the 'conservative' mood prevailed. Third, related with the second point above, relatively 'idealist' attitude in the first conference seems to be replaced with a 'pessimist and conservative 'realism'. Guy calls this as 'accepting' the "rules of the road". According to her (and for the majority of the participants), public administration operates in an environment full of extremely complex and 'immense' problems. These problems cannot be solved easily and quickly, what's more, contrary to the proposals of the first conference, they cannot be solved 'radically'. Thus; "at Minnowbrook II, visions were of the near future, not the long-term future, and they were voluntarily constrained to that which was judged by the participants to be realistic"(Guy, 1989, 221) Getting away from radicalism also may be illustrated by Bailey's remarks, who also wrote an article on the conclusions of Minnowbrook II. According to her;

"In contrast to Minnowbrook I, which challenged public administration to become proactive with regard to social issues, Minnowbrook II retreated from an action perspective to cerebral examinations of democracy, ethics, responsibility, philosophy, and even economics. This was a discussion of the classics; not surprisingly, participants in Minnowbrook II were much more sedate in their interactions than was the original group" (Bailey, 1989, 224)

Why, they were much more sedate and was it really a 'surprise' that they were so? This question cannot be answered easily, however, one point should be taken into consideration. One of the reasons of this conservatism and lack of political rigor may be related with the identity crisis in public administration. As mentioned earlier and to be discussed in detail in the next chapter, a certain conceptualization of the field is getting more and more acceptance. This is identifying public administration with a certain kind of 'problem solver'. Public administration is thought to exist for solving the problems assigned to it. When this is the case, the 'practice' becomes important, making the theory marginal, the 'action' becomes important, making values and/or normativeness marginal. A conservatism is assumed in this perspective, since once this view is adopted, the existence of public administration (along with its being potential 'problem creator') is less questioned. Rather, the focus gets onto internal dynamics, or correctly, on to mechanisms to solve

the problems 'better', 'efficiently' and 'quicker'. Innovation of these methods becomes the core issue, a certain kind of 'technical expertise' is assumed. As it is going to be discussed later, there are direct and causal links between contemporary social and political structuring and this perspective. Again, as already mentioned in the section where we discussed 'public management' approach, this view was further promoted with the 'new-right' policies. In Minnowbrook II, it was noted that almost half of the participants entered the field in 1980s and their experience and education were probably under the influence of this dominant perspective. For them, it is relatively easier to understand why they prefer the practical, rather than the theoretical, apolitical, rather than the political, micro, rather than the macro, short term, rather than the long term, 'amelioration, rather than 'radical change' or concepts and notions like 'privatization', 'competition'¹⁵, 'technological investments'. For the older generation, who lived the first Minnowbrook, it is relatively harder to justify their position, but again it is possible to think that the dominant perspective, as time passes, reinforced itself and probably effected their vision. This is interpreted by

¹⁵ Marc Holzer, who also commented on the conclusions of Minnowbrook II even stated that the competition should be extended to "not only between sectors, but between public-

Holzer in this fashion: "Those who entered the field in 1960s have concluded that the momentum has been lost and have sometimes retreated into the comforting folds of theory and the academy. They may sense that public administration no longer has a clearly defined role" (Holzer, 1989, 221) It is this lack of 'clearly defined role' or put in other words, 'the crisis of identity' that may cause the apparent change in the attitude and standpoint of the older generation. In my opinion, this crisis, being a result of dominant perspective in public administration, as tried to be argued here, blocks the progress in both the practice and the theory of public administration and should be overcome.

In respect to the epistemology of the discipline of public administration, analysis of the conclusions reveals a 'dualist' instance. As discussed above, 'pragmatism' seems to be major theme as stressed by most of the authors. This does not mean, however, theory is left aside, or that practice/theory problematic is completely abandoned. Guy, states this situation like this:

"This was most apparent in several discussion groups that focused on paradigmatic issues in the field. The epistemological question of how people learn about the field has left the realm of science and entered the realm of theology, judging from the intensity of the debates, Reason cannot point where to go, but it can tell how to get there. As a field, public

administration is still in disagreement about how to get there." (Guy, 1989, 219)

In this expression we find not only an indication of the 'identity crisis', but a specific understanding of science as already discussed. "Entering into realm of theology" has a definite, concrete basis for Minnowbrook II, apparent by the comments of Louis C. Gawthrop of Western School of Theology who attended both conferences. Despite this fact, in my opinion, Guy's observation (which in fact implies an indispensability of normativeness in the field) is not applicable to Gawthrop's position. The main reason is Gawthrop, seemingly in defence of 'ethical, moral' issues for public administration, in fact, condemning the theory and emphasize the merits of practice and pragmatism. According to Gawthrop, an incompatibility is evident between ethical, moral issues (of democracy in general and democracy in the United States) and the 'theoretical framework' of discipline of public administration. Just like in 1968, he thinks, 'the attraction' of theory continues in 1988; "Despite the obvious incongruities that exist between theories/models and the stark ethical realities of democracy, the truth of the matter is that the magnetic attraction of Max Weber, incrementalism and systems analysis is seemingly now just as powerful as it was in 1988." (Gawthrop, 1989, 194) In this statement we find that 'incongruities' between theory and 'reality'

(especially the incompatibility between hierarchical, centralist structure of Weberian model and the democracy) could not be eliminated and people continue to remain within these borders. The proposal for the future, is very clear:

"In the mode of Jesus, Jefferson, and Marx¹⁶, the focus of Minnowbrook suggests that despite current wanderings in the wilderness and the diversity and complexity of the present condition, public administration-if infused by a sense of covenantal unity and a sense of democratic constancy- can still become a dynamic and creative force for an ethical reality that, in fact, is free from the corrupting effects of theory" (Gawthrop, 1989, 195)

The gap between 'ethical reality' and 'corrupting effects' of theory would be filled by the dynamic and creative force of public administration. In other words, a pragmatic, action oriented public sector, operating with the guidelines and within the boundaries of a determined 'ethical reality'. An interesting 'normative attitude', perhaps, rejecting a set of norms that constitute the legacy of knowledge accumulation in public administration.

¹⁶ It is interesting to find the name of Marx here, but according to Gawthrop, at Minnowbrook, "what emerged was a seemingly intransigent sense of Marxist faith in the absolute value of human dignity and self-worth and an abiding intensity in a kind of Jeffersonian hopefulness for the future".(Gawthrop, 1989, 194) He finds a ethical/moral merit in what he calls "Marxist faith".

David Porter, metaphorically called this problem of theory/practice as "rigor" and "relevance".(Porter, 1989, 223) Rigor here denotes the academic perspective or the insight, whereas relevance means the pragmatism. According to him, at Minnowbrook I against the discussants from "academe at its ivory-tower-worst, fiddling while Rome was burning", "the louder voices of the action-oriented won the argument"(Porter, 1989, 223). However, at Minnowbrook II, a third word 'resonance' was added to this picture to mean a "bridge for the academician-practitioner between rigor (theory) and relevance (action)"(ibid., 223) Resonance means here an intermediating, that means in the final analysis, theory and practice should co-exist for the discipline. Perhaps, this is the 'normative' conclusion of Minnowbrook II, but just like Minnowbrook I, little went beyond the 'descriptive' stage. This situation is perhaps the most common and continuously discussed issue of the theory of public administration. Needless to say, as such, it is taking its position inside the vicious circle of identifying the same problems and giving the same (or at least similar) answers on the way to solve the identity crisis in public administration. This can also be expressed as, taking its place in the reproduction of this vital crisis of the discipline. Perhaps aware of this point and trying to be cautious on the contribution of Minnowbrook II, most of the authors indicated that such an

evaluation should be done later in the future, that it was early to talk about it. This is a continuation of the view they adopted, that 'verification' or 'falsification' operates as the ultimate guideline, in other words, it all depends on the practice, yet another indicator of pragmatism: "The success or failure of Minnowbrook I and II may well be reflected in the mix of participants in public administration in the next 20 years and in the consequent complexion of Minnowbrook III, if such a conference is convened in 2008."(Bailey, 1989,225) So the discipline has to 'wait and see', whereas "...melding these processes and tasks is likely to be a matter that requires substantial attention on the part of both practitioners and academicians in public administration in the final years of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first."(Cleary, 1989, 227) This ends our discussion of Minnowbrook 'revisited'.

E. CRITICAL THEORY REVISITED:

'A Radical Approach to Public Administration' and 'Toward a Critical Theory'.

The viewpoints that are going to be discussed in this part are essentially different from the previous ones. The difference is related with the epistemology problem. Various perspectives mentioned so far, from an epistemological standpoint, displayed parallelism. Despite the fact that almost all of these were in a 'critical' position and attempted to establish alternatives (paradigm change), it was the content that they differed, not the viewpoints. Put in other words, all these differences, major or minor, were about the "focus" of the theory of administration, rather than the "locus". They displayed similarity essentially because of the fact that they all started from the same assumption on the nature of public administration as a discipline, rather than attempting to alter, if not revise that assumption.

In this part, we shall deal with approaches and theoreticians who claim and share another basic assumption: not only the focus but the locus of the discipline should also be re-evaluated. In other words, this means a rather different conception of the notion of 'paradigm-change', (in fact which is closer to Kuhn's original denotation) by establishing completely different perspective. These theoreticians also share another common assumption: to be

critical. Establishing substantially new viewpoint, naturally, necessitates a critical outlook, mainly towards the mentioned, popularly called, 'mainstream theorists and theories'.

The term 'critical theory' should be underlined here. We have already mentioned that it also denotes a specific perspective in social sciences. It was characterized by a critical attitude towards the capitalist social formation, from Marxist standpoint, exemplified by the works of thinkers like Habermas and Marcuse. The influence of critical theory, as also mentioned, could be clearly seen in the 'new public administration' movement, in regard to its basic criticisms of the contemporary capitalist state. The viewpoints that are going to be analyzed in this part do not belong to that specific 'critical theory' school, despite the fact that they also adopt a critical standpoint. Within this framework, we shall take into consideration Dunleavy's and O'Leary's debate along with Dunn's and Fozouni's interesting formulations.

Dunleavy and O'Leary

In 1982, Patrick Dunleavy of London School of Economics and Political Science wrote an article published in 'Public Administration', Vol.60. (Dunleavy, 1982) The

article is titled "Is There a Radical approach to Public Administration?" and as the name suggests, it constitutes a good example for the 'critical evaluation' of the discipline of public administration. Dissatisfaction with the existing conditions and complaints about the theory of administration, to which the reader is familiar by now, may also be seen in this article. Dunleavy points out that focusing on 'institutions, organizational structures and decision process of governments', the current study of public administration is largely 'formalistic' in nature. Issues outside this nature, such as the 'consequences of these processes' are hardly taken into consideration. Existing literature is full of finding daily solutions to daily problems or "just getting things done". However, according to him;

"... none of these characteristics justify the view held by many writers and administrators that public administration is a theory-less field of study or one which carries no connections with broader approaches to the study of society or to political theories and commitments" (Dunleavy, 1982, 215)

In respect to the theory, his evaluation comprises mainly two categories. The first category is the group of writers (and theories) who are called by him as 'pluralists' being essentially 'conservative' with minor variances in their standpoints. Dunleavy includes to this

group almost all theoreticians discussed in this study who constitute the 'mainstream'. The second category is the 'public choice' theorists and theories, emerged as the result of the 'new-right' philosophy, who; "perceive an intellectual crisis in mainstream public administration, stemming from a damaging and limiting set of assumptions which have prevented writers in the field from thinking critically about the deep structure of their approach" (ibid., 215)

Dunleavy's main objective is to make an 'introduction' to the issue of possibility of a 'radical public administration' that is equally influential as the public choice theory, but which is essentially radical. Being radical here has its own limitations. According to him there may be two broad types of radicalism in social theory. The first one is called the "orthodox Marxism" which is "grounded in labour theory of value economics and historical materialism"(ibid., 216) This type hardly contributes to public administration theory because it says almost nothing about internal dynamics of public organizations and considers state as a whole as a certain social actor 'in charge' of its attributed mission. Further, Dunleavy identifies this type with the practice in some of once called 'communist bloc' countries giving us little contribution to analyze and interpret public administration in a

liberal, capitalist social formation. The only thing related with theory of administration in this perspective is about internal mechanisms of 'communist parties', but he does not find this sufficient:

"Communist party approaches to practical public administration are distinguished chiefly by a stifling and unthinking conservatism. Whilst they officially espouse variants of the Leninist doctrine that public administration can be handed over directly to ordinary workers to run, all communist regimes (with the possible partial exception of Yugoslavia) in practice operate nakedly technocratic form of government." (Dunleavy, 1982, 216)

The second type of radicalism is the one which he is in favour of. This is also 'socialist' in nature, but different from 'orthodox Marxism'. Main characteristics of this type are the acceptance of 'value of liberal democracy', trying to develop socialism through 'classical' political practices that include free elections, free speech and civil liberties. In this type, political system is not accepted as a mere reflection of the economic base, rather taken and studied in itself with regards to its own dynamics. This view is consistent with so called 'neo-Marxism' or 'Marxist-structuralism' or as popularly labelled 'Mediterranean Marxism'.¹⁷ In regards to the prac-

¹⁷ The name comes from the fact that the prominent theoreticians of this school such as Gramsci (with the influence he made to later theoreticians), Althusser,

tice of politics Dunleavy finds links between this view and;

"...left socialist parties or groupings in larger social democratic parties, chiefly the Partie Socialiste in France, the centre to left sections of the British Labour Party, left social democrats in West Germany and Scandinavia, and possibly the most liberal wing of the still Eurocommunist Italian Communist Party" (Dunleavy, 1982, 216)

Drawing the broader context for the 'possibility of radical public administration' in this fashion, Dunleavy gave us major components or tools that will be useful in this mission. These are five in number.

The first 'tool' is related with the problem of 'determination'. A radical analysis must be skeptical about theories of organizations which assume individuals as 'actors' free to choose. In other words 'voluntarism' in organizational life should be questioned. Is it the environment that determines administrative actions or is it the 'actors'? This should not be taken as a complete rejection of 'voluntarism', for Dunleavy, the approaches which pay no attention to the actors and that relate "change instead to the dynamic unfolding of constant

Poulantzas and Balibar were either citizens or had the origin of one Mediterranean country)

'systems of transformation' built into the essential structure of administrative system at any point in time" (ibid., 217) must be questioned. He exemplifies such works by Piaget's and Poulantzas' writings.

Secondly, the radical approach should not reduce its explanations of administrative change to the 'internal logic' of organizational life. Social conflict' is the key factor that initiate such change. In other words, conflict between, "social or occupational classes or major functional groups (such as business and labour)" must be taken into consideration as the administrative change is explained. Administrative events like 'local government reforms', or 'public expenditure control programs' must always be analyzed within this context. His examples are Offe's, Habermas', Littlejohn, Smart and Wakeford's works. This view brings also skepticism on the assumptions that such actions are 'neutral', 'technical' and, perhaps, 'rational'.

The third 'tool' is related with the explanations of social change. Dunleavy claims that a 'radical' approach should refrain 'evolutionary' explanations. Social and organizational change (as assumed by most 'mainstream' writers) does not emerge as a result of 'unilinear', gradual and evolutionary action. Rather 'crises' within the struc-

ture give way to such change. By the term 'crisis' he means;

"..not a point of collapse...rather a crisis is a turning point, for example, the stage of an illness where a patient's condition either degenerates quickly or recovers toward normality and the transcendence of the original illness. Crises are periods of concentrated change.."(Dunleavy, 1982, 218)

Dunleavy thinks most of the administrative crises are the result of 'social conflict'. Since the conflict is endemic, usually crises are managed only by 'displacing tensions'. No need to indicate, this creates further crisis, in other settings. Perhaps, as a result of this, Dunleavy repeatedly indicates that the origins of administrative crises should not be necessarily sought within administrative settings alone. Rather, from a broad angle, administrative change should be visualized and explained.

The fourth 'tool' is about epistemology. In terms of getting knowledge on administrative issues he prefers a 'functionalist' method. Rather than relying on 'causal explanations', functions of the unit of analysis is to be sought for. Dunleavy indicates that this is a 'reintroduction' of functionalism into administration since this was previously utilized by 'systems analysis'. Causal explanations are inadequate, since they usually

give no idea about 'reasons' of change, but just 'describe' it. On the contrary, according to him, functional explanations are 'explanatory' giving us the knowledge of the 'essence' of the action in much more 'realistic' fashion. However it should be immediately mentioned that just like in the most of the above discussed 'tools', he has reservations here as well;

"This is not to claim...that the radical approach can dispense with causal explanation...But a start has been made in analyzing the functions of state activity anew, primarily in terms of a distinction between activities which further economic development (measured by profit and investment levels), and integration" (Dunleavy, 1982, 219)

The final point is about participation of the masses to the administrative process. Here the problem is between 'autonomy in decision making' (which is commonly sought by 'mainstream' theorists) and popular participation. He is against Duncan's and Lukes's what he calls 'revisionist' theory of democracy in which "popular preferences are fulfilled without significant mass participation"(ibid., 219) The result of this and less participation of citizens to the administrative process is the 'technocratic' government (consisted of 'experts' of politics and public administration. Dunleavy uses Habermas's analysis of communication (discussed earlier) to show that in the technocratic government which leads to 'power inequality', communica-

tion is distorted for both within the government and between the government and people. Therefore;

"Technocratic government emerges on this view not just as objectionable in terms of the theory of representative government, but as a form of social arrangements which negates fundamentally human qualities and inevitably induces a loss of common purpose or reference points in society." (Dunleavy, 1982, 219)

In order to reduce these 'inhumane' effects of technocratic governments, mass participation must be sustained and adopted as an ultimate objective for a 'radical' public administration.

According to Dunleavy the most important three areas on which these tools to be applied on concrete basis are 'government organization', 'budgeting' and 'professionalization'. In terms of the first one, the basic assumption is government organizations are structured so that they try to find solutions for social problems. This process, on the other hand, "promotes some kinds of social interests over others". According to Dunleavy 'economic policies' and decisions of government organizations display this nature in liberal democracies. In terms of the 'budgeting' process a radical approach should seek to find 'functions' of each action, especially focusing on the 'output aspects' of them. The example provided by

Dunleavy for such an analysis is the work of James O'Connor and his popular book titled "The Fiscal Crisis of the State". The last core area is 'professionalization'. A radical approach should be skeptical about the merits 'professionalization' of public administration may bring about:

"..in many areas of professional control over policy making, such as doctors' ability to define the content of medical practice, or teachers' control over learning, the provision of pre-packaged services in a form which can be 'sold' to governments is often self-defeating. The professions will almost always reduce people's autonomous capabilities for health care or learning faster than they replace these capabilities with their own commodified solutions. So that for the radical approach, chronic features of state service provision which remain largely unexplained in conventional approaches (such as virtual neglect of preventive medicine) emerge as anomalies inherent in a professionalized form of administration" (Dunleavy, 1982, 231)

Our evaluation of Dunleavy's approach will be centered on two points. The first is related with the positive contribution these ideas bring to the field and the second is the inadequacy of this formulation. The positive contribution is about the epistemology, and the methodology, whereas the inadequacy stems from the content or the practical grounds for materializing the prescribed methodology. Below is the discussion of these points.

The important contribution of Dunleavy's formulation to the field of administration comes from the potential merits inherent in the approach, especially in the methodological 'tools' prescribed. The tools mentioned earlier bring into the agenda those issues either neglected or disdained by previous paradigms/schools. The nature of the contemporary state and the practice of public administration and the 'fact' that dissatisfaction of the existing theory necessitates new visions. New visions are inherent inside these tools, at least in most of them, which should be definitely integrated and utilized in the theory of administration. The theory should go beyond individual subjectivity of administrative actors, should adopt a broader analysis, should take into consideration the crises, functional analysis should be introduced, and, popular participation should be maintained.¹⁸ It must be immediately stressed that this list of 'shoulds' can easily be extended, it will not be wrong to claim that, in fact, these five tools are very small portion that should be adopted by the theory of administration. Second, these tools are not new or original, long been promoted and debated by many other theorists who prefer critical method. The best example for this may be given from the works of Claus Offe. Offe thought two main tasks of the state in capitalism were to maintain the process of accumulation and le-

¹⁸ Among these tools, perhaps, the one which is the most

gitimizing its own existence in the eyes of all citizens. These two 'tasks' are in fact 'functions' attributed to that structure. This view goes beyond subjectivity of the actors, is a good example for broad analysis, is evidently functional and inherently covers crises (especially in terms of what he calls 'legitimation crises'.)

The inadequacy of the formulation stems not from the methodology prescribed but related with the content. This is an important point for it shows us that for the solution of the identity crisis this method is not adequate in itself. Put in other words, 'radicalism', as formulated by Dunleavy prescribes a certain 'attitude' (which is in

open to debate and criticisms is the functional explanation. As already mentioned, Dunleavy conceives functional analysis as an alternative to causal analysis. In my opinion, causality is inherent within the functional analysis. By stating the function of a certain thing or a 'structure', we are making a causal explanation. The reason why it is extremely difficult for us to distinguish causal analysis from functional analysis comes from the fact that both of them starts with a common basic assumption: orderliness. This is evident for the causal analysis which does not question the existence of such an order but only tries to discover or enlighten the aspects of this order. Functional analysis is in a similar position, if the function of A is described as B, then the relation between the object and its function together with the relations between the object and the other objects becomes a 'determined' relation. Determination in this sense reveals the acceptance of an order and orderliness between elements. Further a discursive position emerges when Dunleavy utilizes the notion of 'function', which originally born and consistent with the liberal capitalist discourse towards which he prefers a 'critical' position.

fact, extremely contributory). Setting 'attitudes', or methodologies, definitely is the first step of any inquiry. However these will be in effect when the 'inside' of the context is adequately filled. Dunleavy himself probably did not set such a task for himself, only aiming an introduction (or perhaps 'reintroduction') of those long known issues to the agenda of theoreticians. The problem does not end here especially when we concentrate our analysis on the prospects of application of the proposed 'tools' on the theory of administration.

Such an analysis once again brings to our concern a major problem yet to be solved. This is related with the level of analysis. As discussed above, the main delineating characteristic of the radical approach is related with the unit of analysis. The borders should be consistently a 'broad' one. But when broad perspective is used there will always be the negative potential of what may be called a 'de-emphasis'. When the 'causal-functionality' as mentioned earlier added to this analysis the de-emphasis problem further augmented. The specificity of public administration, taken as a part of a whole (causally or functionally determined) project is likely to be de-emphasized. In my opinion one can easily see this 'de-emphasis' problem in Dunleavy's article when she/he takes into consideration his attempts to 'apply' the approach to con-

crete cases, or the specificity of public administration experience. Inevitably similar analysis remains bounded with a macro, broad context, something which is necessary but not an end in itself.

One of the methods to overcome this problem is, perhaps, replacing the primary unit of analysis. If the specificity of public administration is put into the core unit of analysis and the inquiry starts there then it may be easier to set the links between this unit and the broader context. In concrete, first the aspects of administration in particular, public administration in general should be studied and explained. This seems to be necessary, at least, for the solution of the 'identity crisis'. The broad perspective (and causal-functional explanation) may easily be integrated at each stage of this primary analysis. As also mentioned by Dunleavy, Marxist-socialist school long neglected the specific analysis bounded with the macro approach, integrating both levels is very rare, if not, non-existing. Unfortunately, Dunleavy's efforts despite his own mentioning of awareness of the problem, remain within the same epistemological and ontological position. The importance of his efforts, as mentioned earlier, comes from being one of the 'rare', prescribing what to do, and giving us (desperately needed) alternative vision which should be elaborated and devel-

oped. Unfortunately, it should be added, since the publication of the article (1982), studies inside the borders he set or the ones that utilize his 'tools' are very rare, again, if non-existent. When this is the case, the reasons of this and perhaps the inadequacy of the method itself must also be evaluated and debated among people related with this discipline.

D. B. O'Leary, also of London School of Economics and Political Science wrote a note on Dunleavy's article published in the same periodical three years later. (O'Leary, 1985) In its essence the article is a critique of Dunleavy's approach. The most important criticism is about the relationship between 'radicalism' and 'functionalism'.

According to O'Leary;

"There is no necessary connection between structuralism and radicalism. There is no strong historical correlation between being structuralist and radical. "(O'Leary, 1985, 345)

To illustrate the invalidity of the assertion, O'Leary gives the example of (the first) Minnowbrook. According to him the 'New Public Administration' movement is in one sense radical. It is extremely difficult to consider it as 'structural' (since structuralism, as also proposed by Dunleavy, 'is highly skeptical of explanations' that are

based on conscious actions and motives of actors). The new public administration being essentially 'normative' in character reflected a kind of 'voluntarism', and 'subjectivity'. Also the notion of 'participation', being one of the 'tools' of radical approach, was equally important for the new public administration as well.

In this account of O'Leary, one can easily see a 'reactionary' position against 'neo-Marxist' tenets. This is even clear in his second major criticism of Dunleavy. The second criticism is related with the 'crises'. We have seen earlier how Dunleavy gives a 'primacy' to crises. The frequent crises in capitalist societies were evaluated as indicators of heavy social conflicts and their 'displacement' only displaced the quantity and the nature of the conflict without being able to overcome them. With the radical approach, (as well as for the crisis theories) there is a major problem. The stress on the importance of crises as well as their usage for explanations of broader social conflicts causes a 'shift' from the essence of the problem. If we take the term 'crisis' as a metaphor as used in medicine it is something which can be 'superseded' when correct and adequate measures are taken against it. 'Radicalism' is not highly compatible with understanding of crises as such, since being radical necessitates not only being aware of the crises but being radical against

the existence and continuation of the main body that is associated with the crises. In other words, the (real) target must be the body itself not its crises (which may be superseded and as Offe uses the term 'legitimized'). We shall turn back to this problem in the final chapter. O'Leary proposes a solution for this problem in this fashion:

"Rather than focus upon 'crises' which turn out to be inevitable choices with opportunity costs, attention to routine organizational practices and their evolution may be profoundly important for radical purposes. Such a focus might assist the uncovering of hidden structures of domination, whether capitalist or sexist. (O'Leary, 1985, 348)

O'Leary's conclusion is that in Dunleavy's approach 'radicalism' reflects a "particular epistemology" and 'structuralism' a "substantive ideological position". However, the problem is: "...there are no necessary connections between substantive ideological positions and particular epistemologies or methodologies" (O'Leary, *ibid.*, 351). Another conclusion, is the claim on 'irrelevancy' of 'functional' analysis either radical or not. His very interesting final words are as follows:

"Dunleavy's manifesto threatens epistemic and methodological closure for a discipline and for a radicalism which can do without it. May his version of RPA rest in peace.." (O'Leary, *ibid.*, 351)

The problem with the radical administration as formulated by Dunleavy is demarcation between 'epistemology' and 'ideology'. It should be added that O'Leary, accusing Dunleavy on this ground, is also defending (or at least rejecting) yet another ideological position. The debate between them in general, reflects such a condition. This 'ideological' discourse, naturally does not curtail the merits and contributions of a 'radical' analysis of public administration theory.

As the conclusion, it would be better, perhaps, O'Leary to 'underline' the words "his version of" in the above quotation, for in my opinion, there is no reason for 'radical public administration' to "rest in peace". Rather it should be alive and well, not in peace perhaps, as it needs further and further debates and discussion among theoreticians, at least up to this point, something needed but unfortunately lacked.

Dunn and Fozouni

Now we shall turn our attention to another formulation which attempts to lay the grounds for the possibility of a "critical" administrative theory and is more devoted to "methodological" aspects.

Following one of the rare contributions from places outside the United States we turn back to another American formulation. In 1976 in the "Sage Professional Papers in Administrative and Policy Studies" a book was published titled "Toward a Critical Administrative Theory". Co-authors were William N. Dunn and Bahman Fozouni, both of University of Pittsburgh (Dunn, 1976). Like almost all other studied cases, Dunn and Fozouni also manifested their discontentment with the existing situation in the discipline of public administration. They labeled the situation as a "paradigm explosion". This was "an unfortunate situation marked by the diffusion of multiple superficial viewpoints in a field that is increasingly unintelligible" (Dunn, 1976, 5). In fact, their assessment of the existing situation is not only consisted of such criticisms. They also see positive contributions especially in respect to a general trend in which theoreticians go beyond the conventional borders of this discipline. For example issues related with 'philosophy of science', 'epistemology' and 'ethics' are more and more considered and integrated into administrative theory.¹⁹ Despite these positive advancements, however, the authors also admit the existence of a situation which we call an 'identity crisis' and the need for overcoming this. According to Dunn and Fozouni there are currently three

¹⁹ They further indicated that this point resulted in the

"paradigmatic viewpoints"²⁰ dominant in public administration. These are 'Conventional Public Administration' (CPA), 'Scientific Public Administration' (SPA), and, 'New Public Administration' (NPA). CPA and SPA are not evaluated by the authors, their scope is limited to a criticism of NPA. However, we find that by the term SPA they denote mainly 'structuralist' or, 'scientific management' in which, logical positivism is utilized, analogy to natural sciences is aimed and bureaucratic, centralist hierarchical control is established. The major difference between CPA and SPA lies in the adherence to 'value-centered humanistic models' in the former, with the keywords of 'anti-positivism' and the practice. As already mentioned, the authors attempted to ground their approach upon a substantial criticism of NPA, centered on the rejection of the claim that it provided a 'paradigm change'. This claim

emergence of a 'new' language and concepts hitherto unused, including words like 'dialectics, hermeneutics, existentialism, praxis and being familiar with the writings of thinkers such as Hegel, Marx, Husserl, Kuhn and Popper. This further 'expanded' the borderline of public administration.

²⁰ They think this word is appropriate rather than 'paradigm'. They interchangingly use the word "paradigm-surrogates" or "paradigmatic viewpoints". Their definition is as follows:..a tradition, school, or style of science that has concrete historical significance as well as explicit assumptions, methods and research practices." However, "in administrative theory there are no such clear traditions, although we can identify loosely articulated sets of ideas.." (Dunn, 1976, 10) Thus they do not accept the existence of 'real' paradigms in public administration theory.

is called by them as an illusion and the 'paradigmatic change' it provided, as the 'illusion of paradigm shift'. According to Dunn and Fozouni there are basically six points which make NPA an illusionary paradigmatic change. The first one is its having an "antitheory bias".²¹ This resulted in an (fallacious) understanding that 'paradigms were mutually exclusive and incommensurable. In other words, with the objective of changing prevailing paradigms to establish an alternative, they totally rejected other views which might in fact, contribute positively. Second, being an "incomplete, self-contradictory and often totalized (absolute)"(ibid., 7) approach, NPA may be easily criticized and discredited by the proponents of CPA and SPA, namely, empiricists and pragmatists. These people advocate their own biased positions and due to their idealizing "natural science and North American administrative and political practices" they can easily reject and refute NPA as a whole. The third criticism is about the inadequacy of NPA in being 'relevant' to "problems of a pragmatic nature within public organizations managed predominantly by proponents of Conventional Public Administration" (ibid., 8) This is much related with previously mentioned 'neglect' of NPA proponents of the in-

²¹ By the term 'antitheory' they mean; "a totalized world view which rejects in principle all rival perspectives" (Dunn, 1976, 11) Especially NPA's reactionary position against scienticism and logical positivism is referred here.

ternal dynamics of administrative structures and lack of 'operational' definitions of normative concepts such as 'social equity', 'mass participation' and the like. The fourth point is on the inadequacy of NPA in providing a "viable alternative" to SPA "together with its technical apparatus of policy science, systems analysis, and scientific management" (ibid., 8) The authors think SPA is inadequate as a philosophical rationale to be in consistency with democracy and 'egalitarianism'. However, NPA failed to provide an alternative. The fifth point is related with "social determinants" of knowledge. The authors find proponents of CPA belong to an "older generation" of practitioners of administration. They are thought to be usually "insulated from developments in social theory and research". On the other hand, proponents of NPA belong to a younger generation and their 'problem' is their being too young and inexperienced especially in empirical theory and research. As a result of this 'older generation' could not follow the developments, whereas the 'younger generation' condemned something by which they are not adequately familiar and have sufficient knowledge. The last point is on the problem of 'ethnocentrism'. The authors find the existing theory to be built upon an ethnocentrism which puts theoreticians in a position of 'insularity' from rest of the world. This is despite the fact that each of these societies have their specific experience and knowledge ac-

cumulation on the issues related with public administration.

Before starting to evaluate their own alternative, a few comments should be made on their criticisms of the 'paradigms' and especially NPA. As already mentioned, the authors find an 'antitheory' bias in NPA with their rejection of all "rival" views. When we think of their triple classification of CPA, SPA and NPA, and the nature of criticisms oriented, similar comments be made for this approach. This may also be counted as a 'total' worldview close to others, but it should be immediately mentioned that this is only nature in a platform in which everybody (including the authors) accepts the existence of 'paradigms', 'paradigmatic change' and finally, an 'identity crisis' of public administration theory. Every perspective or school in such platform inevitably will have an 'antitheory' bias, otherwise, by definition, we cannot talk about 'existence' of paradigms at all. One may adopt an alternative perspective by not accepting the existence of 'paradigms', but perhaps, only the existence of different 'ways of thought' without unified or common worldviews. If this is done, perhaps then we can talk about the justification for 'antitheory' criticism. However, the authors explicitly stated the merits of 'paradigmatic development' in public administration

(ibid., pp. 9-10). When this is the case, antitheory criticism becomes somehow irrelevant.

A similar irrelevancy may be considered in their criticisms of NPA as its being inadequate for obtaining an alternative especially to 'scientific empiricists'. A true 'paradigm shift' does not necessarily provide 'viable' alternatives to dominant paradigms. The dominant paradigms of SPA and CPA have their own long history and knowledge accumulation. Being normative in nature, NPA should be taken as a 'manifesto' against these dominant paradigms. It was not the original intention of people in Minnowbrook to provide or challenge this long and accumulated history. It should be taken as a 'beginning', a contextual analysis, inside to be filled later and in time. Criticizing something means, at least, manifestation of a 'problem' associated with it, a manifestation of a potential crisis situation. Alternatives may only be found implicitly in such manifestations, as the occurrence of against which necessary measures may be taken (if possible) without a paradigm change. To expect alternatives for existing structures and/or practices in fact, implicitly assumes their acceptance, just to perhaps, 'reform' them, only changing the content. This does not mean a 'real' challenge to the existing structures. A real challenge would not mean formulating alternatives, but perhaps, total

abolishment or replacement of the existing structures by other structures.

Finally, evaluating viewpoints on the basis of 'ages' of their proponents is itself full of prejudice and 'ethnocentric. No generalizations may be made in this respect, neither the inquiry is bounded with age nor youngsters need to 'live' to learn. Especially in public administration theory this may be defended easily as we have the example of Dwight Waldo, who played prominent role in the emergence of different paradigms or schools, and still continues to do so.²²

When we come to their propositions, two remarks should be made in advance. First, as we have seen in many earlier examples, this formulation is yet another 'contextual' one. In other words, the context of an 'critical' administrative science is debated here, not its 'content'. Formulation is oriented for providing a 'framework' for the theory, which makes it essentially 'epistemological' in character. Second, as its given name suggests, this is a 'critical' approach, not a 'radical' one. When this is the case special emphasis was made in maintaining the internal consistency with reference to the point given as a

²² For an evaluation of contribution of Waldo to public administration theory see (O'Toole, 1982)

criticism of 'new public administration' above, namely being an 'antitheory'. To prevent becoming an 'anti-theory' and because of the characteristic of the discourse adapted, a 'radical' rejection of the existing viewpoints is not made. Rather, a 'comprehensive and perhaps, 'mediating' critic is given. To put in other words, this is a formulation in which 'macro' and 'comprehensive' explanations or 'monistic' viewpoints are rejected.

Dunn and Fozouni followed the critical social science tradition as set by Habermas, Radnitzky, Lesche, and Apel. According to this, epistemological status of any science may be investigated in respect to four different levels. There is a hierarchical order between these and at the lowest level there is the 'science'. Science has a broader meaning here, to cover any "general understanding" which can provide answers to challenges and asked questions. The practice of 'research' is important here, and depending on the realm of the subject variations take place. In natural sciences the 'products' of the research are collected under "knowledge systems" or 'theories'. However in social sciences this is not always the same. "Nevertheless, this lack of symmetry should not be regarded as symptomatic of a comparative inferiority of social sciences relative to more exact and highly systematized knowledge systems." (Dunn, 1976, 36) The epistemo-

logical analysis, or a 'science' of 'sciences' should not stop at this lowest level of analysis. The second and the one above the 'science level' is called a 'metascience'.

Whereas 'science' is mostly concerned with producing the knowledge, 'metascience' comprises a set of views through which we can critically evaluate ways of acquiring, producing and using knowledge. Metascience covers many theories about 'research groups', the 'research' itself, and the 'market' of the produced knowledge. While doing this, at metascience level, five perspectives may be adopted. These are formulated by Radnitzky and the authors propose them without any modifications. The first perspective is called "axiothetic-systems" which "seeks to understand science as an integral part of social systems as goal-setting aggregates with aims which are recurrently asserted and which are capable of change and redirection" (ibid., 37). Second perspective is called a "critical perspective" which questions the place of 'science' in human society and its prospects for the future in a 'critical' fashion. The third one is called a "synchronic perspective" and is related with understanding "logical, semantic, information-theoretical and epistemological aspects of science". The fourth one is a "diachronic perspective", using the historic analysis it tries to lay bare the emergence, development of scientific knowledge. Finally, we

have a "sociological perspective", which deals with 'producers' of knowledge as well as its 'users', in short, the human perspective in scientific enterprise. Metascience, utilizing these perspectives attempts to undertake research on the science, the scientists, users and related people in a society. Thus we see the nature of this 'higher' level of critical analysis in which not only the content of knowledge is evaluated, but other processes of its production and usage is also examined.

The third hierarchical level is called "research policy". "Research policy affects research by articulating explicit and implicit values that originate and acquire salience in society....performs a guidance function by making "differential recommendations concerning research projects on the basis of social and other goals and of research theory."(Dunn, 1976, 38)

The highest level is called "worldview", (or "weltanschauung"). This level has two parts. The first is the theoretical part that gives us world view "pictures" drawn by existing state of scientific knowledge. The practical part is the second one and it is consisted of a 'way of life' which is essentially delimited by 'ethics', 'maxims', 'goals', 'values', and the like. The theoretical part is further divided into two realms and these are

called 'philosophical cosmology' (which deals with the object of natural sciences) and 'philosophical anthropology' (that is globally related with human beings and their place on the world, ideals and images of man, societies and human history).

In my opinion, this essentially functionalist understanding of scientific enterprise in social life is made possible by a rather different conception of 'knowledge'. When knowledge is seen as a 'product', just like many other material products in social life, it gains a 'multi-dimensional' structure. Any product is subject to two major process: its production and utilization. Together with the product itself this triple structure would give us not only a better understanding of the production process, but our mastery over that process. Related with these arguments, any realm of knowledge, including public administration, should not be studied only in respect to its 'technical' stage (or as Dunn and Fozouni stated, at the 'science' level) which is analogous to the 'product' itself, but in respect to its 'production' and 'distribution' (utility) stages as well. This may be the essential condition for its better understanding and mastery over it.

According to Dunn and Fozouni an analysis of science within this framework would give us the current status and nature of administrative science as well. This analysis reveals a 'triple' classification of 'philosophical anthropology' of knowledge and 'metascience':

MEDIA	KNOWLEDGE CONSTITUTIVE INTERESTS	LEVEL OF DEFINITION	AIMS	FOCUS OF RESEARCH	DISCIPLINE CLUSTER
Work	Technical	Context-Free language (extensional/monologic)	Problem solving Operational success Productivity Technical control	Explanation methodological intersubjectivity	Natural, Empirico-Analytic and Behavioral Sciences
Language (symbolic interaction)	Hermeneutics	Intersubjective Shared Ordinary Language (intensional /dialogic)	Understanding and Interpretation of meaning	Understanding symbolically mediated intersubjectivity	Historical-Hermeneutic Sciences
Dominion (mastery, governing, steering, control)	Emancipatory	Undistorted Communication (communicative competence)	Human Freedom in organizations and society Individuation Extension of Domination-Free Communication	Mediation of Explanation & Understanding Ideology-Critique Self-Reflection of Man and Disciplines	Critical Social Sciences

TABLE 1: PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE AND METASCIENCE (Dunn, 1976, 41)

As the above table reveals, depending on the type of 'media' used different disciplines are formed with different characteristics. Here the word 'media' means collectivity of all the tools and means used for creating and

reproducing a society. In other words they are the means of socialization process. The authors use the type of media as defined by Habermas: work (labor), communicative or language interaction and dominion. The first media is the work and where this is dominant the aims of any social mechanisms turn out to be 'problem solving', 'productivity' and 'technical control'. Under such context, for any kind of research activity, the focus becomes 'explanation' and according to the authors this is typical of 'natural', 'empirico-analytic' and their application to social realm; 'behavioral sciences'. If we turn back to their analysis of existing paradigms (surrogates) in administrative theory this level of knowledge is somewhat akin to SPA with its logical positivism, human receptivity, regularity, hierarchy and the like. This level of knowledge naturally fulfills a determined function in social life and this is described within the analysis of "knowledge constitutive interests"²³ The type of interests here are labeled as 'technical interests'. However, this creates an identity problem, since technical interest are not defined and their affinity is not discussed. Technical interests "of whom"? must be the question here but as this

²³ "Knowledge constitutive interests is defined (following Habermas and other critical theory advocates) as the set of all (transcendental or metaempirical) conditions inside which all knowledge related activities including research is made. This is the ground, perhaps, on which individual and collective interests in a society are integrated with knowledge production and utility processes.

is also de-emphasized in critical analysis in general, neglected here as well. When this is the case the material grounds are not brought into concern, despite the fact that the word 'interest' itself is a material word. We shall turn back to this general problem of 'identity' later.

The second level of philosophical anthropology includes the medium of "language" or the symbolic interaction. Here the focus turns back to human being and the aim becomes understanding and interpretation of him in respect to the 'meaning' which is communicated through language. When this is the case research oriented activities are focused on not explanation but only 'understanding', and subjectivity becomes important rather than objectivity of the previous level. According to critical theory the discipline under this category is "historical-hermeneutic sciences" and the knowledge constitutive interest is centered around again, hermeneutic. Here 'understanding'; "...may emanate from a dialectical mediation of understanding of self and others in a process of horizontal and vertical interaction" It can also be seen "...from a spatio-temporal perspective which includes the historical interpretation of actions, products of cultures in the form of texts and scripts, and ways of life." (ibid., 43) Thus language is gained a new meaning here, not a simple "act"

of communication, but a medium through which human being gains an identity and interact with outside. It is interesting to note that whereas the previous level was akin to SPA we can find similar links between this level of knowledge and NPA. NPA was defined as against positivism, stressing the importance of notions like culture and language, human creativity, human control, voluntarism, normativeness, ethics, non-hierarchy, value and the like. It should be repeated here that Dunn and Fozouni did not see a major break of NPA from other paradigms especially in terms of lack of "ideology-critique" and more important, lack of "self-reflection of man and the discipline of public administration". These points constitute the core of the authors proposals and to be able to understand them first we must discuss the third level of philosophical anthropology on knowledge related levels.

The third level brings us to the 'critical social sciences'. At this level the medium is the 'dominion. It means deliberate (and voluntaristic) efforts of men to maintain a condition of mastery or control over all kinds of repression. In other words this is an 'emancipation situation which, in fact, constitutes the main 'knowledge constitutive interest'. In the sense as Habermas put it, 'undistorted communication' takes place here and the basic objective is to sustain 'full freedom at every level of

society'. Here administration becomes an important topic, since 'organizations' are seen as one form of situation through which 'repression' is exercised, and that should be ended. This is not an easy task and if this was done successfully, there would be no problem of 'identity crisis' in public administration. Critical administration, as mentioned earlier, does not provide ways of doing this but only gives us propositions to be able to do so. In the following part we shall try to gather these propositions item by item. First, the concept of administrative 'praxis' should be brought into the core of administrative theory. However, it should be immediately mentioned that their understanding of the word is somehow different from conventional meaning. The term 'administrative praxis' was elaborated by Orion White²⁴, a member of New Public Administration School (White, 1973) Praxis includes both the theory and the 'action'. In fact, according to White, praxis has 'triple' constituents. First, there is a theory (which is the expression of a "relative truth"). The theory in this sense, is not a manifestation of an 'objective reality'. If this was so, there would only be 'one' (or monistic) theory on a single issue. For example; "institutions, which must be based on a theory of one sort or another, have no "objective" reality. As such institu-

²⁴ White is also a member of the group which 'declared' the so called 'Virginia Manifesto'. This 'manifesto' is going to be elaborated in the next part.

tions cannot properly determine human action" (White, 1973, 84). The second part of 'administrative praxis' is the 'action' (White refrains using the word 'practice') The action, in the final analysis, a subjective 'choice' of the individual usually based on intuitions and feelings of him/her. As such it may or may not be in consistency with the theoretical or the institutional context related with it.

The final part includes a 'commitment' which functions as the 'link' between theory and action. In other words, there is going to be a theory about the situation, the administrator is going to be aware of it, but at the last instance of action, he or she will also be taking into account his or her own (subjective characteristics of) feelings and intuition in a committed fashion. This is necessary since the theory is not a 'reflection' of an objective reality, as such it cannot give us 'concrete' guides of action at the time of action, each situation has its own properties (again that cannot be based on a theory of 'objective reality'. In the end;

"Hence, for the theoretician and the practitioner to be able to work together, each must modify his stance. The practitioner must commit himself to risking the implementation of new value orientations in his situation. The theoretician, on the other hand, must become more honest about what he is attempting to sell to the practitioner. In being offered a theory,

the working administrator is being asked to take a political risk. this must be acknowledged. If the theoretician would acknowledge that he deals in values, he might better be able to develop workable strategies for the implementation of his theories by the practitioner." (White, 1973, 85)

In my opinion, the problem with the concept of administrative praxis as formulated in this way is 'overstating' the 'voluntarist' action of individuals in organizations. The intuitions and feelings of the individuals are taken here as another set of 'objective reality'. If this is correct, the objectivity would be associated with their subjectivity and this would lead them to make 'rational' actions. We know that 'objective reality' is rejected at the first instance. The subjective characteristics are treated as parts of an objective reality in according to which individuals take decisions. The point neglected is all the individuals are found inside 'organizational' settings that may shape or restrain their subjectivity, namely their feelings and attitudes. In other words they become parts of an objectivity, the practice of organization, or the institution despite the fact that their objectivity is denied by White. Values, feelings and intuitions are not subjective in the last instance. They are formed, evaluated, assessed and even justified inside an objectified reality. Being an administrator, your intuition or feeling may say you to act in a certain way, but the 'concrete' situation that also in-

clude restraints, pressures and more important, conflicts that emerge inside the organizational life would result in your choice and you will probably act in a different way. Most organizational decisions, at least in contemporary world, is not left to voluntarist individual 'preferences' of administrators. This would only mean a complete acceptance of centralist, hierarchical bureaucratic structures in which participation of masses and maintenance of democratic mechanisms is extremely difficult. The subjectivity as such only provides grounds for justification for the central administrators who may take decisions and easily justify these by saying that their feelings told them to do so. White accepts this and calls it a "political risk", but it is the risk of the administrator, what will be the risk of many people who are negatively affected by the results of that action. Political risk should not be taken as something similar to 'risk in business'. In the latter, the involved and negatively affected is relatively very less in number. However it must be added that this view is consistent with other tenets of New Public Administration Movement, which, as stated before, reformist in nature, rather than radical especially when one takes into account its acceptance of the existence of 'administrative structures' and 'state apparatus', only proposing changes (or reforms) in the normative attitudes of technical adminis-

Against White's understanding of 'administrative praxis' the critical approach make criticisms in respect to the problem of 'objective reality'. According to Dunn and Fozouni; "the inevitability of theory to relate to reality in no way justifies the rejection of reality. Important sources of confusion derive also from theory, which itself must be questioned. Societal change always includes a theory of reality which expresses normative ideals that contradict reality" (Dunn, 1976, 59) If the objective reality is rejected, how one would be able to change the world and organizations (which are not in reality but only in our mind, or in our cognitive structure) Is it going to be sufficient to change our views (or cognitive set) to change the world. If this were possible, the world would be very different by now!

Thus, according to critical theory the concept of administrative praxis which is taken as an integration of theory and practice in a dialectical fashion should be seen as a core notion. It should exclude 'relativism' since relativism would give way to 'antitheory'. It is impossible to criticize any idea in relativism, since "...criticism cannot be directed against doctrines which deny the premise of objectivation" (ibid., 59)

The second point important for a critical administrative theory is related with the 'historical understanding'. According to authors, in evaluating our "knowledge about public organizations" it is popular to use "synchronic" approach.²⁵ By definition this perspective focuses on current position of the issue, not primarily concerned with its 'history'. On the contrary, only 'history' related theme is using the notion of 'paradigms' but this is done in an 'ahistorical' and 'ethnocentric way. These two characteristics prevent to understand the emergence and reasons of 'true' paradigm changes both in general sociology and public administration. To prevent this, perhaps, a "diachronic" perspective²⁶ should be preferred since this is going to make us to adopt a historical analysis.

The third important point is related with the methodology. We have already mentioned repeated emphasis on the use of hermeneutic approach and empirical techniques together. Empirical research is especially important for three areas in which, according to authors, it is currently almost nonexistent. These areas are related with

²⁵ Synchronic approach is defined as a perspective "which seeks to understand the logical, semantic, information-theoretical, and epistemological aspects of science:(Dunn, 1976, 37)

²⁶ A diachronic perspective is defined as the one "which seeks to explain the genesis, growth and development of scientific knowledge"(ibid., 37)

the dominant paradigms in public administration and these are as follows. First, the 'extent' of actual dominance of any paradigm in the profession and discipline. Second, the impact of knowledge generated upon influencing planning, policy and administration directly or indirectly. Third, its influence for the legitimation of intellectual schools, the tradition and other institutions. The empirical research on these areas are necessary because of the fact that;

"..epistemological studies are not substitute for empirical research,.. to treat epistemological hypotheses as if they were empirically substantiated is a gross error." (ibid., 64)

It must be remembered that advocating empirical research does not come to mean here advocating positivism or logical empiricism. In the last instance, empirical method is a tool, and just like the other tools, the context within which they are utilized is important.

Finally, the 'philosophical foundations' of public administration must be settled, especially paying attention of the issues of 'metascience' and the criticisms of the dominant ideology. This may help in maintaining a critique of the 'self-reflection'. However, for the time being, this has "scarcely begun".

Many points discussed in this book and collected under the name of a 'critical approach' to public administration is valuable for the discipline in respect to its identity crisis. The authors try to give an 'outsider' perspective and mention a number of points that are hardly conceived by 'insiders'. Along with this fact, and along with particular points we have discussed in the text, a few points in general also should be stated.

Russell Keat and John Urry, in their book titled "Social Theory as Science" (Keat, 1975) oriented two set of criticisms toward the critical theory in general. First, they find Habermas's (and other critical theorist's) approach in which analytical analysis (and hermeneutics) is attempted to be combined with empirical analysis to be essentially 'positivistic':

"This is revealed partly by the way he characterizes the objects of these sciences, in terms of what is open to detection and manipulation in controlled experiments; partly by the way he describes their aim as the discovery of nomological knowledge; and partly by his inclusion of what he calls the 'systematic sciences of social action', namely economics, sociology and political science, as examples of empirical-analytic science" (Keat, 1975, 227)

The book we dealt with in this part is a good example for attempts to provide justification for including 'public administration' to the list mentioned in the quo-

tation. However, the assertion that this is a 'positivistic' standpoint, in my opinion, is very doubtful and open to debate. This debate is beyond the scope of this study.

The second criticism oriented by Keat and Urry is more valuable and important. This is about 'reconciling' the causal explanation based on the empirical research on the one hand, and the 'interpretive' analysis based on subjectivity (values, feelings, intuition and the like) on the other. Keat and Urry thought this would lead to an undesired 'split' into "two irreconcilable components" in the critical social theory, (ibid., 227) making its future highly 'critical'. This problem is also relevant for public administration theory and when we look at it after approximately twenty years of its formulation, unfortunately, as the existence of the 'crisis of identity' further shows, not resolved yet.

Along with the above two points, in my opinion, there is yet another important problem for the critical theory. Adopting a critical position, in any inquiry, is an essential thing for knowledge accumulation process. However, it cannot be considered as a 'theory' in itself. Without any contextual framework, the list of things which may be criticized is 'ad infinitum'. Everything, as a result of

mental activity, may be criticized in all respects, but the important thing is this is not a theory, but perhaps, only an 'approach' in itself. Put in other words, oversimplifying the point, it becomes a 'critic' for the sake of 'criticism'. It is a fact that in every criticism there is explicitly or implicitly an 'alternative' action proposal, but these 'alternative proposals' should constitute a whole and show consistency among themselves. This problem emerges because of confusing the method and the knowledge generated as the result of its employment. Adopting a critical position may only be one constituent of the method, which may further be discussed and elaborated in itself (its various aspects, relevancy, reliability, etc..) But to turn this method into a theory is something else and this may be realized if one has specific 'reference points' (or yardsticks) against which criticisms are formed. The totality of these 'references' may (or may not) constitute a theory. The term theory is not used in only in strict scientific sense here. It may easily be replaced by the term 'world view'. Criticizing everything in itself cannot be a 'world view' but this is essential for two things; formulating or generating world views and legitimizing (or re-generating) them. In this respect, a need for 'critical self-reflection' in public administration (for each dominant paradigm or school) is essential, but it is not a theory and not adequate as

such. We must set the points on which we base our evaluation. It has a sense to criticize the post industrial society and its associated administrative structures and practices only when and if we have also in our hands adequate reference for legitimizing our criticisms. If we are not adopting a 'pragmatist philosophy' (to be discussed in the next chapter) explicitly framing the alternative may not be strictly needed. However, one must always be careful in legitimizing his/her criticisms. This legitimization may only be made when there exists specific, sometimes ideological, sometimes material, sometimes conflicting, sometimes harmonizing or balancing, but always referencing set of arguments: a contextual framework. This was lacking to a great extend in critical "theory" in general and attempts to bring it to the administrative agenda in particular.

The next part is the last part for this chapter and it includes one of the recent examples of attempts to 'solve' the identity crisis in public administration, this time, in the form of a "manifesto".

F. THE BLACKSBURG "MANIFESTO"

The Blacksburg "Manifesto" is the name given to an article written by six authors. It was first written between 1981 and 1985 but in 1990 it was published in a book titled "Refounding Public Administration". (Wamsley, 1990) All the authors belong to Center for Public Administration and Policy in Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The article is titled "Public Administration and the Governance Process: Shifting the Political Dialogue" and is perhaps one of the rare examples of this field with six authors. This in fact, constitutes one of the reasons of calling the article a "manifesto". All the authors share a certain perspective in the analysis of existing public administration both in practice and theory and as the name suggests, this is a "reactionary" position. This position shows similarity with the earlier cases included in this study in respect to both the methodology and the content. As it is usual by now, it starts with complaints and criticisms of the existing public administration system in the United States and goes on to propose a number of alternative views and concrete 'demands'. The word 'demands' is deliberately used here to indicate that the priority here is with the practice of public administration but always with an attempt to integrate and get the benefit of the theory. This being the

case, it will not be wrong to consider it as a whole, as another attempt to find a solution to and improve the quality of public administration, in practice and theory.

The criticism of the existing situation takes a different form in this article. Difference comes from the fact that the usual pattern used by previous authors was a criticism of the public administration (be theory or practice) followed by the alternative proposals. However this time it is not the public administration to be blamed, it is the system and a number of difficulties if not 'paradoxes' inherent in it. Some of these difficulties are as follows: a) "governing a modern republic with a commitment to freedom and justice on the one hand and a commitment to a complex mixture of capitalism and state intervention on the other" (Wamsley, 1990, 32), b) "maintaining a vigorous economy in an increasingly dangerous environment" which creates, "...pressures for a rational, comprehensive, planning and policy process while our historical and constitutional tradition is based on fractionated power, overlapping jurisdictions, and disjointed incrementalism" (ibid., 32), c) "The commitment to freedom and justice" that "...creates pressures for equity but commitment to state capitalism creates a counterpressure for economic and social differentiation"(ibid., 32) These three items underline in fact, some of the inherent con-

traditions in the 'design' of the capitalist social structure. These contradictions are both within the state itself and between the state and the rest of the society. For instance the first item implies 'capitalism' and the existence of the state pose a potential threat upon 'freedom and justice'. This is a paradox between the state and the rest of society and a continuously stated problem. The operational part of the state has to reconcile between its own presence and preventing itself (and the capitalist system) to pose restrictions upon individual freedom and justice. The second item is the problem generated in the environment, but reflected upon the state: need for being centralist (and comprehensive) whereas the rest demand to be decentralized and 'fractionated'. The last item is related with the 'inequality' directly brought with the existence of state which, by definition represents an unequal relationship. Under such circumstances and difficulties inherent within the system how to run a 'public administration'? In other words, is it relevant and fair to blame the administrative system or is it the capitalist system responsible for the crisis in the social life? The answer provided to this correctly posed question unfortunately, is not clear in the Blacksburg manifesto. On the one hand, we get the impression that problems are generated by the system; "the difficulties of governing such a political system are not the result of, or caused by, pub-

lic administration"(ibid., 32), but on the other hand we find that public administration itself needs to be 'reformulated'; "we see no way of arresting the pathologies of our political system and coming to grips with the sizeable problems of our nation's political economy without a new way of thinking about, speaking of and acting toward The Public Administration"(ibid., 34) This 'dualist' perspective perhaps be justified in this fashion; it is the system creating the crisis, it is the public administration that is going to "arrest the pathologies" and solve the problems (by the help of a sort of "refoundation") Thus we see that public administration is capable of solving (at least alleviating) the difficulties posed by the system as a whole. If the above argument is relevant, it brings forward one positive and one negative aspect to the attempts of 'refounding' public administration. The positive one is the relevant conceptualization of public administration in the broad sense, extending the conceptual and the practical borders. The negative point is related with its isolation. This is an isolation from the system by giving it the eternal role of 'problem (or difficulty) solver, as if it was independent (and autonomous) from the system to which it is 'embedded'. In the Manifesto the trend is towards 'refounding' the public administration so that it will be able to cope with these problems, not, primarily towards criticizing and proposing

alternatives to the system, the place of the state within this system and the public administration. When this is the case, unfortunately, attempts remain in erratic 'adjusting' the (views, words and actions about) public administration to the ongoing system. Put in other words, this is the case 'for' the public administration, not 'against' it. This is also the case for 'recovering' it, if not, solve its 'identity crisis';

"We need to assert that The Public Administration, with the managerial skills which lie at its core and its experience in applying those skills in a political context, is, despite its problems, a major social asset. As a major social asset it should be subjected to constructive criticism but not diminished, denigrated, or decapitalized lightly or for short-run partisan advantage" (Wamsley, 1990, 35)

At the essence of being 'for' the public administration lies a concrete reason; need for recovering or (as also stated by Stever, (Stever, 1988)) "legitimizing" public administration which, as the result of 'new-right' understanding in general, Reagan administration in particular, was 'degraded' and made inferior in/to social relations. This is the second reason (first was its being a collective attempt) why it could be called as a 'manifesto'.

According to the authors, public administration has a 'distinctive character'. This characteristic may be divided into two broad categories. The first is related with the actors and the second is related with the institutional aspect. In respect to the actors, the distinctive nature of public administration is focused on three points: "(1) the Public Administrator must engage not in a struggle for markets and profits but in a struggle with other actors in the political and governmental processes for jurisdiction, legitimacy, and resources; (2) those persons with whom he or she must interact possess distinctive perceptions, expectations and levels of efficacy toward the Public Administration (e.g. the differences between consumers and citizens or suppliers and interest groups are profound); and (3) the requisite skills, foci of attention and perceived tasks of the Public Administration differ markedly from private-sector management." (Wamsley, 1990, 36) These specific 'roles' of actors of public administration are almost completely consistent with the arguments of 'uniqueness' as we have discussed earlier. Before all, these arguments do not support the 'public management' view. The place of 'management' in this picture is defined as "management technologies" which are found "at its core" in a generic form. These technologies further, "comprise its administrative capacity". (ibid., 36) This statement could be reversed, which,

in my opinion would be more correct. It should not be the 'management technologies' as the 'core-generic' but it would be the generic 'administrative practices' that comprise its 'management capacity'. If we take management as the generic activity, the distinctive character of public administration becomes extremely difficult to define and defend. However, the administrative practice can be taken as the generic form from which public administration and management are derived (and separated).

The second aspect of public administration's distinctive character is associated with the institutional side. The authors prefer to call this as "agency perspective". The institutional aspect reflects at least three characteristics. First, the institution is a reflection of a 'specialized knowledge' both with the structure and members. Second, they reflect a 'historical experience' together with a "time-tested wisdom", and third, they represent a kind of a 'social consensus' pertaining to the "public interest relevant to a particular societal function".

In fact, the emphasis on the 'institutional dimension' of public administration is one of the most characterizing aspects of Blacksburg Manifesto. This concept is used in a broad form to include the "constitutional governance pro-

cess". The constitution and the order it brings is the grounds of 'legitimation of public administration' since it is almost completely defined and operated by the constitution. The existence of 'elected officials' is not adequate in itself for the expression of popular will, but a "constitutional order that envisions a remarkable variety of legitimate titles to participate in governance"(ibid., 47) is also needed. The constitutional order is put together with the notion of 'public interest' and this is why perhaps, Gary Wamsley in his introduction to the Manifesto considered their position as "institutionally grounded" (ibid., p.20) especially when compared to Minnowbrook.

Another characterizing nature of Blacksburg view, as repeatedly mentioned by Wamsley is the advocacy of "structuralism". The primacy of the institutions in respect to individuals becomes important. This is legitimized as ; "whatever our commitment to individualism may be, we must live and work in an organizational society.."(Wamsley, 1990, 21). The similarity of this formulation with the 'tools' proposed by Patrick Dunleavy (Dunleavy, 1982) in his "radical approach to public administration" (as discussed earlier) is evident. The first 'tool' of a radical public administration was 'being skeptical of explanations' which were based mainly on 'free'

and 'conscious actions' of individuals. There, public administration as a whole was taken as a structure in itself and the primacy of that structure was maintained. It is further interesting to note that remaining four 'tools' of radical administration as proposed by Dunleavy may also be found in the Blacksburg Manifesto as well. The second tool was proposing a 'broad analysis' on the determination of place of public administration in the society. This is also relevant for the Manifesto in which, as already mentioned, a completely broad and relatively macro analysis is utilized. The third 'tool' is related with the primacy of the concept of 'crises' in making an analysis. The title "refounding public administration" implies the acceptance of a crisis of this sort. By definition, a 'manifesto' includes prospects for overcoming such a crisis. The fourth 'tool' of the radical administration as proposed by Dunleavy was the need for "reintroduction of" functional analysis. In the Manifesto one can also find a 'functionalist' attitude. This is mostly clear in the link between the public administration and capitalism:

- "Capitalism in our case has been helpful in releasing the energy required to move our societal ship. It cannot by itself, however, give it adequate navigation. We must look to The Public Administration, under the captaincy of our political institutions, for this." (Wamsley, 1990, 45"

Before all, the totality of public administration is perceived as something that fulfil a vital role for the society. It is seen as an intermediary between the political institutions which constitute the utmost "guides" and the capitalism. Put in other words, capitalism (to which there is little criticism) can only be properly run when public administration effectively plays its functional role. Thus we see that despite the convergence between the radical administration and Blacksburg perspective, there is also important divergence. It should be noted that the convergence is evident in respect to the methodological issues and the divergence in ontological dimension. Blacksburg Manifesto and the radical administration (and up to a certain point, the critical administration) share views on how to see and evaluate (and give an identity) public administration. However, the former one justifies its 'radicalism' on the grounds that "radical public administration ..has something to offer..to those democratic socialists" (Dunleavy, 1982, 234) on the way to 'refound', 'reform', or completely change the capitalist social formation, whereas, the latter considers public administration to 'steer' the capitalist order within the existing and unnecessarily reformed political, constitutional and societal settings. Blacksburg view is the effort for 're-finding' public administration exactly at the location where it was once lost and to re-establish it. An analysis

of it reveals that 'the point' where it was lost was the beginning of 'new-right policies' and Reagan administration. The authors explicitly or implicitly orient their manifesto (and criticisms) towards this practice.

One important point must be repeated here. As a whole the Blacksburg manifesto is also oriented for the practice of public administration. Further, it is also oriented for the United States of America. However, these should not come to mean the theoretical issues and 'universal' issues are not mentioned. Some of the prescriptions for theory and theoreticians may be summarized like this:

1) Organizational and technical skills (and to study these) are good for public administration, but never sufficient. They give us little about the distinctive characteristic of modern public administration: the governance process. In this context;

"Although public policy analysis and program evaluations (along with 'decision sciences', all being parts of 'organizational and technical skills') used wisely can be valuable in carrying out the public business and in demonstrating agency performance, they are not ends in themselves, and simplistic use and clever abuse must be constantly guarded against." (Wamsley, 1990, 38)

This is the expression of getting away from 'positivist' and 'behavioral "science" of administration toward a 'normativeness' in theory. However, the possibility of a 'universal' discipline of public administration is not considered here. This is evident in the words of Wamsley when he wrote; "Although we never sent it outside the United States nor intended to speak to circumstances outside the American system, we soon began to receive responses and requests for the paper from such places as Australia, the Netherlands and Canada. (We still do not know what to make of this phenomenon but find it interesting)" (ibid., 16) The problem at this point is how to or whether to translate the normativeness involved in this perspective into the universality. If the Manifesto is going to be a "useful invitation to dialogue" and "represent anything in the development of public administration theory" (ibid., 16) this problem should be solved. This is both a justification for its being 'ethnocentric in nature and 'universalistic' at the same time.

2) The politics/administration dichotomy is reconsidered in the Manifesto. "Resolution and clarity" in this very important issue is required in respect to the 'distinctive character' of public administration. The authors stated that depending on the levels of abstraction of both realms it is possible to talk about the following

points; a) the existence of no such dichotomy, b) the existence of such a dichotomy clarified by the practitioners and their attempts to define and distinguish administrative and political roles, c) efforts to further 'clarify, nurture, acknowledge and extend' the distinction between political and administrative roles'. The last point has a vital role in 'legitimizing' the public administration within social relations. This is another component of the 'normativeness', if not a desire to gain an 'independent' identity to the field. Close and 'organic' relationships between two realms are also evident, and perhaps, inevitable.

3) About the 'focus' of the academic study, care should be taken of the efforts to provide more and more 'technical' knowledge and expertise, since these sort of contribution may lead to undesired and too much 'professionalism' in this field. Here we find a prescription for the academic community and perhaps an 'auto-criticism'. It is related with the 'dilemma of 'bureaucracy as a technical, specialized 'profession' and the principle of 'direct participation' and mass-control. As the profession is more specialized by the contributions from the academic community, it is losing its legitimacy in the eyes of citizens as it is getting harder and harder to 'access' and 'control'. The practical consequence of this proposal

is to be a 're-evaluation' of the focus, the research agenda and the objects of study.

These three points not only emphasize some major concerns for theoreticians of this field, but are very crucial 'universal' matters. This is, along with the others, one of the reasons that the Blacksburg Manifesto should be taken, analyzed, elaborated and criticized, despite the fact that, looking from a certain angle, it can also be conceived as practical, political and even ideological manifestation. These characteristics, naturally, do not prevent us placing it among the other attempts of solving the identity crisis in public administration and limiting it only to the context within which it was born. This is also valid for a number of criticisms that may be oriented towards it, both for the ones mentioned here and not mentioned.

General Evaluation

With the Blacksburg Manifesto we conclude our analysis of current developments/contributions to the theory of public administration. The following is the summary of two important conclusions/evaluations of this analysis.

First of all, in respect to the contributions to the knowledge accumulation in the field of public administration since the 'new public administration', a 'dual' situation is seen. On the one hand there is an 'abundance of "new" approaches, or new attempts of formulations which 'enrich the theory. Since Minnowbrook 1, seven different approaches emerged in approximately twenty years. This is a positive thing. However, on the other hand, when we magnify these different formulations and look at the interior, with a few exceptions, 'real' originality seems to be missing. Using another jargon, it seems that there is an 'illusionary' change in the 'focus' of the field which is in fact, a 'displacement' among a few points. Among those few 'focal' points are 'structural' aspects of public administration, 'human' elements, 'political' dimension, 'managerial skills', and the question of 'bureaucracy'. The content of seemingly original formulations changes from one to another and underline different aspects of these. However in essence these remain almost

the same. Among the ones considered in this study almost only the 'critical' and the 'radical' approaches have a different location, others either being 'new wine in the old bottles', or, 'old wine in the new bottles'. Epistemological and ontological reasons for this situation is going to be discussed in the next chapter.

Second, when it comes to the problematic of establishing and utilizing 'paradigms' in theory of public administration the following remarks may be made. If this notion is going to be utilized (despite the problems mentioned earlier), one can talk about the existence of a 'crisis' of paradigms today. Identification of any paradigm in the field is relativistic. To be able to do so, we should have concrete references by which to compare whether a specific formulation is constituting another paradigm or not. If we use the common way of considering the structuralist (or the formalist) and behavioralist approaches as two major paradigms in the field, it is very difficult to locate any modern counterparts. Almost all the approaches covered in this chapter showed a degree of internal consistency, important contributions, and prescriptions. However when compared with two major ones above they are far from being labeled as 'new paradigms'. It should be repeated that the notion of paradigm is used here only for 'comparative' purpose for specific viewpoints. The abundance of 'new'

formulations and the lack of 'paradigms' as such constitute a paradox for public administration theory. One explanation of this may be related with the practice of public administration. The change in the practice showed dynamic and static characteristics concomitantly. Despite the enormous changes in the social, economical, political, ideological and cultural aspects of societal life the essence of the 'state' and practices to run that structure remained almost the same. This is further interesting when we consider the demands or 'utopias' of even contradictory political missions on the way to either completely abolish 'the state' (such was the case for left wing) or 'minimize' it as much as possible (for the right and liberal wing). Despite these 'demands' and 'attempts' to realize this common mission, the state for almost all contemporary societies, is 'alive and well'. When this is the case, for example, the 'analytical' manifestations of the structuralist school and their 'principles', Weber's, Taylor's work, studies on bureaucratic structures still preserve their relevance ²⁷. Ways of 'governing' changed a lot, but the concept of 'administering' remained along with many of its old practices such as bureaucratic structures, hierarchies, formalism, departmentation and the

²⁷ Despite the fact that there is almost nobody or no political mission today which take these principles and analysis as ultimate end points and utilize them in a very strict sense.

like. Perhaps this duality of being 'dynamic' and 'static' at the same time was also reflected to the theory and the result was the condition of being 'original' but 'old' at the same time. In this sense, one may talk about a direct link between theory and practice, a consistency in itself, but looked from another angle, an inconsistency as this does not indicate a 'progress'.

Lennart Lundquist of Copenhagen University in his 1985 article (Lundquist, 1985) has reached to an opposite conclusion on this point. He wrote;

"My thesis is that there is an orientation (in the study of public administration) away from the traditional Weberian model with its rationality, hierarchy, etc." (Lundquist, 1985, 201, my emphasis)

Following a comprehensive analysis of some common concepts used in some contemporary empirical studies he concluded that; "we find within the empirical trends a number of characteristics that are not stressed in Weber's theory of bureaucracy" (ibid., 223) He interpreted this conclusion as the possibility of a "towards a post-Weberian theory of administration" This statement contradicts our above argument that despite the abundance and riches of new attempts little has changed from the major (and older) paradigms, including the structuralism upon which Weber

had substantial influence. However, the justification (or evidence) given by Lundquist in support of his thesis, in fact, supports our conclusion. Lundquist made a comparison between some categories used by Weber and by contemporary theorists and mentioned that some of them were even contradicting each other. The examples are as follows:

<u>Weber</u>	<u>New Characteristics</u>
rationality.....	'garbage can'
intraorganization.....	interorganization
hierarchy.....	mutuality
central coordination.....	spontaneous and decentralized coordination
substantive steering.....	form steering
static.....	dynamic
bureaucracy.....	democracy

(Lundquist, *ibid.*, 224)

Almost all the items given as different from Weber are in fact, do not represent a 'breaking away' from his theory. On the contrary they show that his principles and their validity is still alive. For example 'garbage can' is given for 'rationality'. The existence of a 'garbage can' only gives us a certain, determined level of rationality. (in which rationality is tried to be kept at minimum). The concept of 'rationality' itself is not probed

here, its existence is accepted and attempts are oriented towards not replacing it but decreasing it as much as possible. The same point is relevant for the second item as well. 'Interorganization' does not mean a break away from the concept and practice of the 'organization'. Organization exists, only our focus changes from the internal aspects to external and/or other organizations. The third item is the hierarchy based on division of labour. By replacing it with 'mutuality', we are not replacing this division but only assuming a new 'form' of it, based on this time, for example 'cooperation'. In the fourth item we have 'central coordination' and the contrary item is given as 'spontaneous, decentralized coordination'. We see a similar thing here, the concept and practice of 'coordination' is still relevant, only we propose a different form for its practice: 'decentralized' one, not the 'centralized'. This is also the case for 'substantive steering', when we try to replace it by 'form steering'. The essence, which is the act of 'steering' remains the same. The last two items as being 'static' and emphasis on 'bureaucracy' are by no means different, however I have an objection to their usage here, they are given as two aspects 'favoured' or 'desired' by Max Weber. It is known that Weber himself was aware of the fact that bureaucracy and democracy, inevitably would clash with each other, that bureaucratic structures pose a threat upon democracy.

However what he mentioned was the 'inevitability' of bureaucracy and organizations for;

"..it would be fruitless to try and eliminate it. For one could do so only with the aid of an alternative organization which, in the course of time, would itself become a bureaucracy." (Halevy, 1985, 35)

Thus, Weber's was only a 'determination' of the ongoing process. It would not be fair to think Weber himself favoured 'bureaucracy'. Similar arguments also can be made for being 'static' and 'dynamic'. Again his emphasis was on 'static' nature of the bureaucratic structures inherent in their operational mechanisms, but not favoured them. However, these points do not support the assumption by Lundquist that the theory is getting away and away from Weber's (and structuralism) influence. A real change in the paradigm, or an epistemological break would take place when the concepts like 'organizations', 'rationality', 'hierarchy', 'coordination', 'steering', 'bureaucracy', and even, perhaps, 'administration' itself become 'obsolete and abandoned. This would be the real "post-Weberian theory of administration".

This concludes the second chapter of this study. In this part, we have considered/evaluated some of the contributions to theory of public administration since the

'new public administration movement'. Also evaluated how the commonly accepted 'crisis of identity' is 'visioned'. Very important and valuable steps are made to overcome the crisis but it seems now there is a long way to reach there. The next chapter is devoted to 'prospects' for overcoming this rooted crisis.



CHAPTER THREE OVERCOMING THE CRISIS

Misconceptualization of the identity crisis in public administration.

The analysis in the previous section reveals that in respect to the epistemological and methodological issues of the discipline of public administration a series of problems are encountered. Looking from one angle it may be possible to label the resultant situation as an 'identity crisis'. In fact, as we have tried to show in the foregoing sections this seems to be the common belief of most of the theoreticians. This thesis does not claim the opposite. On the contrary, a vital and substantial 'identity crisis' exists. However, the definition of this crisis and its reasons need to be reformulated and/or reevaluated. We can talk about a prevalent 'misconception' of such a crisis that often leads to a definition of an 'illusory' crisis.

The 'illusory' crisis of identity in the discipline of public administration is characterized by common complaints on 'theoretical pluralism', 'no definition of boundaries', 'unresolved epistemological and methodological problems', 'the existence of unrenewed paradigms and self-repetition', 'lack of universality' and the like. The

totality of these problems are usually accepted to be the causes of the crisis. It should be underlined that almost all these problems are related with the epistemological, methodological, academical and in other words 'intellectual' dimensions of this field. It is impossible to deny the existence of these questions both for social sciences in general and study of public administration in particular. However, we must extend the borders of our definition of such a crisis for this may lead us to erroneous diagnosis and inconvenient treatment.

Such a task necessitates, before all, to think over the distinction and linkage between the 'experience' and the 'academic activity' in public administration:

A- The Experience of Public Administration

Three important topics in the evaluation of practice of administration are; a-collectivities, b-social constructs and, c-professionalization. Below is the discussion of these three points.

a-collectivities

In almost any of the related 'textbooks', the action of 'administration' is characterized by its taking place in between more than one person. Administration in this sense is yet another form of a social relation between in-

dividuals. This characteristic lies at its core. When one considers public administration, the nature of collectivity becomes even more crucial since the state exists for 'administering' the collectivities. At the same time, this administration process is carried out by again collectivities; people who work for the state. Put in other words, this dual involvement of collectivities of human beings results in the consideration of; a) the relationship based on the 'administrative interaction' between the collectivities of the state (civil servants) and collectivities outside, (the civil society, or the 'clients'), b) The 'administrative interaction' among the collectivities of the state. In fact, it would be misleading to completely differentiate between these two groups. The relationship between state collectivities and collectivities of the civil society is shaped by and shaping in return, the relationship within the members of state apparatus. However, taking into consideration the ongoing practice of demarcation between the state and the civil society (despite all the efforts towards 'minimizing' this demarcation as much as possible through for example, the practice of democracy, direct participation, mass control over the state apparatus, practices of 'privatization' and others), the above classification may still be made.

Dealing with collectivities of both types results in return, consideration of the 'inequality' issue. Whichever defining criterion is used inequality is the case when we are faced with collectivities of individuals both within and outside the state formation. Inequality is between both the personal and the social characteristics of individuals. Further, inequality takes place within the relationship of the state as a whole and the civil society. What we call civil society is not a collection of homogenous individuals. Collective interests and demands is a fact, but at the last instance the individual is by himself or herself and by his or her specificity. He or she has his or her own interests, conflicts and demands from the state collectivities. This means, at least theoretically, there exist numerous such characteristics that are reflected to the relationship between the state and the civil society. On the contrary, as we have already mentioned, the collectivities that constitute the state cannot display such a 'variety' in their actions toward the civil society. There is always the practice and the need for 'unification' in the operations of the state. Otherwise, the state would get into a so called, 'legitimation crisis'. Despite this fact, there is no such equality among the members of the state as well. Again despite all efforts to abolish it or replace it with

other forms, the practice of 'hierarchy' is a fact, some people 'administer' 'more' than the others.

The existence of the collectivities (of both types) and their unequal relationships (of all kinds) together with the variety and extent of 'areas' on which administrative actions are carried out, makes the experience of public administration highly difficult, arduous and complex task. Broadly speaking, this experience has two major interrelated grounds of operation. First is the political grounds and the second is the practical grounds. The political grounds are related with the place (and distinction) of the state and civil society and the relationship between these two. The practical grounds, on the other hand, are concerned with the actualization of the actions of the state; when, where, how, for and by whom to realize these. Based on the principles of division of labour, specialization and separation of powers, conventional conceptualization of public administration is basically oriented towards the latter. It is thought that public administration basically operates on the practical grounds, leaving the political dimension to the political authority. This view assumes a politically 'neutral' and/or 'technical' role for public administration, i.e. 'depoliticization' of bureaucracy. In Chapter 2, especially in regards to some

as the 'democratic administration', 'civism in public administration', 'new public administration movement', 'critical approach' and the 'Blacksburg perspective' we have seen the common tendency to view and conceptualize public administration not away from political grounds. On the contrary we have seen attempts to give it more and more and political roles: such as initiator of democracy, civism, participation, defender of minority rights, equality, normative attitudes, and the like. In the contemporary practice it is extremely difficult and erroneous to separate administrative actions as 'political' and 'technical'. Seeing the bureaucratic mechanism as a 'tool' or 'instrument' of political authority is highly problematic, at least because of two interrelated reasons: a) in respect and parallel to political developments in most of the countries practice of 'decentralization' is getting more and more acceptance and application, b) as the jobs that are going to be undertaken by bureaucratic cadres are getting more and more specific and complex, the control of the central authorities over this 'instrument' is more and more decreasing.

In respect to the 'practical' grounds the difficulties and strains put upon the practice of public administration within the context of 'collectivities' is basically related with the 'coordination' and the 'cooperation' prob-

lems. As the quantity and nature of tasks of administrative bodies increase, the number of collectivities also increase. The difficulty stems from the coordination of divided jobs and orient these people to the tasks. There sometimes arise a negative effect of this matter on the political ideals such as decentralization and more participation. As the number of posts and people that are going to be coordinated increase, the accomplishment of this function necessitates more centralized and strong coordination mechanisms. On the other hand, in respect to the 'cooperation' issue the existence of collectivities pose further problems. We have mentioned that the collectivities are by no means homogenous. Also it is generally known that the 'cooperation' factor in administrative functioning is extremely important. The problem then, becomes how to sustain cooperation between these heterogeneous elements. What makes this further problematic is concurrent development of 'competition'. Increasing competition does not only take place between the members of the public administration and the civil society, but perhaps more important, takes place between the members of public administration themselves. If we take the members of bureaucracy as a 'unified' whole committed to common missions or goals, a competition of this sort will not mean anything at all. However, again at the last instance these members are individuals with their own specific social,

political, economical, ideological and even historical conditions and own interests. Cooperation is an individual action and its success depends on individual commitment. Where the competitive conditions exist it becomes more and more difficult both to ask for and to maintain 'cooperation'. Another dimension of 'cooperation' takes place between the civil society and the public administration. In this respect also difficulties and problems may arise since here again we can talk about the existence of both competition and conflict. Not all the times the presence and activities of the state are necessarily 'legitimized' in the eyes of the citizens. Public administration has to cope with rivalries thus generated within itself and in the environment as well.

b-Social constructs:

Perhaps one of the most characterizing feature of collectivities involved in the act of public administration is that they produce and are found inside specific social constructs. The experience of administration necessitated the existence of coordination, order and control in order to cope with the collectivities. There needed a specific 'social construct' to maintain this and then came the concept and practice of 'organizations'. In fact, as it is usually asserted, this is the age of organizations. Public administration is conventionally identified with organiza-

tions. Organization is needed for coordination; to concert and integrate (competing) collectivities and the required operations (actions), order; to maintain efficiency and effectiveness of the actions and, control; to justify the existence and need for such constructs and to sustain the (political) power of the state as the institution and its holders. Therefore organizations, themselves being social constructs, in our age, are the essential operational dimensions of administrative process. At the level of practice, then, making a public administration system run would mean 'designing' and 'running' the organizations.

The conventional understanding, once again, generally assigned the latter task to public administration bodies. 'Design' is basically carried out through political process and authority. Parliaments, laws and governments are the most common three source of accomplishing this task. Public administration is in charge and responsible of 'running' these bodies. When this is the case, public administration once again faces a 'reduction' to 'instrument' position. Under the predefined conditions and borders, within the established contexts and structures operational action is continued. The flexibility given to the public administration is expressed under the notion and practice of 'administrative reform', organizations usually being at the core of it. We have mentioned the

'dynamic' component of administration. Organizations, by definition, are social constructs oriented for action. However, a paradox exists here. As the dimensions of the organizations and organizational life enlarge, it becomes extremely difficult to attain coordination, order and control, three main functions of organizations. Added to this is the rapid change in the outer environment and variations in the quality and quantity of demands to be met. Paradox comes from the point that against the need for such dynamics, the notion and practice of organizations inherently and by definition display static structures over time. The outlet is the so called 'organizational reform' or 'organizational development', a process, itself becomes extremely difficult and problematic in the presence of 'collectivities' of all kind.

Another kind of social construct located in administrative actions emerges as the 'outcome' of the previous one. So called 'public policy' is yet another construct as such. Policy becomes the manifestation of public administration of its 'control' over the civil society and the nature. It is the planned action and involves yet other problem areas for the experience of administration. Resource allocations, decision making, financial control, evaluation are all issues of this sort. Each of these areas necessitates specific mastery, knowledge, and even

talents and fastidious application. Otherwise not only the practice of organizations but the practice of public administration would reflect serious crisis of various kinds.

Before discussing the third core dimension of the ongoing experience of public administration an emphasis should be made. The mentioned concerns on some major aspects of the experience of public administration and many others justify Wilson's previously quoted famous comment: "It is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one". After about 105 years it is even harder. The tasks are widespread, so the organizations. The quantities are enormous, so the risk of all kinds. Specialization marks the societal development, so the collectivities that run the administrative process have to specialize. This is the 'technical' dimension, if not the 'technological' one. There is, and under the given existing conditions, there should be a 'branch', or correctly, the 'profession' of public administration to be able to cope with all these problems.²⁸ This brings us to the third dimension.

²⁸ Whereas specialization of this kind seems to be inevitable and beneficial for the practice of public administration we have the reservation that the same would not be true for it as the 'academic activity'. This is going to be discussed in the following part.

c- Professionalization:

James Stever, in his 1988 book titled "The End Of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-Progressive Era" (Stever, 1988) made a substantial analysis of the 'profession' of public administration in the contemporary era. The study is centered on the case for the United States, however, includes many interesting observations and arguments that have universal validity. Stever's was an attempt to find an answer for a paradox he observed: On the one hand, "American culture has manifested an entrenched bias against government bureaucracy or public administration. On the other hand, it has embraced goals that entail the use of large-scale, nationwide (even worldwide) public bureaucracies: e.g., a technical military, a man on the moon, a nationwide transportation system, regulation of interstate commerce, and control organized crime" (Stever, 1988, 4) He thought that "entrenched bias against government bureaucracy" was basically the product of what he called "progressive era" in which public administration was born (1890 to 1920). There are a number of reasons for this 'degrading' from which both the practice and theory is responsible. However, in terms of the practice, the most important reason is inability of public bureaucracy to 'legitimate' its existence. This is in fact, indirectly seen as an important

'crisis' for public administration and efforts should be oriented to make it 'legitimate' in the eyes of the rest of the society. According to Stever legitimizing public bureaucracy should be essentially based on two processes. First, there is the need for 'ideation' of the field (to be done by the theory, shortly to mean establishing firm grounds and adequate systematic knowledge accumulation to serve the practice), second, this should be turned into a 'real' profession. In other words, for the salvation of public administration, its experience should be fully 'professionalized'.²⁹

Stever defined six 'conditions' for any profession to be developed. These are as follows:

²⁹ Dwight Waldo is very cautious about the possibility of "to levitate public administration into the position of a respected "polity profession". (Waldo, 1988, 931) In his review of Stever's book in September/October 1988 volume of Public Administration Review he mentioned three reasons that curtail such a possibility. These are; a-The concept of 'profession' is a construct of social science and "it is too nebulous and contentious to serve as a model"(ibid., 930 Main reason for this is its being extremely difficult to draw the borders of a 'profession'. Who are going to be included in it?, b-Relevant historic, constitutional and socioeconomic factors create barriers. Some of the factors stated by Stever as the blockades on the road to professionalization are stemming from the constitution, unless the constitution changes (which Waldo thinks cannot be possible without very serious nationwide crisis) these cannot be eliminated, c-in terms of the ideation, or the theory, there is no evidence that an 'integrated', firm basis can be achieved in the future. It should be added that despite his cautious position for the possibility, Waldo has no objection to the idea and the need for professionalization of public bureaucracy.

a) the clients of that profession must perceive it "as the possessor of special, even mystical powers" and they must perceive the services provided "as vital to their well-being" (Stever, 1988, 25). In other words, the profession by whichever way and method (or through ideology) must 'legitimize' itself, its existence and importance in and for the society in general. In my opinion, the legitimization process, despite the fact that it has theoretical and ideological basis, is a practical action, in the last instance. It is at the same time, basically a political process, both depending on and be effected by the ongoing political activity in one country. In other words, it is a practice having historic roots and determination. This is because of the fact that, it is dependent on time, since it is not a spontaneous and discrete action, rather, once such a legitimation is established, there remains an even more difficult task: to reproduce it and to take every possible measure to prevent it facing with 'crises'. Despite all these difficulties, both the 'power' and the 'need' for public administration, i.e. its legitimation is a must for the continuance of the existing system.

b) In order to become a member of the profession, 'training' is necessary. According to Stever existence of 'on-the-job' training is not adequate for becoming into a

profession. Candidates should be subjected to such an education, not only to increase qualifications but also for being able to 'control' the number of them. At the times of 'oversupply', admissions for training programs can be limited. In fact, whereas such a training is a must, and as getting more and more universal acceptance and application, it should not be limited to recruitment only. At all stages of organizational life, education at all levels is a must, and this itself, like many other issues, poses extra burden for maintaining an effective practice of public administration. There is a mutual relation involved here. Education is needed for professionalization and further professionalization is essential within the public administration structuring to cope with ever increasing need and demands for effective education systems.

c) The third requirement is related with the motivation of the members. Everybody should be adequately motivated for their share so that the resultant service produced will be effective enough. The 'professional' is defined as the person who has "higher motives" for action. If one takes into consideration, the question of collectivities and often their being in 'competitive situations, it becomes extremely important to motivate public officials. Without such motivation, and well prescribed action schemes for them, neither professionalization nor legit-

imization could take place. This, in return, poses extra strain and need for technical/talent for the people in charge of motivating the public sector.

d) Another requirement for a profession is stated as the need for "institutional network". This indicates the need for establishing specific institutions through which the members of the profession get into interaction with one another. The institutions may be; "a professional association, certain institutions where professional employment and work occurs, liaison with government licensing boards, and institutions where the training of new recruits occurs." (Stever, 1988, 43) Through such institutions public bureaucracies would not only legitimize their existence easily, but also these would help in overcoming the individual problems of the members. As the consequence, the 'integration' process, both within and with outside, will be more effective for public bureaucracies.

e) The fifth requirement is related with 'inside control' for the profession. In other words this is going to be an 'auto-control' mechanism. By using various institutions and procedures such control mechanisms would be operationalized. Main objective will be preventing certain 'pathologies' of the profession. "No profession can exist

as long as quackery is allowed to tarnish the image and reputation of others in the profession"(ibid., 24)

f) The last but not the least important requirement for professionalization is their having "scientific or technical bases". This point is very important for the scope of this study and is going to be the link to the next topic. Stever stated this as follows:

"..practitioners of a given profession must be able to claim special competency vis-a-vis the general public and vis-a-vis other professions. This competency must be based on a valid body of knowledge that will support the professional's claim for expertise" (Stever, 1988, 23)

The "scientific or technical bases" becomes very important at this point. In my opinion, it will be more relevant to use "and" rather than "or" in this expression, in order to be able to make a distinction between 'scientific' and 'technical' bases. The scientific basis is directly concerned with the field as the academic discipline whereas the technical basis is essentially the concern of the 'experience' of public administration. In fact, all the major concerns about the ongoing practice of public administration, such as the issues of collectivities, inequality, cooperation, coordination and control problems, organizational life, and the problems of profes-

sionalization, together with all the problems that are generated by these bring forth the necessity of establishment of a strong 'technical basis'. We have already mentioned the 'oldness' of the practice of public administration. Human beings have adequate history and experience to accumulate knowledge on that 'technics' side. Administration and state administration is very old practice as a result of which for example, we are able to build 'efficient and effective' administrative structures, carry out highly technical service production and solve many collective problems. In short, at least theoretically human beings are capable of accomplishing 'organizational life' and build appropriate, successful organizations. The role of 'science' in this picture, however, is limited to the 'method' it offers us. Those techniques are subject to improvement day by day, not only by the talents of the people involved, but more important, by the utilization of the method of science. A crisis for public administration is not basically stemming from the problems within the academic realm or between the academic realm and the practice. The real crisis takes place when the 'technicians' of public administration in the face of rapid change of demands 'from' and 'within' public administration structures get short of adequate and effective 'techniques' to meet these and solve many 'unforeseen problems'. Public services, in contemporary period vary from physical con-

struction to health services, tourism to agriculture, finance to international relations, engineering to national education. Further, not only the quality of these services increase, but also the quantity reaches to unprecedented proportions, as the state functioning spreads to all segments and physical being of the societies. Under these circumstances public administration experience should collect within its body all the experts of these areas, in contemporary age can we talk about the existence of the specific 'expertized collectivity' of 'public administration practitioners'? Consequently, in terms of the experience of public administration, where the real crisis takes place, for such a crisis, not only the profession of public administration could be blamed, but perhaps all the above professions together. When we turn back to the assumed crisis in the 'discipline of public administration', the following remarks and arguments about the discipline should also be taken into consideration.

/

**B-THE ACADEMIC ACTIVITY AND RESEARCH IN PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION:**

The unresolved problem of identity crisis in public administration creates a number of complexities within the academic discipline as well. There exist various indicators of such complexities. Among them perhaps, the most important one is related with the quality and the quantity of research activity undertaken. Research making is the essential means of increasing the knowledge accumulation in any branch of study. Surrounded by very rapidly changing environment the research activity becomes the vital factor for the reproduction of that field. It is also crucial for the paradigmatic settlement. For this reason, in this part of the study evaluations of the existing research activities and their quality will be discussed. A series of related studies which cover the period between 1983 and 1992 will be considered here. These will provide a general idea about the quality and the quantity of the last decade research activity in the discipline of public administration. In 1983, Roger L. Dunbar conducted a study (Dunbar, 1983) with the aim of finding out whether the research in public administration has reached to a stage that makes an 'applied' administrative science possible or not. The term 'applied' denotes here a field which adequately provides highlights and prescriptions for the

practitioners, such as that of any branch of 'engineering'³⁰. For this purpose Dunbar analyzed two popular periodicals, Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ) and Harvard Business Review (HBR). He classified the research work published in these journals according to these criteria: a) objectivity-subjectivity, b) orientation towards explaining the order or the change, c) intra or extra organizational boundaries, d) utility (or the existence of) specific recommendations or alternative perspectives. In respect to the first criterion the finding is that "for HBR, administration is considered an art rather than a science. In contrast, the mix of articles published in ASQ represents both sides of the objective-subjective debate over the nature of knowledge in a functional positivist social science." (Dunbar, 1983, 135). The analysis of the second criterion revealed that "both journals emphasized explanations of order. ASQ was more balanced, frequently publishing articles directed towards explaining change. HBR explained existing order and placed relative emphasis on a unitary view of goal accomplishment."(ibid., 135) The third criterion was the boundary problem for the organizations as the main unit of analysis. It was concluded that in both of the journals,

³⁰ For the elaboration of this proposal see (Daneke, 1990) Daneke indicated that the developments in the natural sciences and systems theory in general makes the possibility of an 'applied social sciences' and an 'applied administrative science'.

"criteria for defining boundaries between organizational units and their environments were rarely discussed. Whether the criteria used were appropriate was discussed even less frequently" (ibid., 136). As a result of this, "omitting organizational definitions precludes generalizations; thus, administrators seeking generalizable standards for making judgements may often be intuitively correct in showing little interest in the social science literature on administration"(ibid., 136). The last criterion was related with the 'utilization'. In HBR it was found that the majority of studies published were more "inclined" to give 'one best way' solutions to problems. In ASQ one-quarter of the articles mentioned no ways of utilization of the findings at all.

The conclusion of Dunbar is as follows:

"The analysis of articles published in ASQ and HBR clarifies some distinctions between the scientific and practitioner oriented literature on administration. The majority of studies in HBR related to practice but used arbitrarily selected examples to illustrate rationalized realities. The majority of studies in ASQ emphasized objective approaches for studying static organizational orders, but findings were often neither generalizable nor applicable, because of unidentified confounding effects."
(Dunbar, 1983, 140)

The above quotation indicates two sets of important observations. The first is the theory/practice distinction, and the second is for both the theory and

practice oriented research, results were unsatisfactory. The common complaint is a sort of 'gap' between the research and the applicability of the findings on the practice. These two sets in fact, underline the crucial epistemological and methodological concerns for the academic activity in public administration. One point may be emphasized at this point. What may be the main reason for the mentioned 'gap' between theory and practice in administrative sciences? Are we to blame the inadequacies stemming from the researcher, research environment and/or the methodology undertaken? (variables which may all be controlled and corrected by the academic community) Or, is this a deeply rooted philosophical and epistemological problem emerged as the form of an 'incompatibility' between the theory and practice? (variable which is extremely difficult, if not impossible to be controlled and corrected by the academic community unless the basic understandings and structuring of main variables are changed.) For example the conventional understanding and expectation out of the scientific study of things is to reach to generalizations as much as possible. In Dunbar's article as mentioned above this was the basic criticism oriented towards ASQ articles that they were far from generalizable conclusions. Neither Dunbar, nor many of the academic circles question the possibility of such generalizations for 'unique' administrative settings. The

quest for a 'technical' generalization is the product of 'monist' and isolated understanding of the unit of analysis for the administration. If only one variable, for instance, the organization, was considered, then it could be possible perhaps to make universal generalizations applicable to all related settings and situations. The contemporary experience of administration because of many reasons beyond our concern here reveals the concomitant existence and variation of many different variables. These variables, further, do not necessarily display equal even similar change in their content and form. If we even limit our unit of analysis for determined settings, say, for one specific society, because of the variables in question, it would be highly difficult to make generalizations for different organizations or for different time periods. Unless the organizational forms (i.e. administrative practice) or our (conventional) understanding of scientific research activity change, the problem of 'gap' between theory and practice as such, would likely to remain unresolved. Generalizations, then are possible only in respect to the settled essential structuring of the practice of administration prevailing in almost all parts of the contemporary world, emerged as the result of determined developments in social life and after a specific time period. Beyond this, the search and demand for generalizations would be useless, since these

change from time to time, place to place and since they are related with not the 'science', but only the 'technique' of administration. The academic world of public administration, on the way to solve the identity problem, should make the distinction between the 'science' (or theory) of administration and the 'technique' of 'administering'. We shall turn back to this point later. Now we shall continue our exploration of various evaluative studies concerning the existing status of the research activity and the 'academe' of public administration.

In 1986 James L. Perry and Kenneth Kraemer studied another popular periodical, Public Administration Review (PAR) in a similar fashion (Perry, 1986). The study covered the articles published between 1975 and 1984 with a population of 289. In terms of the subject matters, the highest frequency was the ones related with 'public policy' matters (51), the second was the topic of 'planning' (36) together with 'public management' (36) that were all followed by 'administrative theory' (34). The authors indicated that "80 percent of the research was problem oriented rather than theory oriented" (Perry, 1986, 217). Further, the majority of the studies "dealt with either problem delineation or variable identification" (ibid., 219), basically remaining at the

'descriptive stage'. Only a few of them were related with theoretical issues and/or establishing causality among variables. Thus we find again that studies oriented for the 'technique' of public administration are prevailing. The other two important findings stated by Perry and Kraemer are that the public administration research has not been cumulative in nature. Reviewing previous research findings are rare and the topics are very different from one another, curtailing the possibility of being cumulative. The last finding mentioned is the lack of 'adequate institutional support': "Eighty percent of the articles failed to identify sources of financial or other institutional support."(ibid., 220)

Based on the findings of their study Perry and Kraemer formulated three groups of 'proposals'. 1- Due attention should be paid to 'core issues in public administration'. This may be accomplished by "the study of characteristics that distinguish public administration from other administration", and, the study of "political-administrative system interface" (ibid., 221) This proposal once again emphasizes the importance of the 'identity crisis' in public administration, since two methods mentioned are both problems related with its identity. 2- The research should be institutionalized. This would be accomplished mainly by; -increasing the

importance given to research in 'faculties' of administration, -increasing the importance given to the PhD programs in schools of public administration, - increasing the relationship between 'formal research units and public administration education institutions' and - increasing funding for public administration research. 3- Improving the research methods used by the scholars of this field. In this context, special emphasis must be made on the utilization of 'meta-analysis' which allows cumulating knowledge among different branches. This would be consistent with this field's being 'interdisciplinary' in nature. However, Perry and Kraemer also indicated that; "Even if all the suggestions outlined above could be implemented instantly, it would take several years before their consequences would be noticeable." (Perry, 1986, 224) One of the components of the second proposal above was the need for improving the quality and quantity of PhD. programs in public administration. Such programs are generally considered to be very important for the academic world. PhD programs not only mark the specialization of the students but also (as a result of common practice of dissertation preparation) contribute to knowledge accumulation in any field³¹ . In other words the quality

³¹ Robert Stallings of the University of Southern California wrote an article in 1986 on the importance of doctoral programs in public administration. (Stallings, 1986) He stated that; "the core problems in the field of public administration for a doctoral program must rise

and the quantity of such programs may give an expression on the status of the academic field. Aware of this point, Jay D. White, of University of Missouri, conducted a research in 1986 in which 300 dissertations of public administration were examined. (White, 1986) The objective was two-fold. First an evaluation of the research quality of dissertations and second, whether these dissertations later become the subject matter of publications. The author tested dissertations by using criteria such as their purpose, validity, theory testing, hypothesis testing, and causality. The overall findings are as follows:

"Much of the dissertation research fails to satisfy the criteria for mainstream social science research. About half of the dissertation authors did not set out to do mainstream social research. Nonmainstream research can contribute to knowledge in public administration if it is guided by alternative methodological and philosophical frameworks. Unfortunately, few of the abstracts from the nonmainstream dissertations gave any indication of this. My analysis of publications indicates

above the individual and particular problems of day-to-day practical administration. They should be the sorts of things that overworked public officials seldom have time for during normal working hours. The function of the university doctoral program should be to provide an intellectual "sanctuary" in which doctoral students, regardless of their occupational roles, may step back and contemplate the meaning of public activity and its relation to the rest of the society." (Stallings, 1986, 239)

that only a few of the successful doctoral candidates have contributed to academic journals. Dissertation research does not seem to be a major source of publications in public administration" (White, 1986, 232)

One thing should be mentioned at this point. Most of the above and below referred studies which 'evaluate' the research work in public administration have their own internal ambiguous and problematic matters. In fact, the idea of the 'evaluation' of the 'quality' of something is itself problematic. The limitations posed by selecting the employed criteria as well as selecting the cases to be included inevitably reflect a 'bias' of some kind. For example in the above study, the author initially had an apparent bias: scientific research should contribute to what is called as the 'mainstream' science. However, if one adopts the opposite view that 'paradigmatic' brake may only be possible when people begin to go beyond the 'mainstream' research, then the findings should not be taken as pessimistic. It depends on the adopted philosophy and epistemology even the worldviews, if not the ideology to conduct such an 'evaluative' study.³² Despite these

³² For example Jay D. White in the article titled "On the Growth of Knowledge in Public Administration" (White, 1986a) proposed methods and modes of research that went behind the 'mainstream' research. These were 'positive research', 'interpretive research' and 'critical research'. He called these together as "postempiricist" research and indicated that their employment would contribute positively to the 'research issue in public administration'.

points such studies provide us the broad idea that: a- another form of discontentment is common among scholars on the status of research in public administration, and, b- the 'identity crisis' is also reflected upon and play a negative role on the research activity which constitute, so to speak, the 'backbone' of the academe.

In 1988 Robert Stallings and James Ferris conducted a study which extended the work of Perry and Kraemer (Perry, 1986), (Stallings, 1988). Whereas Perry and Kraemer's study covered the research work published in PAR between 1975-1984, Stallings and Ferris extended this to cover between 1940 and 1984, analyzing the data for five year intervals³³ . Among the findings, two topics are very

³³ David Houston and Sybil Delevan's study should also be mentioned here. (Houston, 1990) The authors conducted a study based on the similar methodology of that of Perry and Kraemer and Stallings Ferris. However, they included six journals other than the PAR. These journals are 'Administration and Society', 'Public Administration Quarterly', 'International Journal of Public administration', 'Public Budgeting and Finance', 'Review of Public Personnel Administration', and, 'Policy studies Review'. It is interesting to note that the findings showed parallelism with that of other four authors. Houston and Delevan also indicated that public administration research is basically engaged in 'little theory testing' and most of them are at the stage of identifying concepts and issues (the descriptive stage). They stated that; "Several general conclusions can be drawn from this analysis that are consistent with the findings of Perry and Kraemer of Stallings and Ferris. First, public administration journals generally represent a source for the dissemination of academically oriented research. Second, public administration research generally receives an even lower level of financial support than has been previously determined. Third, this published research

important for our purpose: a-staticism in the research work, b-remaining still at the level of problem and/or concept definition (descriptive phase). The latter of these is in consistency with the findings of similar works mentioned earlier. As to the first one, this is an interesting point and should be underlined:

"The recent history of research in public administration, as demonstrated by articles published in PAR, differs little from the state of affairs nearly a half century ago."
(Stallings, 1988, 583)

This observation, in my opinion, fully supports the results of the previous chapter in this study. Analysis of different schools/paradigms revealed that other than few exceptions, recent academical contributions to the theory of public administration were not able to 'alter' the main current (or the mainstream). It is our thesis that this field today stays on its original pillars. Recent contributions only support (in varying degrees) the same argument. Looked from one angle, this may be a desired situation. Persistence, if it was established on correct and adequate grounds may show that the road chosen is not the wrong one. It may be the real knowledge accumulation.

generally focuses on the conceptual development of issues for future research and is nonempirical."(Houston, 1990, 680)

However, there is another finding of our previous analysis: almost no one is satisfied with this build-up as it is proved by the continuing existence of the 'identity crisis'. If such earlier mentioned complaints, and the existence of the identity crisis is a fact, then it means there is something wrong with this establishment and the way how things work in the academical life. Further, such a persistence may only be relevant in the case when the unit of analysis displays little or no change at all. On the contrary, as mentioned earlier, the macro unit of analysis of public administration has both static and dynamic components. The static component comes from the fact that the characteristic establishment (or the structure) of this age is almost completely determined by the specific organization of the social life. It is marked as the 'capitalist' organization. This way of structuring, in respect to its basic principles and elements, has not changed a lot. Almost in all countries of the world there is a 'state', there are its 'institutions' (so the separation between the 'civil society' and the 'state'), further, there are its specific 'executive' (and 'executing) institutions often called public administration, these specific institutions almost in everywhere, structured as 'organizations' (or at least we call them so) and in each organization of the world, despite minor differences of the forms, there is the

function of the 'administration' and people who are in charge of (or charged by others) fulfilling this function. This picture constitutes the 'static' component of the public administration. However, the dynamic component is nevertheless less important than this. Almost all the elements included in this picture are continuously and from place to place changing their forms. It is a fact that we have still the structures called public administration today, but are these the same that Woodrow Wilson and the other 'founding fathers' witnessed? In other words, should the contemporary academicians of this field suffice with the classical and the neo-classical theories that contribute to our understanding of the basic structure mentioned above? Shouldn't these people feel themselves obliged for 'changing', or preparing the grounds for 'change' in these structures. The common acceptance of the 'identity crisis', being the first step on the way to change must strictly be followed with such efforts. However, unfortunately, as these studied research work also say, we are a little bit far from that. The field is still preoccupied with defining the concepts, underlining the problems and trying to find daily solutions to daily management problems. On the contrary, perhaps, :

"The emergence of a research agenda for the field will only result from a broader focus

than the more limited emphasis on management problems, analyses of policy choices, and evaluation of specific programs" (Stallings, 1988, 585)

It is our proposal that this must be the real task and duty of the academe of public administration, leaving the others to the 'technicians' of this experience. For such techniques, in the presence of the 'dynamic' component and nature of the function of administration, are unlikely to be universalized. These probably change from one system to another, from one organization to other. Determination of such techniques (as well as their application) may be taken as one 'educational duty' of the profession of public administration. Scientific method surely would help in the accomplishment of such a task. Technicians should be well aware of it and its utilization. This should not be the real work of the academician and the theorist of administration. This is perhaps the most important reason of the persistent crisis of identity. Academic community was too much occupied with this technique and 'technology' of administration that it was not able to solve the crisis and played a little role in the function of 'change' mentioned above. We shall turn back to this point. Now let us continue our analysis of the existing situation of the academic realm of public administration concentrating on more recent evaluative works.

Robert E. Cleary wrote two articles in 1990 and 1992 consecutively in which he evaluated the recent quality of 'masters' programs and the 'doctoral dissertations'. (Cleary, 1990 and Cleary, 1992) The article in which he evaluated masters programs was based on a survey he conducted comprising 215 public administration masters programs in the United States continued in the summer of 1989. The response rate was 80% and the distribution was as follows:

- "1. programs affiliated with a political science department or school:64 (37.0%)
2. programs in a public affairs school, college, institute, or center:44 (25.4%)
3. programs in a public administration unit of a school or college of arts and sciences, social science, or professional programs (i.e., not affiliated with a political science, business, public affairs, or public policy school or department):31 (17.9%)
4. programs in a business school or college: 19 (11.0%),
5. public policy programs:12 (6.9%), and
6. programs in an integrated management school:3 (1.7%) (Cleary, 1990, 664)

In fact, the MPA programs were established mainly by the purpose of educating pre-service and in-service manpower usually employed in the public sector. The nature of the programs are designed to cater the needs of the 'practice' of public administration. In other words, these programs are mainly based on the 'technique' and/or the 'technology' of administration. Cleary's findings show

that among the representatives of different programs there exists a 'strong agreement' on the content of the curricula. However this does not mean that there also exists a 'standardized' curriculum. Despite this and other shortcomings of programs as noted by Cleary, the overall status seems to be satisfactory:

"Technical competence is absolutely essential in government and in other public administration work. The United States must have government specialists in many different fields. Public affairs/public administration education seems to be doing reasonably well in providing courses for these specialities, particularly in such traditional fields as finance and personnel....Overall, masters programs in public administration are serving the needs of education for management in the public service reasonably well..." (Cleary, 1990, 671-672)

The commonly shared belief in the success of MPA programs³⁴ perhaps comes from the fact that these were oriented to fulfill a very important function. As already mentioned, the 'experience' of public administration, in contemporary age, necessitates more and more expertise along with a continuous education. The need for specialization in this context is felt more and more, day by day.

³⁴ This evaluation was also indicated by J. Norman Baldwin, who conducted a similar work on the 'effectiveness' of MPA programs in the United States. (Baldwin, 1988) Baldwin concluded that; "this research demonstrates that, although certain administrative

However, repeating, the primary objective of the academe should not be this sort of specialization. Programs like MPA in the United States, or certain administrative education institutions and institutes that exist in many other countries with a similar orientation should always be supported and developed. This is the need coming from the demand. The academe, on the other hand, must be primarily in charge of understanding, explaining, interpreting, teaching and guiding (changing) the nature of public administration systems vis a vis the rest of the society, the essence of such systems, their functions or roles, universal characteristics, along with the design of alternatives. These are just the right issues and questions on which the scientific method should be strictly, in a fastidious manner, and, persistently utilized. These characteristics in fact, are the right characteristics of the academe and the academic life.

The second study of Robert E. Cleary is related with again the doctoral dissertations in public administration (Cleary, 1992). We have earlier analyzed another article

structures may be moderately more attractive than others, a variety of MPA program structures appear to be capable of delivering the desirable outcomes of a professional degree program...this research demonstrates a promising future for a variety of MPA program structures..(Baldwin, 1988, 882)

about the same issue. This time Cleary evaluated 165 dissertations included in 1990 edition of 'dissertation abstracts'. The results would give us an impression on two points. First, in a comparative manner, whether there is any difference between the earlier and 'not-so-bright' results of the similar study, and second, the existing overall quality of such dissertations which, contrary to previous programs are expected to be closer to the 'academe' rather than the 'experience' of public administration. Now we may analyze his study.

Cleary designed his study so as to be able to compare the findings with that of the one he earlier conducted with McCurdy. (McCurdy, 1984). 165 dissertations included in 1990 'Dissertation Abstracts' were tested according to the six questions: a) Is there a research purpose?, b) Is there a 'rigorous' research design?, c) Is there any test of an existing theory?, d) Is there a 'causal statement' as the conclusion?, e) Is there an importance of the topic for the field of public administration?, f) Is the study oriented for developing a new question or new experience for the field?.

According to Cleary, 80% of the 1990 dissertations had a clear research purpose whereas this figure was 64.1% in 1981;

"These totals included 4 projects (2.4 percent) in 1990 and 8 (5.6 percent) in 1981 that were purely theoretical or philosophical in nature, contributing to an understanding of the nature of the field of public administration" (Cleary, 1992, 57)

Forty eight of the dissertations (29.1%) are found to have 'methodological validity' (in 1981, it was 21.1%). Thirty six of the total number (21.8%) were involved with testing an existing theory whereas in 1981 it was 17.6%. A substantial increase took place in respect to 'concluding with a causal statement'. Such studies were 51.5% of the whole and this figure was 26.1% in 1981. On the other hand a decline was found in respect to the 'importance of the topic'. In 1990 studies 32.1% found to be related with an important topic for the field. In 1981 it was 38.7 percent. Finally, in respect to the question whether a new question or experience was posed or not, 72.7% percent of the dissertations in 1990 found to meet this criterion. There is a substantial difference here, in the sense that in 1981 this figure was only 16.9%.

The overall findings were interpreted by Cleary in the following fashion:

"There is evidence in this study that the field of public administration is changing in nature and in emphasis...The 1990 data show

substantially increased attention to topics of organizational theory and behavior as well as to public finance and budgeting and substantially decreased attention to administrative theory and to comparative public administration, along with some smaller changes." (Cleary, 1992, 59, my emphasis)

We have already mentioned that one of the potential problems in this sort of 'evaluative' 'qualitative' research lies in the way how the findings (of which relevancy and validity are left aside and not discussed in this study) are interpreted. Cleary very optimistically interpreted the findings and considered them as "impressive strides on the road toward significant improvements in the use of the doctoral dissertation as a research tool to help educate students while holding promise of advancing the field" (ibid., 61)³⁵ .

However we should always take into consideration, before reaching to such conclusions, the finding stated above. In the year 1990, out of 165 public administration doctorate dissertations only 4 of them (2.4%) were

³⁵ Another similar optimistic comment on the current status of public administration research is made by Richard Box, (Box, 1992). He also admitted the 'crisis' in the sense that; "research in public administration is in need of constructive change resulting from healthy debate over the nature of the problems...But pessimism about the field based on a narrow view of the nature of knowledge and research methodologies is premature and to some extent inaccurate. Hopefully, future work in this area will broaden the debate and allow a more comprehensive look at the quality and usefulness of public administration research." (Box, 1992, 69)

oriented towards "contributing to understanding of the nature of the field of public administration". The problem increase when we take into consideration the fact that almost ten years ago this figure was more than the double (5.6%). Can we now consider these improvements as positive and contributory in the event that the questions on the nature and the context of this field is not yet determined and little hope is for the future? The findings, despite the improvements, display consistency with our earlier arguments. The academic studies in public administration are preoccupied with 'finding daily answers to daily and unique problems of the experience of public administration'. In other words, towards creating the 'technology' of public administration. Whereas the need for these studies can not be denied, we think that this target for the academe is distorting its real and important functioning. When this is the case, Cleary is completely right when he wrote this statement:

"Public administration now needs to examine its subject matter with a view toward providing more careful responses to the question: What doctoral dissertation topics will allow students to write quality dissertations and at the same time hold promise of advancing the field?" (Cleary, 1992, 61)

The task of 'examining' the subject matter in respect to the ultimate duty of 'advancing the field' seems to be

the point and the crossroad where the identity crisis of it may only be solved. The analysis of current academic activities, at least within the framework of the matters we have covered in this section, unfortunately, shows a different trend.



C. Ontological and Epistemological Re-evaluation of Public Administration:
Towards solving the crisis of identity

In the previous section we have tried to underline the need for identifying two dimensions on the way to solve the identity crisis in public administration. These are; public administration as the practice (the experience), and the public administration as the subject of the academic life (the discipline). Now, we shall elaborate on the link between these two realms, and also add a further dimension: the intellect (the theory) of public administration. This triple consideration will be made as a 're-evaluation' of the main ontological and epistemological characteristics of this area.

In most of the classical textbooks on public administration, the concept and the practice of 'division of labour' is treated as the 'major source' of the administrative phenomena. The conventional argument, in a highly simplified manner is as follows. Where 'collectivities' and a 'common task' exist, there is also the need for 'coordination' and 'guidance' to make a concerted action, called the 'administration', itself being a part of 'division of labor'. In such a division some people administer, some people administered. Division of labour, in one sense, is used as the legitimization of

this process, which also assumes an unequal relationship, and thus in need of legitimization. The division of labour, naturally is not peculiar to administrative process. It may not be an exaggeration to argue that it is one of the most important factors on the enshapement of social life and relations. Whatever the determining factors of social relations in different periods were, the practice of 'division of labour' remained unchanged and likely to be the same in the near future.

The practical utility of this experience is very clear. When the task is so complex and beyond the physical and/or intellectual capacity of individuals, dividing it into a number of parts and fulfilling them by different persons particularly increases the capacity (or lack of capacity) of human beings. This provides, before all, an 'economy' or 'efficiency' and it may be considered as a form of 'collective action' while it is designed upon an 'individualistic' structure. Individuals through division of labour express and reflect the collectivity, therefore division of labour also has an 'integrating function. Consequently, it is (perhaps the most important) dimension of the process called 'socialization'.

Along with these practical utilities, there are also adverse effects of this experience. Among such effects two

of them are relatively more important and also related with our topic. These may be broadly called as the problems of 'lessening dimension' and 'alienation' of one sort. The practice of division of labour, when fully and persistently applied, inevitably results (and resulted) in another form of social structuring: the specialization. The individual element, within the context of its own part of such a division experiences things peculiar to that context. Consequently, either its physical activity or intellectual capability develops so as to increase its mastery of its own part. This is the process of specialization, also called as 'expertise'. In fact, this type of division of labour is perhaps the most characterizing feature of capitalist social formation. It prevails in most parts of the world in most of the century in which we live. Together with the concept and practice of 'work', specialization continues to determine the socialization process and thus contributing to the reproduction process of this formation. Despite this, the adverse effect of specialization is much evident when we look at it from the side of the individual, not the system as a whole. Individual, being an expert of any phenomenon, is subjected to a situation of 'lessening the dimension'. If the environment was consisted of a single dimension, and if the individual was able to base its expertise upon that dimension only, then there would be no problem at

all. However, on the contrary, the very definition of the notion of 'division of labour' rejects such a monistic structuring. Originally, the need for division of labour emerged as a result of the existence and awareness of 'multi-dimensional life' (and lack of capacities to cope with that). If it was a single dimension, there would also be no need for hence the practice of 'division of labour'. The individual, as a result of experiencing the expertise is to be reduced to envisage and live its environment in a 'one-dimensional' way. In other words, the dimension is 'lessened'. There is a contradiction inherent in the coexistence of 'multi-dimensionality' and 'expertise'. Through the expertise, the 'task' is more economically, efficiently, in short, much easily accomplished. But is 'accomplishing the task' (or fulfilling the 'work') the 'ultimate' objective or meaning and the purpose of life for the individuals? To ask the same question differently, is it convenient and/or desired to reduce the individual to less dimension whereas it is surrounded by and a part of a 'multi-dimensional' and 'multi-faceted' world?

We have earlier mentioned the second important adverse effect of specialization is a form of 'alienation'. In fact, this latter effect emerges as the natural outcome of the first one. Reduction to single dimension, being in charge of executing the same thing, inevitably creates an

'alienation' effect. This is not only related with doing the 'routine', but also related with a false 'conception' or 'image'. Executing the similar tasks may create on the part of the individual entity a false conception that part is the most 'important' or crucial job to be undertaken. This form of alienation also may be related with a strong sense of 'legitimization'. It is natural under the conditions of 'monistic' lifestyle that emerged as a consequence of specialization to put that style at the center of the world, over-emphasizing its function and exaggerating its importance. This also may be called as a form of 'alienation', alienation towards the world, itself bearing multiple dimensions composing a unified whole.

These positive and negative effects of division of labour, specialization and expertise, fortunately and/or unfortunately dominate almost the entire socialization process of the contemporary world. Tasks to be undertaken are, usually, very well defined, predetermined by borders sometimes clear-cut, sometimes thin, and yet sometimes invisible living in the minds and traditions of individual beings. This structure maintains a kind of 'social control', since a situation of 'orderliness' is associated with it. As the tasks and jobs predetermined together with all other forms and structures of 'organizations' to reproduce this body a relatively steady and stagnant

vision is maintained. The radical critique of such an order would ask questions like "is this the inevitable or the most convenient form? or, is the re-structuring possible?". Other questions and types of criticism such as the re-definition of borders between different divisions, or finding the exact locations, or issues related with the 'adverse effects' of that body, such as the lessening of dimensions and alienation, would only make that structure continue itself, albeit in different shape and forms.

The concepts and practice of 'organization' and the complementary 'administration' are all the products of this form of life. Both are contributory to the set of mechanisms and ways of social 'control'. Further, not only these are the products, but also contribute to the reproduction. There exists a continuous chain between organizations, administration and the social control based on the division of labour. We shall turn back to these issues. Before that, the relation between the world and life that is 'divided' and what is called 'scientific endeavor' will be taken into consideration.

Scientific activity is another area in which all the effects of the division of labour and specialization may clearly be seen. In the 'natural sciences' (as if human beings were excluded from the 'nature') the analysis on

the inquiry of 'matter' is basically divided, each forming an area of expertise on its own, based on the 'unit of analysis'. The unit of analysis, basically, is determined according to different properties of the 'matter'. Those different properties are not only observed, but also identified and defined by human beings. Identification and definition in return, are subjective operations representing the way convenient to human understanding and interpretation of that phenomenon. To put it in a different manner, the 'division' (both ontological and epistemological) of the matter and the way how individuals conceive it are all intellectual, if not arbitrary expressions. The compatibility problem between this epistemological settlement (of human subjectivity) and the ontological position of the matter is little questioned. What is usually more questioned, making us remembering one of the 'adverse' effects of the 'division' process, is the compatibility of that individual branch with predefined subject matter. That is done through using the conventional methods of knowledge accumulation, falsification and/or refutation, inductive and deductive methods, empirical analysis and the like. Each success in this endeavor is labelled as 'progress' in science and, increasing 'mastery' over nature. One thing should be noted at this point. The above argument is based on the conventional assumptions on the distinction of the

'subject' and the 'object'. This should not come to mean a direct acceptance of that assumption, but only made in an effort to criticize a certain understanding of the concept of science. This stays within the discourse limits defined by that perception itself. On the contrary, post-modernist probation of the distinction between 'subject' and the 'object' should be taken seriously and be debated:

" There is no monolithic entity, "science", that can be said to clash with things and "the modern situation" is a catastrophe that offends our most basic desires for peace and happiness. Scientists themselves have started criticizing the separatist view of human beings, the view, that is, that there exists an "objective" world and a "subjective realm" and that it is imperative to keep them apart. Thus Mach pointed out, more than a century ago, that the separation cannot be justified by research, that the simplest sensation is a far-reaching abstraction and that any act of perceiving is inextricably tied to physiological processes. Lorenz has argued for a science advanced scientific disciplines, elementary particle physics has forced us to admit that it is impossible to draw a sharp boundary between nature and the agencies (mind included) used to examine it." (Feyerabend, 1987, 710)

In our opinion, that separatist view should always be subjected to re-evaluation and perhaps more important, the view that takes such a distinction as an "imperative" should ever be questioned. The word 'distinction' not only includes 'subject-object' separation, but the 'artificial (and subjective) separation of 'sciences'

created yet another extension of prevailing experience of 'division of labour'.

Things get more complex and problematic when we turn our attention to the inquiry of social relations. There, again we have ontological and epistemological problems. The abstraction of human relations along with the isolation of definite aspects is itself a problematic issue. Before all, the 'matter' poses 'unique' properties, displays action that is not 'self-evident' (be precisely and accurately vulnerable to empirical analysis), and the separation between the subject of inquiry and the investigating object is entirely artificial. The social reality, just like the 'matter', constitutes a 'whole' in which existing multiple dimensions are so intertwined that it would extremely problematic to abstract and divide those dimensions. To put it in more concrete terms when we make a comparison, to abstract and distinguish the 'chemical' properties of the matter and say its 'physical' ones, within the subjectively but commonly legitimized borders of definitions is relatively less problematic. However, for example, to do the same for the 'economical' and say, 'political' properties of social relations is possible (and usually done) however, does this come to mean that we can overcome the 'compatibility' problem? The 'compartmentalization of social 'science'

vis a vis the holistic and ever increasing complex and intertwined nature of contemporary social relations seems to be the number one epistemological problem of our day. If those artificially divided areas are relatively 'isolated' from one another, trying to develop ways and methods for coping with the problem of 'compatibility' (compatibility of the properties of their own field with the properties of their unit of analysis) the adverse effects of division of labour likely to arise. The members of fields try to develop both the means for their own legitimization process and live at the same time their own 'alienation' as mentioned above. The concrete evidence of this process may be seen in the common practices of 'developing' specific 'methodologies' and 'techniques' of that field, 'departmentation' of academic education and research work, knowledge accumulation remaining within the borders of a specific area, hardly 'daring' to go beyond the borders', and the like. In fact, these are all typical consequences of 'expertise' and what may be called 'professionalization'.

Especially in respect to social relations, contrary to usually proposed, 21st century likely to be the age of 'anti-expertise'. It will be very likely that the limitations posed by the expertise (monistic and alienated

situation) will enforce humanity to break the artificial 'walls' around the so called 'sciences'.

The problem is even more serious when we take into consideration the field of 'public administration'. Today and more likely in the future, it will be extremely difficult to define and identify the 'experts' of public administration. The state formation, characteristic to all the contemporary societies of the world, displays properties which can not be 'limited' to the 'expertise area' predefined by the 'field' or the 'academe' of public administration. A public administration expert, if the existing borderlines are going to be preserved, should at the same time be an 'expert' of almost numerous and unrelated 'fields'. She/he must be an expert of intra-office administrative matters (the technology of administration), the political affairs, the economical affairs, the technical affairs, social affairs and cultural affairs. These all emerge as the result of ever increasing extension and expansion of 'state' experience. We have earlier mentioned that today (and probably in the near future) state is (will be) at the heart of almost all kinds of social relations and at each corner of societies. Under these circumstances, will it be convenient for 'public administration' experts to limit themselves with only the technology of administration? The administrative

experience can not be abstracted or isolated from other forms of social relations. Administrative actions and procedures do not display a need within themselves. They arise as the natural outcome of 'regulating' and/or controlling definite social relations. The expert should at the same time be aware of and understanding of those relations so that administrative ones could be subjected to a meaning, interpretation and reformation. Division of labour and expertise, just like for many other areas is likely to face a problem of compatibility of this sort today and tomorrow. This argument, naturally, is relevant as long as the existing form of social relations, especially that of the location of the state, being the defined 'ground' of and for 'public administration' remains the same or similar.

There is another inherent problem related with the practice of expertise in public administration. This is the compatibility question of experts of public administration and adherence to the democratic way of administration. Earlier we have mentioned the arguments on the need for 'professionalization' of public administration. However, professionalization, for most of the time, brings with it a kind of 'autonomy' and 'protectionism'. During the process of the professionalization of public administration autonomy and

protectionism should be made compatible with the principles of democracy, and this is not an easy thing. Democratic principles necessitate, among others, two crucial practices: popular control of the state and mass participation in the administrative process. A professional group, consisted of experts should always be ready and willing for the operation of these principles under democracies. The crucial question at this point is if this group is the 'expert' group will the people that are going to exercise control over their activities be equipped adequately to fulfill that control? Each profession has its own jargon, way of communication and experience. Will those controlling them be able to place themselves in such technical communication? Further, related with the second characteristic above, that group of experts, by the requirement of being a profession in its own will probably operate 'protection' mechanisms which may again negatively effect the control process. Similar arguments can be made in respect to the 'participation' as well. By definition, the terms 'participation' and 'expertise' at least, are not the things that can smoothly co-exist. Participation is a 'right' that must be granted for all the 'administered', however, expertise, at least speaking from an historical point of view, has always been a 'privilege' granted to relatively less number of people.

In fact, the question of bureaucracy/democracy has long been debated since Weber. Eva Etzioni-Halevy classified the main arguments of this debate under two groups: 'bureaucracy as a dilemma for democracy' and, 'democracy as a dilemma for bureaucracy' (Halevy, 1985). The main theme of the first group is the potential threat of bureaucracy, with the state power in its hands, to increase the state power and state repression over the rest of social formation. The second group of arguments are related with our argument above. The bureaucracy is expected to act itself (holding the responsibility of its actions), and at the same time, is expected to be subject to mass (or representative) control. Whatever the case, it is rather difficult to cope with the inherently opposing nature of both practices.

These arguments in fact, are usually based on the holistic and mostly political characteristics of bureaucracy. As we have mentioned here, in this age of rapid progress and perhaps unprecedented increase in the knowledge accumulation of all kinds, 'expertise' will likely to create similar effects as those that may be created by political ones.

The 'conventional' solution to this problem goes in the following fashion. Under representative democratic systems and where the principle of 'separating of powers' operates the elected people dominate the bureaucratic mechanisms. Major policies are planned, designed and put into effect by the representatives (or the politicians), the 'expertise' of public administration implements or executes those policies. Since, that 'expertise body' is always subject to the control of political authority through common practices of hierarchy and chain of command, the above mentioned 'protectionist' or 'technical' effects of professionalization could be overcome and popular control would be maintained. In my opinion this argument and expectations of that direction are unrealistic because of a number of reasons. First of all, at this age and that proportion of state existence and permeation, public policy making itself has become an area that necessitates 'expertise' in itself. Whatever the level of 'preparation' to be made by the politician and be interested with the issues, he /she would always be in need of the technical assistance and 'staffing' of the bureaucrats. Decisions related with policy making are usually not simple ones. Before all, information and data support is essential. These may only be collected and submitted through bureaucratic channels. Bureaucratic structures, being continuous in nature are the main source

of this sort for the usually 'temporary' politicians. Second, by 'making' the policy, the job is not finished. Perhaps more important, the implementation should always be subjected to monitoring and revision. In respect to the monitoring again, the politician is almost totally dependent to bureaucratic structures. And perhaps more important than all these, assuming the control of bureaucracy by the political authority is, as mentioned earlier, a mere 'reduction' of that body to a status of a 'problem solver', if not an 'engineering body'. This reductionism is completely rejected in this thesis. This would mean to accept only the 'technology' or the 'technical dimension' of public administration experience. The academic inquiry, concentrated on the essential structuring, place, mechanisms and philosophy of public administration would only be neglected. Even if for a moment we accept the validity of the arguments of 'reductionist' perspective, a very serious and perhaps solutionless problem of 'boundaries' will likely to arise. It is extremely difficult, as the analysis in previous chapters revealed, to define the borders of this field and prepare an education of expertise for the practitioner. The determination of the boundaries between this field and political science, management, law, economics is extremely difficult to cope with and highly problematic. In other words, the problem of identity crisis, once again, will

likely to show its existence. The 'technical' public administrator in the contemporary age, should be educated in many different areas and a kind of 'multidisciplinary' form that extends the limitations posed by the requirements of a specific 'expertise'. To go beyond this problem necessitates a closer look at the relationship between organizations, administration and the social control.

By definition, as we have earlier mentioned, the practice of organizational life and the existence of organizations are based on the 'ends and means rationality'. Put in other words, each organization has its own clearly defined 'end' or the purpose. The organization as a whole is itself a 'means', oriented for that purpose. If this conventional definition is correct, then an organization is itself a tool and a technical instrument or a 'problem-solver'. The important question is what is the nature of problems that are going to be solved and who decides both on the existence of such problems and possible solutions for them? Again the conventional answer to these questions is clear. The problems set as the purpose for organizations are the 'collective' ones and that the organizations are formed as determined and usually try to solve 'common problems'. However, an analysis on the emergence and development of

contemporary organizations reveals two important points.³⁶ First, although there is no dispute over organizations being purposive instruments, the identification of the purpose is highly problematic. The origin of the contemporary organizations goes back to the emergence of capitalist social relations. Organizations were regarded as tools of increasing capital and profit accumulation. The industrialization process born upon the base of organizations and the existence and development in organizational life indirectly increased this process. At the same time the tool of organizations was used by non-capitalists, the workers, as a means to strengthen their position against the capitalists and decrease the exploitation of their physical and mental labour. In other words, different segments in the society used the 'tool' of organizations for their own interests. Whichever segment and whatever the purpose, then, organizations turned out to be arenas at which a certain form of 'social control' and exercise of 'social power' experienced throughout contemporary history, rather than serving the common purpose as commonly proposed. Second, as a result of social developments of our age, the organizational life (just like the state) rapidly and extensively permeated to almost all areas of social life. This resulted in a situation at which another form of 'alienation' emerged.

³⁶ See Clegg, 1977, Clegg, 1987 and Burrell, 1985

Organizations under capitalist social relations dominated the biggest part of our lives that the organizations purposive and voluntaristic nature has been concealed. In fact, this is another, and perhaps, 'modern' form of 'social control': Life of individuals is determined by the given boundaries of organizations. Individuals spend most part of their daily life inside organizations (even the family is considered to be a form of organization) and what is important, by definition, the way of life inside any organization is predetermined or 'organized' previously by other people. Life turned out to be identified with organizations, despite the fact that organizations were purposive human creations.

Naturally there exists a strong link between this situation and the 'reproduction' of capitalist social life. This link is established by the philosophy and practice of 'pragmatism'. The philosophy of pragmatism was founded by Charles Sanders Peirce an American physicist who lived between 1839 and 1914 and may be summarized as:

"Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then our conception of these effects is the whole of our conception of the object" (Flew, 1980, 265)

For pragmatism, 'practical utility' is the key word. Any action, happening or idea is to be 'tested' against this criterion. As such, there are strong ties between ends/means rationality, purposiveness, organizations and pragmatism. Further pragmatism also may be identified with the idea of 'problem' and 'problem-solving'. If the world in which we live (both the physical and the social) is conceived as a totality of 'problems' to be solved by human beings, then any alternatives for the solution of these micro and/or macro problems may also be tested in respect to their pragmatic value. Organizations may also be evaluated within this context.

However one point should be emphasized here. A differentiation should be made between 'resorting' to the pragmatist practice (whenever needed and possible) and adopting 'pragmatism' as a philosophy or world view, as a means for explaining (and directing) the world in which we live. These two are different and should be separated from each other. Whenever we need we consciously or unconsciously follow this method but the serious situation arise when the latter is adopted. Under this philosophy human being himself or herself is seen as a 'consumer' of problems and their solutions, as if this was the so to speak, the 'meaning of life', or the 'ultimate purpose'. This is where the link between pragmatist philosophy and

reproduction of capitalist social relations may be established.

Among other things, the reproduction of capitalism is based on the existence and continuation of 'production/consumption' cycle. Products must be consumed so that the whole mechanism works, new products to be produced, so the profits. Both the new products and the profits should be converted into 'demands' which is the ultimate 'motivating factor' of continuation of production process and the profit making. On the part of the consumers, there are two conditions of continuation of demand. First, the material condition, in other words, the material resource to 'buy' the products in the market, done through money exchange, second, the mental condition, the belief and the 'motivation' to buy the products. In terms of the second condition, then, individuals should be 'motivated' to 'consume'. Without the motivation, the cycle can not run, even if the individual has the adequate material resource. Therefore under capitalism, such motivation has to be created, pumped and 'injected' to the individuals. Pragmatism is a philosophy which is directly related with the 'motivation' process. Each product, having a practical utility of one sort, is presented (through marketing, promotion, advertisement and mass

media) as a certain 'problem-solver'³⁷ . If the meaning of the world is given as facing numerous problems in daily life and totality of efforts to find solutions to these,³⁸ as individuals buy products they think they are finding (or buying) solutions to the problems that life shows them³⁹ . One thing should always be remembered. There is no necessity for the existence of a one-to-one correspondence between the 'problems' presented to

³⁷ The existence of many different alternatives (products) to the same problem presented for the 'choosing' of individuals also make the 'competitive system' under capitalism to be reproduced. More alternative means more competition, which is conventionally considered as one of the 'sine-qua-non' of the 'free-market' conditions. Competition as a contributor the reproduction of the system as a whole results in more 'solutions' to be produced and more solutions means more competition as well. There is another closed chain reaction in this matter.

³⁸ There is also a strong link between this process and the idea of 'progress' and 'modernization. Progress in this context is being identified with 'identifying and creating' more problems and to be capable of producing more and more solutions to those problems. As this accumulation increases, the progress continues, the society is supposed to be more 'modernized'. Therefore, further, modernization is also identified with 'capitalist social relations'.

³⁹ The concept of 'freedom' is also associated with this process. Individuals are 'free to choose' the product presented to them. Freedom is identified with individuals' own 'will' and 'desire' to get into this chain. But can we talk about the existence of a real 'freedom' under such conditions that problems and solutions are 'given', only we are free to 'choose'. Total freedom may only be possible if the individuals are also free to define the real problems of their own and identify the solutions without adopting this chain as a worldview. However due to the vital importance of this link between production, consumption, motivation and problem solving processes for the reproduction of capitalism, unless the system as a whole changes this seems unlikely to be broken.

individuals and their real problems. Put in other words, the problems may and usually, 'produced' as well. For most of the time, this makes 'artificial' problems and the illusion that concrete solutions are 'produced' for these. In this context, the motivation essential for consumption is maintained with the establishment and re-production of pragmatist philosophy. The more problem, and the more solutions, the more the consumption, and the more profits together with the total reproduction of the system as a whole. The problem is created first, then its solution, only to give way to the emergence of a new problem followed by its production, This inevitably in the end becomes a 'chain', a continuous one, to be broken at a certain point, if such a reproduction is not desired. However, unfortunately, usually not this continuity and the chain but the process of actual production of problems and solutions are taken into consideration. This contributes to successful reproduction of the capitalist system as a whole. Such an 'engineering' only contributes to the continuation of the system, usually through the directions of 'more efficiency', 'more effectiveness', 'more productivity', 'the best way', and the like. This all started with the assumption that we live in an environment full of 'problems' and that human beings are the entities who live to find solutions to those problems.

Contemporary organizations, being instruments of certain social control mechanisms control this process as well. We have mentioned the purposive aspect of organizations established on an end/means rationality. Organizations exist for the solutions of problems. Naturally, organizations have their own internal problems as well. Organizational life is so complex nowadays and full of many problems to cope with, if the maintenance and reproduction of organizations are also desired. We have earlier discussed the concerns related with the 'experience' of organizations and administration. Naturally those problems are to be handled with the function and people of 'administration'. Put in other words, being itself another 'purposive' action based on ends/means rationality, the process of administration becomes an experience of 'manipulating' or 'handling' of the problems generated as a result of organizational life (there may also be cases that problems are created as the result of that administration process itself). Administration, then, is identified with the problem solving process. Therefore the administrative process has a direct and an indirect 'social control' function. Organizations being social entities are put under the control of the administration. This is the direct control. Also, since organizations contribute to other social control structures internally (social control posed by the

organization upon its own members) and externally (organization's control of people who are not members to that organization and other organizations), indirectly, the process of administration contributes to the social control at large. Consequently, under capitalist social relations organizations, whatever their nature and the kind of problem they are oriented for solution, contribute to the reproduction of the system as a whole.

If the 'expertise' of public administration is identified with the knowledge and application of running public organizations, or the 'technology' of public administration, it may be asserted that this field has a direct or indirect role in the reproduction of all the processes mentioned above. In fact, our analysis in the first and the second chapters revealed that the paradigmatic development of 'theory of administration' apart from few exceptions, was basically oriented for this 'pragmatist' understanding of public administration. i.e. to generate and apply the technology of administration. As also indicated, this was not and is not an easy job. In fact, what is called as the 'identity crisis' is the direct product of this effort. The result was the generation of a 'false' identity crisis. The false crisis was defined and proposed as a crisis of 'epistemology'. The efforts to define the boundaries of this field and to

develop a methodology of its own (and the problems met while doing this) was erroneously labeled as a 'crisis of identity'. The 'real' crisis of identity, in fact, if there is any, should be identified with a crisis at the 'ontological level' of public administration. In other words, the nature and functioning of administration in general and public administration in particular, its place in social formations, together with the 'state' practice and 'organizational life' have undergone a crisis. Public administration, being an essential part of the practice of state has become expansionist and inevitable day by day, being more and more a factor that has 'vital' role in the reproduction of capitalist social formations. It became so deeply rooted, in almost all societies, that it began to regulate almost anything, decreasing the sphere of action allocated for the rest of the society. The state has many roles and tasks to fulfill, as it is more rooted, these increase in quantity and quality making 'identity crisis' (at the ontological level) ever difficult to cope with. The expertise of public administration, despite the contributions to knowledge accumulation and generation of new technologies, becomes inadequate, if it is to continue to be limited with the 'borders' conventionally defined for public administration. Organizational analysis and technology is not sufficient today, for the expert of administration, since all organizations are identified

with ever complex multiplicity of tasks, he/she should also be equipped with specific knowledge and talent needed for these. When this is not adequately maintained, a crisis for public administration is only 'natural', since it gets into a problematic situation in respect to fulfilling the tasks and duties assigned to it. All efforts are directed for finding 'solutions' to these problems, unfortunately, as we have earlier seen, including the important part of the 'academe'. Identifying, defining and solving such practical problems may be defined as a crisis of practice of administration, and should not be its essential task and objective.

Then, what this field needs, is perhaps, institutions oriented for making research in the practical matters and education of the public administrators. In fact, there are some examples of this kind all around the world usually organized in the form of 'institutes for public administration'. Related with this point, programs like MPA as experienced in the United States, as mentioned earlier, is contributory and should be developed in all countries. It should always be remembered that, it is extremely difficult to generalize the findings and proposals generated as the result of these activities. In this respect each administrative setting and problem to be solved is unique and may not be relevant under totally

different environmental (cultural, political, economical, social etc) surroundings. Even solutions proposed for one organization in a specific country may not be relevant for another organization at the same country. The needs, the demands, the potentials for solutions and actualization of these differ and these may best be analyzed and solved under specific circumstances of the unit concerned. This does not mean that 'universalization' is impossible in this field.

The 'theory of administration', which aims to understand, explain and direct the exact location and functioning of public administration shows universal validity. This is because of the fact that such a theory, would be rather different from all pragmatist/problem solving oriented, thus localized and reductionist, paradigms in public administration. It would be holistic, rather than individualistic, explanatory rather than prescriptive, scientific, not technical or technological. This would not be a simple paradigmatic change, like the ones we have discussed in the first and second chapters, but rather, a total 'reformulation' of the understanding of the 'identity' of public administration theory. It should be 'transcendental', meaning, it must transcend the existing inadequate 'compartmentalization' of social sciences, even rejecting the notion of

'multidisciplinary', always taking into consideration and taking care of the adverse effects of 'specialization' and 'expertise'.⁴⁰

The scientific analysis of any phenomenon necessitates, among others, two important attitudes: - being critical, -being prescriptive. Being critical is necessary in the face of the ontological nature of the universe. Universe is changing, together with its constituents. Even in the areas which conventionally

⁴⁰ To give another example on the way to erroneously 'limit' the research inside the 'compartment' of administration we can discuss Shangraw and Crow's arguments. (Shangraw, 1989) The authors proposed that public administration should be given the identity of a "design science" which would mean; "As a design science, public administration can be separated from the behavioral sciences such as political science, psychology, or economics. In those fields of inquiry, the goal is to understand and predict particular types of human behavior in individual and social settings. Political science, for instance, is the study of human behavior in the allocation of power and the selection of leaders, and economics focuses on human behavior in the allocation of resources among competing purposes. Public administration, alternatively, draws knowledge from these fields and others, for the purpose of designing, constructing and evaluating institutions and mechanisms for the public good."(Shangraw, 1989, 156) Since 'behavioralism' is identified with social sciences, politics, economics and psychology are identified with the same perspective. This criterion, interestingly, is not used for public administration, which is again defined as "designing, constructing and evaluating institutions and mechanisms for the public good". All purposive, all technological, all compartmentalist and all reproductive (of capitalism) formulation with the bias that public administration is the totality of mechanisms and institutions oriented for solving the problem of "public good". In fact, the name "design science" itself well explains this epistemological position.

regarded as more stable, in the long run, change is inevitable. The assertion 'change is endemic' has empirical validity. If change is at the heart of the universe, the scientific endeavor, with the purpose of understanding, explaining, predicting and prescribing it should be done with a critical manner. The reason is clear: Uncritical attitude is usually 'satisfied' with the given. It takes the given 'as it is', accepts its validity, barely in search of the others. At the most it can do, is to look for 'ideal solutions', or the 'best ways' when confronted with an irregular situation. In other words, its 'analytical, oriented for solving the problems. It has at its hands analytical tools and conceives the things within the framework of these tools. It is highly pragmatic, finding the solutions to daily problems, but never questioning the analytical tools it acquired and the question itself that is going to be solved. They are always 'given'. Such a method may be attractive and utilitarian. It is attractive because it has at its disposal always a set of 'answers' to give (from its own frame of reference). It is utilitarian because always tries to 'exploit' the environment on behalf of the 'problem' assigned to it, together with its very sophisticated analytical tools. Adherence to such a method may give illusionary assumption that the 'science (or the engineers) that make the world go round'.

Being critical, on the other hand, should always be associated with 'being prescriptive'. In fact, being prescriptive is 'rooted' inside being critical. Every statement of criticism of the existing, directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly is prescribing. However, it must always be remembered that the 'prescribed' is not the end-point in itself, but to be subjected to further criticism. This is the required scientific method, to be able to cope with the 'endemic change' in the universe. For the so called 'applied sciences', prescriptions may relatively be put into effect easily. In human relations, prescriptions generated as the result of critical attitude are usually only be 'dictated' in history. Their existence (even these are utopian) and their being 'noted' in history is adequate in itself. The scientist has no power or control himself or herself beyond this (to apply the prescriptions), it is determined by the humans in time.

The 'science' of public administration then, should not be preoccupied with 'engineering'. It should not contend with 'its own' 'analytical tools' and commit itself to finding solutions to 'organizational problems' reported to it by the practitioners. Also, perhaps more important than this, should confine itself to

'explanatory', 'critical' and 'prescriptive' actions. Unfortunately, our previous analysis of the theory of administration shows a general lack of these characteristics. Among the approaches covered in this study, 'manifestations' discussed as the 'critical theory' partially fulfil these criteria. These are partial mainly because of the fact that they were either temporarily or spatially limited (relevant only for a specific time and place) thus could not be grounded universally, or had no adequate prescriptions as discussed earlier.

Doing this is not an easy task. However we have the adequate knowledge of the existing public administration practice needed to criticize and prescribe. Whatever the ideological inclinations, almost everybody accepts that today the dominant form of social relations (including the economic, social, political, cultural and the others) is 'capitalism'. Further, public administration as we understand it today, is the 'child of' that formation and contributes to its reproduction. The critical and prescriptive outlook necessitates looking for 'alternatives' for both systems as a whole. For the 'public administration' side, a re-structuring, radical or reformative, should always be taking into consideration the points we discussed earlier: Administration is generally a social control system, 'organizations' are the

common 'means' of that control, (therefore classical understanding of 'serving the common purpose' is illusory), and common organizational practices like 'hierarchy, chain of command, unity of command etc.' are the enforcements and 'security measures' of the maintenance and reproduction of the system. Despite various techniques and methods used worldwide, by definition, organizations are the structures of 'concentration of power', and as such they are contradictory to full democratic practices. These do not bring human beings the 'utility' and 'happiness mainly because inside predetermined 'boundaries' of administrative, organizational and bureaucratic life (regulation of all kinds) 'utility' and 'happiness have their serious costs. Therefore the alternative should start with questioning of the existing social relations, the universal common practice of 'state', the universal practices of social control mechanisms like public administration, organizations, hierarchy and authority. However, repeating, this task cannot be limited to 'artificial' compartmentalization of social sciences, including the public administration. This necessitates a macro, holistic and universal point of view without dividing the social relations into particular definitions. Otherwise we may get the false impression that we have the adequate knowledge of say, a flower, without having the

knowledge of 'plants' in general. Similarly, the inner office, problem solving, engineered and technical knowledge of public administration (despite the very important contributory advances there) will not be adequate to say that 'this is a social science'. The solution for the 'identity crisis in public administration', if there is any crisis, 'problem' and solution at all, should be searched in that direction.



CONCLUSION

As the conclusion, some of the major arguments/proposals discussed in this study will be summarized.

The assertion that an 'identity crisis' in public administration exists is very common in the related literature. Further, despite the varieties in respect to solutions, definitions of such a crisis show similarities. The crisis is usually identified as a 'boundary problem'; this field needs a re-definition of its borders, where it starts, where it ends, if this is a relevant problem at all, have not been resolved yet.

The early development of this field was marked by attempts to give it an identity especially vis-a-vis the political science and law. Along with this, efforts included to make public administration a field subject to 'scientific inquiry'; to acquire it a 'compartment' among other similar fields. The early 'paradigmatic' developments could not be separated from one another by visible lines. However, these early paradigms were very influential in the development of the field, so as to say that majority of later developments were all built upon the basis drawn by the early 'paradigms'. Main reason for

this is perhaps despite rapid and enormous differences in most aspects of social life, relative stability in the basic structuring and practices experienced in organizations general, public organizations in particular; Classical and neo-classical approaches are still relevant for most aspects of organizational life.

The development of most perspectives and approaches followed the common path of being 'ethnocentric'. The 'official emergence' was in the United States, just like many other paradigms/approaches that followed. The specific social, historical and administrative conditions of that country were naturally reflected upon theories. Despite this point, most of such approaches/theories found applicable to many other places mainly because of shared common characteristics of capitalism, political structures, liberalism, democracy and organizational practices. Beginning by 1970s 'varieties in the approaches/theories of public administration increased. Most of these were influenced by historical/social developments of their age, common themes were, democracy, humanity, voluntarism, and other forms of 'normativeness, and pluralism. However most of these formulations remained within the 'mainstream' of this field and its research agenda, rarely providing alternatives to early paradigms.

The effect of 'pragmatist philosophy' upon most of the approaches is visible. This is in consistency with the conventional definition and understanding of public administration: technical instrument organized in 'ends/means rationality', always with specific purpose (determined by political authority), should always protect itself from negative effects of politics and serve the common purpose. This way of understanding was usually taken as 'given', barely questioned. Rather, efforts were directed towards making public administration systems; more 'technical', more 'instrumental', 'more rational', more 'goal oriented' and more 'efficient and effective'.

When conceived this way, it is only 'natural' and inevitable to meet the 'identity crisis' and to be unable to find solutions to it, as the contemporary characteristics of the public administration brings with it such a situation. State is everywhere and in every 'field' that exists. Inside such a vast 'territory' determination of the 'borderlines' is almost impossible and would be extremely artificial. Therefore a discrepancy exists between their ontological status of contemporary public administration systems and the dominant epistemological manifestations. This in fact, constitutes the 'real' identity crisis.

The analysis of existing research and academic activities, is far from being satisfactory for most of the persons who evaluated these. Pragmatic orientation continues with the stress on 'technological' dimensions. However this would likely to create further crisis since technology in this field may barely have 'universal' characteristics. Problems relevant for specific organizations and administrative situations may only be technically solved within their own context. Contrary efforts (of importing and exporting the problems and the solutions) usually were not successful, as expected.

As a result of all these, the distinction between profession, 'technical expertise', academic activity and theory of public administration must always be re-considered. Professionalization of the practitioners is useful, the technical dimensions, creations of solutions to problems, their evaluation and implementation should be left to that profession. The empirical methods will be contributory to handling these intra-professional, intra-organizational and 'unique' cases. Professionalization will bring with it relevant and competent 'in-house education' and 'consultancy' based on past experience.

The academic activity, on the other hand, primarily necessitates a concern with 'theory' of administration

based upon a rather 'different' understanding of science in which the 'given' is never satisfactory. Being critical must be the keyword, not the technical solutions to temporary and unique problems are primarily searched for, but in a reverse order, the questions (thus the 'given') are probed first, hence contributing to our understanding, explaining and prescribing the future of this practice. Such an activity initially necessitates 'transcending' the existing artificial compartments of social science and 'expertise' of public administration. Even the notion of being 'multidisciplinary' should also be rejected in that manner.

Such an activity would lead to elaborated study on concepts and practices like capitalism, organizations, domination, hierarchy, power, state formation, the relationship between the state and the civil society and, alienation as these are the most common characteristics and determining factors of our age. Whether inside capitalism or not, alternatives to division of labour, organizations, administration and the state structuring will be the 'real' change of paradigm in this area and the academic activities should at least be equally oriented towards these topics as well.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

ALLISON, Graham T. Jr. (1983) "Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects?" in PERRY, James, (1983), pp.72-92

BAILEY, Mary Timney (1989) "Minnowbrook II: An End or a New Beginning?" , Public Administration Review, March/April, 1989

BALDWIN, J. Norman (1988) "Comparison of Perceived Effectiveness of MPA Programs Administered Under Different Institutional Arrangements", Public Administration Review, September/October, 1988.

BOBBIO, Norberto (1988) Which Socialism?, London: Polity Press.

BOX, Richard C. (1992) "An Examination of the Debate Over Research in Public Administration", Public Administration Review, January/February, 1992.

BURRELL, Gibson and MORGAN Gareth (1985) Sociological Paradigms And Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life, Portsmouth:Heinemann.

CARROLL, James (1987) "Public Administration in the Third Century of the Constitution: Supply-Side Management, Privatization, or Public Investment", Public Administration Review, January/February, 1987.

CHARLESWORTH, James (1968) Theory And Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives and Methods, Philadelphia: AAPSS.

CLEARY, Robert E., (1989) "Dialogue, Negotiation, and the Advancements of Democracy: Reflections on Minnowbrook II" Public Administration Review, March/April, 1989 pp.226-227.

CLEARY, Robert E., (1990) "What Do Public Administration Masters Programs Look Like? Do They Do What Is Needed?", Public Administration Review, November/December, 1990.

CLEARY Robert E., (1992) "Revisiting Doctoral dissertation in Public Administration: An Examination of the Dissertations of 1990", Public Administration Review, January/February, 1992..

CLEGG, Steward and DUNKERLEY, David, (1977) Critical Issues In Organizations, London:Routledge & Kegan Paul.

CLEGG, Steward and DUNKERLEY, David, (1987)
Organization, Class and Control, London:Routledge &
Kegan Paul.

COURSEY, David, and BOZEMAN, Barry, (1990) "Decision
Making in Public And Private Organizations:A test
of alternative concepts of publicness" Public
Administration Review, September/October, pp. 525-
534.

DAHL, Robert,(1947) "The Science of Public
Administration:Three Problems", Public
Administration Review, Vol 7. No. 1, 1947.

DANEKE, Gregory,(1990) "A Science of Public
Administration?", Public Administration Review,
May/June, 1990.

DUNBAR, Roger, (1983) "Toward an Applied
Administrative Science", Administrative Science
Quarterly, Vol. 28,1983.

DUNLEAVY, Patrick, (1982) "Is There a Radical Approach
to Public Administration?" Public Administration,
Vol., 60 pp. 215-233.

DUNN, W. and FOZOUNI, B., (1976) Toward A Critical
Administrative Theory, California:Sage
Publications.

DUNSIRE, A. (1973) Administration: The Word and the Science, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

FEYERABEND, Paul, (1987) "Creativity- A Dangerous Myth", Critical Inquiry, Vol., 13 Summer 1987.

FLEW, Anthony, (1980) A Dictionary of Philosophy, London: Pan Books.

FOLLETT, Mary Parker, (1923) The New State, New York: Longmans, Green and Company.

FREDERICKSON, George, (1971), "Toward a New Public Administration" in MARINI, Frank (1971), pp.309-331.

FREDERICKSON, George, (1982) "The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration", Public Administration Review, November/December, 1982.

FREDERICKSON, George, (1989) "Minnowbrook II: Changing Epochs of Public Administration", Public Administration Review, March/April, 1989.

FREDERICKSON, George, (1990) "Public Administration and Social Equity", Public Administration Review, March/April 1990.

FRY, Brian R., (1989) Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo, New Jersey: Chatam House.

GAWTHROP, Louis C. (1989) "Minnowbrook: The Search for New Reality", Public Administration Review, March/April 1989.

GULICK, Luther, (1987) "Time and Public Administration" Public Administration Review, January/February, 1987.

GULICK, Luther, (1989) "The National Institute of Public Administration" quoted in FRY, Brian, (1989)

GUY, Mary Ellen, (1989) "Minnowbrook II: Conclusions" Public Administration Review, March/April, 1989.

HALEVY-ETZIONI, Eva, (1985), Bureaucracy and Democracy, London: RKP.

HAMMOND, Thomas, (1990) "In Defence of Luther Gulick's 'Notes on the Theory of Organization'", Public Administration Review, Vol. 68 Summer, 1990.

HARMON, Michael and MAYER, Richard, (1986), Organization Theory For Public Administration, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1986.

HART, David K. (1989) "A Partnership in Virtue Among All Citizens: The Public Service and Civic Humanism" Public Administration Review, March/April 1989.

HEADY, Ferrell, (1979) Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, Revised and Expanded Second Edition, New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.

HEAPHEY, James, (1968) "Comparative Public Administration: Comments on current Characteristics" Public Administration Review, May/June, 1968.

HEFFRON, Florence, (1989), Organization Theory and Public Organizations: The Political Connection, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

HENDERSON, Keith, (1971) "A New Comparative Public Administration" in MARINI Frank, (1971), pp234-250.

HENRY, Nicholas, (1989) Public Administration and Public Affairs, (Fourth Edition), New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

HOLZER, Marc, (1989) "Minnowbrook II: Conclusions", Public Administration Review, March/April 1989.

HOOD, Christopher, (1986) Administrative Analysis: An Introduction to rules, Enforcement & Organizations, Kent: Wheatsheaf Books (Harvester).

HOOD, Christopher, (1991) "A Public Management for All Seasons?", Public Administration, Vol 69, Spring 1991.

HOUSTON, David and DELEVAN, Sybil, (1990) "Public Administration Research: An Assessment of Journal Publications", Public Administration Review, November/December 1990.

HUNT, E. K., (1978), Property and Prophets: The Evolution of Economic Institutions and Ideologies, Revised Second Edition, New York: Harper and Row.

KEAT, Russell and URRY, John, (1975), Social Theory as Science, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

KIGGUNDU, Moses, et.al., (1983) "Administrative Theory in Developing Countries: A Synthesis" Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol., 28, 1983.

KIRKHART, Larry, (1971) "Toward a Theory of Public Administration" in MARINI, Frank, (1971)

KUHN, Thomas, (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Second Edition, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,

LANE, Frederick S. (ed.) (1990), Current Issues in Public Administration, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990

LANE, Jan-Erik, (ed.), (1985) State and Market: The Politics of the Public and the Private, London: Sage.

LUNDQUIST, Lennart, (1985) "From Order to Chaos: Recent Trends in the Study of Public Administration" in LANE Jan-Erik (1985), pp.201-231.

MARINI, Frank (ed), (1971) Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, Scranton: Chandler.

MCCURDY, Howard and CLEARY, Robert (1984) "Why Can't We Resolve the Research Issue in Public Administration?", Public Administration Review, January/February, 1984.

MORGAN, Gareth, (1983) "More on Metaphor: Why We Cannot Control Tropes in Administrative Science" Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol.23, 1983, pp 601-607.

MURRAY, Michael, (1983) "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Explanatory Essay" in PERRY, (1983).

O'LEARY, D. B., (1985) "Is There a Radical Public Administration?" Public Administration, Vol., 63 Autumn 1985.

O'TOOLE, Laurence, (1982) "Dwight Waldo", in UVEGES, Joseph, (1982), pp., 107-113.

O'TOOLE, Laurence, (1987) "Doctrines and Developments: Separating of Powers, the Politics-Administration Dichotomy, and the rise of the Administrative State", Public Administration Review, January-February, 1987.

OSTROM, Vincent, (1973) The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.,

OSTROM, Vincent, (1982) "The Theory and Practice of Public Administration as a Science of the Artifactual" in UVEGES Joseph, (1982)

OSTROM, Vincent, and OSTROM, Elinor, (1971) "Public Choice:A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration", Public Administration Review, March/April, 1971.

PERRY James, and, KRAEMER Kenneth, (1983), Public Management:Public and Private Perspectives, California: Mayfield Publishing Co.

PERRY, James, and, KRAEMER, Kenneth (1986) "Research Methodology in the Public administration Review", Public Administration Review, May/June 1986.

PORTER, David, (1989) "Minnowbrook II:Conclusions",
Public Administration Review, March/April 1989.

RAINEY Hal, and BACKOFF, Robert, and, LEVINE, Charles,
(1983) "Comparing Public and Private Organizations"
in PERRY, (1983).

REDFORD, Emmette, (1975) Ideal and Practice in Public
Administration, Alabama:University of Alabama
Press, Revised Edition, London:RKP.

SCHUMANN, David, (1976) Bureaucracies, Organizations,
and Administration:A Political Primer,
NewYork:Macmillan.

SELF, Peter, (1982) Administrative Theories and
Politics, London: George Allen and Unwin.

SHAFRITZ ,M. and HYDE, A. (1978) Classics of Public
Administration, Illinois:Moore Publishing Co.

SHANGRAW, R. F. and CROW, Michael (1989) "Public
Administration as a Design Science" Public
Administration Review, March/April 1989.

SIMON, Herbert, (1946) "The Proverbs of
Administration" Public administration Review, vol.
6, Winter 1946, reprinted in SHAFRITZ & HYDE
(1978), pp107-122.

STALLINGS, Robert, (1986) "Doctoral Programs in Public Administration: An Outsiders Perspective" Public Administration Review, May/June 1986.

STALLINGS, Robert, and, FERRIS, James (1988) "Public Administration Research: Work in PAR, 1940-1984" Public Administration Review, January-February, 1988.

STEVER, James, (1988) The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-Progressive Era, New York: Transnational.

STILLMAN, Richard, (1983) Public Administration: Concepts and Cases, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

STILLMAN, Richard, (1987) "The Constitutional Bicentennial and the Centennial of the American Administrative State", Public Administration Review, January-February 1987.

UVEGES, Joseph, (1982) Public Administration: History and Theory in Contemporary Perspective, New York: Marcel Dekker.

VAN WART, M., and, CAYER J., (1990), "Comparative Public Administration: Defunct, Dispersed or Redefined?", Public Administration Review, March/April 1990.

VENTRISS, Curtis, (1989) "Toward a Public Philosophy of Public Administration: A Civic Perspective of the Public" Public Administration Review March/April 1989.

WALDO, Dwight, (1968) "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration" in CHARLESWORTH James, (1968)

WALDO, Dwight, (1971) Foreword to MARINI, Frank, (1971).

WALDO, Dwight, (1982) "Public Administration" in UVEGES, J., (1982)

WALDO, Dwight, (1988) "The End of Public Administration?" Public Administration Review, September/October 1988.

WAMSLEY, Gary, and,, BACHER, Robert, et.al. (1990), Refounding Public Administration, California: Sage.

WHITE, Jay D. (1986) "Dissertations and Publications in Public Administration" Public Administration Review, May/June 1986.

WHITE, Jay D. (1986a) "On the Growth of Knowledge in Public Administration" Public Administration Review, January/February 1986.

WHITE, Orion, (1973) "The Concept of Administrative Praxis", Journal of Comparative Administration Vol V No 1 May 1973.

WILSON, Woodrow, (1887) "The Study of Administration" Political Science Quarterly, Vol II no1 June 1887., reprinted in SHAFRITZ Jay, and HYDE Albert (1978)

