

The Study of Public Administration : The State of the Science

By

A. EKANAYAKE
*Senior Lecturer & Head, Department of
Public Administration*

I

The study of Public Administration¹ on a global scale is a phenomenon of the second half of the twentieth century, a phenomenon which spread through out many countries after the second World War. The proliferation of the study has been singularly influenced by the developments of the study in the United States of America since it was initiated by Woodrow Wilson in 1887 and advanced by the writings of Frank J. Goodnow and Leonard D. White of the 'politics-administration dichotomy' stream in the first two decades; and W. F. Willoughby, Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick of the 'principles of administration' stream in the third decade of this century. These two streams led subsequently to a great deal of controversy in this field and contributed to the emergence of new perspectives and theories, especially after the Second World War, which was a period of vast proliferation of literature in Public Administration; some challenging the traditional assumptions, some attempting new interpretations, and yet others advancing 'new theories' having been dissatisfied with traditional Public Administration.

An analysis of these developments helps us to identify the sources of Public Administration and its interrelationships with those sources and disciplines. The importance of understanding these relationships lies in the fact that Public Administration is an interdisciplinary, crossroads science which has links with not only its mother discipline: political science, but also with other social sciences² and therefore an acquaintance with those links and connections is necessary for its study and practice.

1 In this paper, following Dwight Waldo, the *study* of public administration will be referred to as 'Public Administration' beginning the two words with capital letters, while the *practice* of public administration will be denoted by 'public administration' using simple letters in the two words.

2 Ridley, F.F. *The Study of Government : Political Science and Public Administration*, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (1975) p. 160.

Although the modern study of Public Administration has been greatly influenced by the developments in the United States of America, which in itself was the result of the reformist tendencies of the pioneers; Woodrow Wilson - the pioneering father - seems to have been influenced by the 'administrative sciences' of France and Germany.³ Therefore it is useful for us to trace these developments in Europe to place our study in its proper perspective.

II

Continental Administrative Sciences

Cameral Sciences

The cameralistic sciences were the basis for providing education and training for the functionaries of Prussian kings to manage their estates and the activities of their states. The eighteenth century "witnessed the birth and growth, in Germany, Austria and other countries subject to Germanic political and cultural influence, of the 'cameral' sciences, the forerunners of the present-day administrative sciences ... With few exceptions, it was only in Central Europe that the study of machinery and methods of administrative action were reduced to a system and expressed in teachable form. (Here) the cameral sciences accompanied the afflorescence of princely absolutism and the consolidation of modern bureaucracy in the service of the 'Police State'"⁴

In Prussia, professorships were established in 1729 to train future administrators and the teaching centred mainly on the description of administrative institutions and practices, rooted in an "economic mode of thinking rather than a legal approach." The subjects included were: agriculture and forestry, finance and taxation, statistics, and administration, and by the "middle of the eighteenth century it was virtually impossible to obtain a high official post in the Prussian royal services without a qualification in these subjects."⁵

Administrative Law

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there was a concurrent development of administrative law and thus a relative balance was struck between juridical and non-juridical administrative sciences.⁶ But with the increasing predominance of administrative law, cameralistic administrative sciences more or less disappeared in Germany and thereafter its place was taken by

3 Ostrom, Vincent *The Intellectual Crises in American Public Administration*, Alabama University; The Alabama University Press (1973), p. 27; and Dunsire, Andrew, *Administration: The Word & the Science*, London, Martin Robertson & Company Ltd. (1973) pp. 88-89.

4 Molitor, Andre, *The University Teaching of Social Sciences: Public Administration*, Geneva, UNESCO (1959) p. 26

5 Dunsire, *op. cit.* p. 54

6 Molitor, *op. cit.* pp. 29-30

juridical administrative science⁷. The demand for 'administrative science' in the Continent declined with the absolutist state giving way to more democratic changes and the "rapid development of administrative law gave a different emphasis to the training of officials", eclipsing the cameralistic tradition in Prussia in the nineteenth century and cameralistic sciences dissolved into Politics, Law, and Sociology⁸. Cameralism also involved management by a system of councils and this was something that Napoleon disliked because of his distrust of divided responsibility⁹. Therefore when his influence began to be felt in Europe it also contributed to the disappearance of cameralism from the scene and administrative sciences began to be predominately juridical especially in the Latin countries of Europe, in spite of the then prevalent view that administrative sciences borrow not only from law but also from philosophy (principles), ethics (rules of conduct), history (origins), and political economy (solutions to problems)"¹⁰ "Administrative law is not the whole of administrative sciences, since that science comprises historical, economic, statistical, and technical notions that do not form part of legal studies"¹¹. Yet in the nineteenth century, administrative theory was the concern of teachers of law"¹². It would appear that the administrative law approach to Public Administration is the predominant system in the Continent up to the present time. This is not surprising since "in Europe the state used to be conceived primarily as a legal system" and therefore the roots of Public Administration are in administrative law." However, during the period between the two wars and after 1945 non-juridical administrative science seems to have gained ground in many countries because it has been felt that the training of public servants should not be confined to legal aspects alone but should also include social sciences."¹⁴ This change of attitude is likely to have been influenced also by the developments that took place in the United States in the study of Public Administration and its 'export' not only to the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but also to Europe after the Second World War.

The study of bureaucracy

The sociological approach to the study of bureaucracy, which forms a major part of the study of Public Administration today, is also an European development which was the result of the works of several sociologists and more

7 Ridley, *op. cit.* p. 150

8 Dunsire, *op. cit.* p. 77

9 *Ibid*, p. 64

10 Molitor, *op. cit.* p. 31

11 *Ibid*

12 *Ibid*, p. 32

13 Van Nieuwenhuijze, C...A.O., "Public Administration, Comparative Administration, Development Administration: Concepts and theory in their struggle for relevance" in *Development and Change*, vol. no.3 (1973-74), The Hague, Institute of Social Studies, p. 1

14 Molitor, *op. cit.* p. 32

A. EKANAYAKE

particularly those of Herbert Spencer, Gustav Schmoller and Max Weber. The increased use of paid officials for the performance of governmental activities saw the growth of the bureaucracy in many European countries and it became the target of criticism and analysis by politicians, statesmen, and sociologists. In the eighteenth century, de Gournay identified bureaucracy as rule by officials and in 1821 vom Stein lamented that the Germans were "governed by salaried, book-learned, disinterested, propertyless bureau people."¹⁵ John Stuart Mill has remarked that the sickness that afflicts bureaucratic government is routine thus losing its vitality.¹⁶ Walter Bagehot recognized the need for a permanent body of officials with increasing government activity but was critical of it remarking that "not only does a bureaucracy tend to under-government in point of quality; it tends to over-government in point of quantity."¹⁷ Although such criticisms were levelled against the bureaucracy the first academic use of the term is attributed to von Mohl who used it (in 1846) for describing any organization of officials.¹⁸ The analysis of human societies by Herbert Spencer using biological metaphor has been used as a model by Gustav Schmoller and this has had its influence on Max Weber.¹⁹ who is seen as the scholar who advanced the most influential version of the bureaucratic theory; but his studies did not have much impact in the English-speaking countries until after nineteen forties, that is, till Weber's work was translated into English.²⁰ In fact Vincent Ostrom holds the view that the theories of French and German scholars which inspired Wilson and Goodnow were in their own time being reinterpreted by Max Weber, but unawareness of the latter's work by American scholars until 1947 enabled the old theories in new clothes a new splendour of several decades in the twentieth century in the United States of America.²¹

We can thus see that the contribution of the Continent to the development of the study of Public Administration has been large and is in the juridical (administrative law) and sociological (bureaucracy) approaches. But what has been the contribution that Great Britain - a country which had a globe-girdling empire and an equally widespread administrative apparatus - has made to the development of the study of Public Administration?

15 Dunsire, *op. cit.* p. 67

16 *Ibid*, p. 72

17 *Ibid*, p. 74

18 *Ibid*, p. 79

19 *Ibid*, pp. 82-83

20 *Ibid*, p. 85

21 Ostrom, *op. cit.* p. 9

III

Great Britain's Contribution

Any contribution that Britain has made to the study of Public Administration has come largely from the writings of statesmen and academic political scientists who were concerned with political institutions rather than with administration as such. Thus up to very recent times there has been no independent theoretical work in Britain in this field. In fact, Ridley expresses the view that "Britain is still an underdeveloped country" as far as establishment of Public Administration as an academic subject is concerned.²² In Britain administrative law did not gain recognition until recently, the old established universities considered non-juridical administrative sciences non-existent or unworthy of a place in their syllabuses, and the civil service itself was sceptical about these subjects in a situation where 'intelligent amateurism' dominated the civil service.²³

In examining the evolution of the meanings of the word 'administration', Andrew Dunsire indicates that even as late as 1914, in Britain, administration was taken to mean the "work like that of the Ministers" in their ministries when there was no developed civil service.²⁴ And it was only gradually and with the growth of the higher civil service that it came to mean the work of the civil services. Although there was no development of the field of study as an academic discipline or programme in the universities, there have been contributions to the literature on public administration by philosophers, statesmen and social scientists in Britain.

A large part of Jeremy Bentham's *Constitutional Code* is concerned with administration (structural-procedural) and this is said to be in the cameralistic tradition because of "his concern for specialized training and examinations for public officials and for his espousal of monocratic or single-headed administrative structures as against council or 'Board' direction".²⁵ John Stuart Mill in his *Representative Government* (1861) "paid much attention to what we might now call the effects of structure upon administrative behaviour". Mill is quoted as having said that the "ideally perfect constitution of a public office is that in which the interest of the functionary is entirely coincident with his duty"²⁶ an instance where the artificial system and the natural system of an organization are congruent.

22 Ridley, *op. cit.* p. 159

23 Molitor, *op. cit.* p. 36

24 Dunsire, *op. cit.* pp. 22-23

25 *Ibid.* p. 61

26 *Ibid.* p. 71

In commenting on the views of Walter Bagehot on a permanent body of officials with specialized knowledge mixed with a group of people with non-special minds, the implication of which is to indicate less of a need for a 'trained' bureaucracy, Dunsire says:

"This is very close to the expression of a theory that there are common elements in the direction of enterprises of all kinds, a theory that goes back to Socrates' dialogue with Nicomachides in the fifth century B.C. and which.....had a flowering in the British civil service in the decades after 1920".....²⁷

but for Bagehot the non-special minds were ministers and special minds were civil service.

While the centralized absolute monarchies of Europe created a demand for a vast body of officials to carry out the functions of the state, in England centralization was inhibited and the "monarchy was never as absolute, especially in the control of financial resources" and the result of it was that while France and Prussia "made a science of the service of the state" England "considered it a task for intelligent amateurs".²⁸ Although continental observers were impressed by English system for its avoidance of bureaucracy, "it had also avoided schools for public servants; and with them, administrative science textbooks".²⁹ And this absence of textbooks is attributed to the lack of "incentive to collect and draw together and generalize" in the absence of a demand for teaching and training,³⁰ the demand "emerged when the accustomed methods of supplying enough trained recruits" failed towards the end of the nineteenth century" and Dunsire goes on to say :

"In the public service of the Prussian kings, the demand began to obtain in the middle of the seventeenth century. In the public service of the British Queen, there may be controversy over whether it fully obtains in the third quarter of the twentieth century, so apparently successful was the adjustment made to the whole provision of national higher education in the mid-nineteenth century to meet the then demand for 'trained men' that arose when the grandsons of the eighteenth-century squires were sent out to administer India, and were found wanting."³¹

Although no interest was shown by the established universities to initiate the teaching of Public Administration, in the industrial and engineering fields it had been accepted that the universities should impart administrative

27 *Ibid*, p. 75

28 *Ibid*, pp. 55-56

29 *Ibid*, p. 57

30 *Ibid*, p. 76

31 *Ibid*, pp. 57- 58

THE STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION : THE STATE OF THE SCIENCE

studies and in 1918 Manchester University established a Department of Industrial Administration,³² but in industry, 'administration' refers to the house keeping activities and does not embrace policy as in public administration. In industry, policy is considered to be the function of management and not that of administration.

The sociological contribution from Britain came from Herbert Spencer who analysed organizations of human societies and indicated the need for complex structures with increasing complexity of society but that these structures become rigid and the dominant aim of every social structure being survival they will keep themselves intact as long as they can, even when their functions are useless or detrimental to the society. Although Spencer was against the expansion of state activities in England, he has (in the process) contributed to the latterday organization theory. Spencer's model of the association (leader, staff, and followers) was developed by Gustav Schmoller in a history of the Prussian administrative system and this had its influence on Max Weber in his work on bureaucracy.³³

Because of the conservative attitude of the older universities of Britain in admitting Public Administration as an academic discipline, it was left to the technical colleges and the newer universities to provide the education necessary for various administrative services outside the central government civil service, such as the local government administration and this together with the establishment of the Royal Institute of Public Administration in 1972 stimulated the progress of the study.

In some British universities, especially in the Arts Faculties, new subjects find it hard to get acceptance. "Public Administration, considered as a science or even as a subject in its own right is definitely on the wrong side of the border"³⁴. In reviewing the situation around 1959, Molitor says that Manchester University awards a degree in Public Administration (B.Admin) some others award diplomas: many technical colleges offer fulltime and evening courses preparing students for examinations of many professional bodies such as the Institute of Hospital Administration, Diploma in Government Administration and Diploma in Municipal Administration of the Local Government Examinations Board and in the fifties the Diploma in Public Administration of the University of London has been raised to post-graduate level.³⁵

32 *Ibid*, p. 42

33 *Ibid*, pp. 82-83

34 Molitor, *op. cit.* p. 43

35 *Ibid*, pp. 63-64

Although the professional civil service and the older universities were not receptive to the idea of the need for teaching of Public Administration or its existence as an academic discipline, certain official bodies seem to have had faith in the existence of an administrative science and principles. Dunsire refers to the Haldane Committee as having been influenced by the "existence of common principles of administration" and the "Institute of Public Administration (which) was founded in London in 1922 (breathing) through the first editorial of its journal *Public Administration* in 1923" the same spirit.³⁶

In spite of the fact that Britain administered a far-flung and vast empire up to the end of the Second World War, its administration both at home and abroad has been pragmatic and carried out mainly through 'intellegent amateurs' trained in the liberal arts tradition of orthodox British universities and therefore did not contribute to the development of the study of Public Administration as an academic field, discipline, or subject, until it was influenced by developments in the United States. Academic circles are now making an effort, although still weak, to keep in step with the developments in the various aspects of the study and the latest developments are being taken up where some scholars have even devoted their attention to policy studies.

Having said all this, it is still possible to identify literature in Britain on Public Administration in the political science tradition, especially those concerned with institutions, not only among early political scientists and statesmen such as Bentham, Mill and Bagehot, but also latter-day scholars such as Ernest Barker, Herman Finer, Harold Laski, William Robson, A.H. Hanson, Brian Chapman, W.J.M. McKenzie, E.N.G ladden, F.F. Ridley, Peter Self and Andrew Dunsire whose works throw some light on the historical and political perspectives of Public Administration.

IV

American Public Administration

The European administrative sciences did not spread beyond its boundaries - although it had its influence on the pioneers of American Public Administration - because of the absence of such a need in the previous centuries in other countries of the world and also because there was no conscious 'export' from Europe, even in the twentieth century, specially after the Second World War when most newly independent countries looked to the developed countries and international organizations for technical assistance for 'modernizing' their administrative machinery and techniques of administration.

³⁶ Dunsire, *op. cit.* pp. 96-97

By this time, American Public Administration had come to pre-eminence and whether technical assistance went direct from the United States of America or was channelled through international agencies such as the United Nations and its agencies, what was exported to the LDCs was the American Science of Public Administration. Even the Continental and British institutes which provided education and training in public administration and development studies were influenced by the literature and theories developed in the United States and when we talk of Public Administration as a field of study it is hardly possible to talk in terms of any literature free from the influence of American Public Administration. In fact some American scholars have gone so far as to claim that "public administration is a peculiarly American contribution to behavioural and social science" and public administration's ladder of knowledge is traced "from Aristotle and Hamilton, through Wilson and Goodnow... to Willoughby and White and so on,"³⁷ as if between Aristotle, Hamilton and Wilson nothing had happened in the study of Public Administration. However, it is in the U.S.A. that the largest amount of theorising has been done in the field. Therefore it is useful for us to make at least a very brief survey of the development of the study there over the last eight decades.

The literature in the field of Public Administration can be divided into two broad categories : those that describe organizations and processes of public administration; and those that attempt to generalize and develop abstract concepts to contribute to a theory of Public Administration. Most of the current literature found in the Continent and Great Britain and some in the United States and almost all in the developing countries would fall into the former category; while theory-building is mainly the pre-occupation of scholars in the United States so that theory, if there is any, of Public Administration is a product of the United States; with all its implications for other countries which seek to make use of such theories for the study and practice in those countries. This view seems to be confirmed by Peter Self who says: "There is a large, descriptive literature dealing with the organization and processes of modern governments; and there is another substantial literature mainly American, dealing with theories of organization and bureaucracy."³⁸

The developments of the study of Public Administration in the United States of America have been analysed by various scholars under different categories. Nicholas Henry traces these developments from 1900 to date under five 'paradigms'.³⁹ While Richardson and Baldwin isolate seven 'fruitful

37 Durham, Homer, in *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives and Methods*, (ed) James C. Charlesworth, Philadelphia, The American Academy of Political and Social Science (1968) p. 241.

38 Self, Peter, *Administrative Theories and Politics*, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (1972) p. 11

39 Henry, Nicholas, *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc. (1975) pp. 6-22

perspectives'.⁴⁰ H. George Frederickson traces the developments under five 'models'⁴¹ which are challenged by Gary L. Wamsley who talks of two 'conceptual streams'.⁴² It is also possible to make use of four categories of theories: descriptive-explanatory, normative, assumptive, and instrumental, to classify these developments.⁴³ However, before going into these various categories it is proposed to trace the developments themselves.

Politics-administration dichotomy

The developments in the study of Public Administration in the United States up to the end of the Second World War was inspired by the reformist movement initiated by Woodrow Wilson and centred on the politics-administration dichotomy and the 'principles of administration' which the former gave rise to; and the subsequent challenges and reactions to those challenges.

The first two scholars who developed the thesis attributed to Woodrow Wilson, for a separation of administration from politics, were Frank J. Goodnow in *Politics and Administration* (1900) and Leonard D. White in the *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (1926); the latter being the first textbook in the field. The period bounded by these two publications (1900-1926) is identified by Henry as the period during which what he calls the paradigm of 'politics-administration dichotomy' prevailed. This paradigm was 'locus-oriented' in that its concern was with the demarcation of the boundaries of Public Administration and the major concern of these scholars was to indicate the apolitical nature of administration, the function of which was to implement the policies determined by those who were competent to make such policies and who were not administrators as such.⁴⁴ It is hinted that Wilson was influenced by the bureaucratic system of administration in such countries as France and Germany and therefore advocated the separation of the administrative function from the political function and their being entrusted to two groups of persons.⁴⁵ However, this insistence seems to have been subsequently interpreted as a call for a separation between political science and Public Administration on a theoretical level as well. It would appear that Wilson's call had been for a permanent body of civil servants who would devote

40 Richardson, Ivan L. and Sidney Baldwin, *Public Administration: Government in Action*, Ohio, Columbus, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company (1976) p. 9

41 Frederickson, H. George, "The Lineage of New Public Administration" in *Administration and Society* vol. 8 no. 2 (August, 1976) p. 153

42 Wamsley, Gary L., "On the Problem of Discovering What's Really New in Public Administration" in *Administration and Society*, vol. 8 no. 3 (Nov. 1976) p. 153

43 Bailey, Stephen K. "Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration" in James C. Charlesworth (ed) *op. cit.* p. 129

44 Henry, *op. cit.* pp. 6-7

45 Ostrom, *op. cit.* pp. 9, 26 and Dunsire, *op. cit.* pp. 88-89

their full time to administration so that these activities could be taken away from political appointees which led to inefficiency, corruption, and waste. However, when this separation was called for, Wilson's followers seem to have argued that administrators are neutral agents of politics and that they do not themselves decide or participate in policy formulation. In fact, this appeared to be the logical conclusion which needed to be arrived at in the particular situation in which the U.S.A. was placed at that time in order to keep administration free from politics even if in practice the political and administrative functions could not be strictly compartmentalized. Such a separation was thought necessary to pursue the implementation of policies in the most economical and most efficient manner because if administration was the work of a special body of permanent civil servants, then specialization in their activities would lead to efficiency and economy. Further, the low level to which politics had fallen at the time in the United States required that administration be freed from it to faithfully implement the policies of those who are concerned with the authoritative allocation of values for the society. If Administration is separated from politics and is considered as a tool, then scientific methods could be applied to its study for ascertaining principles for efficient and economic performance. Scientific methods could be applied to objective facts of administration and not to politics which is concerned with subjective values. Therefore in theory as well as in practice there was a felt need at the time for insisting on the existence of a separation between politics and administration.

Principles of administration.

Once this separation was clear, the study of administration, it was argued could be (or should be) approached as a science and principles derived from such scientific study. The works of Willoughby (1927), Follet (1924), Gullick and Urwick (1937), and Mooney and Riley (1932, 1939), have advanced 'principles of administration'. These principles were first given expression with the publication of W.F. Willoughby's *Principles of Administration* (1927), and later in Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick's *Papers on the Science of Administration* (1937). This period, (1927-1937), is identified by Henry as the heyday of the 'principles of administration paradigm' which was 'focus-oriented' in that, having earlier disposed of the boundary problem, the concern was with the search for principles and techniques of economical and efficient administration. But the work of Gullick and Urwick moved towards a theory of generic administration rather than public administration as such and therefore it would appear that it is not correct to identify this paradigm as purely a focus-oriented one. While on the one hand, the boundaries of Public Administration seemed to be reduced to something less than political science during the earlier period, the works of Gullick and Urwick seemed to push Public Administration to be subsumed in a wider concept of administration.

In reviewing the trends in the study of Public Administration before 1940 in the United States, Waldo mentions four closely related doctrines that prevailed during the period: (a) the dichotomy between politics (decision) and administration (execution), under which the students of Public Administration concentrated on that part concerned with the execution of public policy which then justified "placing a new emphasis upon proper professional or scientific training for administrative work....." Once this separation was recognized, the emphasis after the First World War tended to become more specialized, more intent upon administrative improvement in itself."; (b) emphasis that administration can be made into a science (to gain respectability after its separation from politics which latter had a low prestige at that time); (c) assertion that scientific study can and does lead to the identification of a body of 'principles' of administration and these principles are found in such categories as organization, management, personnel administration, planning and budgeting; and (d) that the application of these principles would lead to economy and efficiency, which was "the central if not the sole goal of administrative study."⁴⁶ He summarizes the trend as follows:

"Thus the philosophy of early public administration; proper analysis of governmental functions divides administration off from politics; the sphere of administration is one to which science can and should be applied; application of scientific methods of inquiry leads to the discovery of principles of organization and management; and these principles determine the way in which governmental functions can be administered most economically and efficiently."⁴⁷

Generic administration

The period of self-confidence in the existence of a body of principles of administration also coincided with the period of the Scientific Management Movement in industrial administration with its heyday in the 1920s. These two, parallel, developments in industrial administration and Public Administration seems to have obscured any distinction between *public and private* administration in so far as the 'principles' were applicable to the administration of any organization or enterprise whether in the public or in the private sector. Richardson and Baldwin think that during "the late 1920s and the decade of the 1930s, the ideas and practices of scientific management greatly influenced the study and practice of public administration"⁴⁸ although Henry asserts that while "obviously related in concept, scientific management had little effect on public administration during its principal phase because it (scientific

46 Waldo, Dwight, *The Study of Public Administration*, New York, Random House Inc. (1955) pp. 40-41

47 *Ibid*, pp. 41-42

48 Richardson and Baldwin, *op. cit.* p. 16

management) focussed on lower-level personnel in the organization".⁴⁹ But Peter Self says that the principles of administration school "drew some of its inspiration from the writings on industrial management of the American Frederick Taylor, and of the industrial psychologists in Europe and America" although the "focus of these studies is on routine tasks and operations, and influential as these discoveries have been these have not much relevance to general issues of administrative organization".⁵⁰ The view of Andrew Dunsire is that although Scientific Management Movement first began at the shop floor level it moved up to cover the "organization of an enterprise as a whole, to leadership, and to the realm of business policy, (which) most affected the policy/administration dichotomy' literature, and indeed, university and college courses in public administration... The twin ideas, of the politics/administration dichotomy and Scientific Management, gave a form and purpose, a self-confidence, to both the practice and the study of administration in the 1920s and early 1930s."⁵¹

Whether it is the developments in the Scientific Management Movement or in the study of Public Administration which had the influence on the other, one can safely assume that these parallel developments had their influence on each other, if one does not wish to be so bold as to assert that it is the developments in the Scientific Management Movement that had their impact on Public Administration; considering the chronology of their publications as well as the particular 'culture' of Public Administration in the United States to borrow largely from industrial and business administration. However, it is evident that the prevalent assumption seems to have been that wherever 'principles' are discovered they are applicable in general and therefore the emphasis is not so much on *public* (or private) but on administration in a generic sense. The culmination of the development of principles of administration was marked by the publication in 1937 of Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick's *Papers on the Science of Administration* where Gullick put forward his POSDCORB which sought to integrate the different elements of administration in a total process. Thus we find that the reform movement initiated by Woodrow Wilson by his arguments for a separation between politics and administration for the improvement of efficiency and economy in the conduct of governmental activities led to the search for principles upon which such an achievement could be based and this culminated in the identification of what were then considered to be the key elements of administration, and body of principles under each of these categories of administration.

49 Henry, *op. cit.* p. 9

50 Self, *op. cit.* p. 19

51 Dunsire, *op. cit.* pp. 93-94

Challenges

However, the two paradigms of politics-administration dichotomy and principles of administration did not go unchallenged. In fact, from about the twenties they seem to have been criticized by several scholars. Around 1927 Mary Parker Follet is said to have expressed doubts about the validity of the separation of politics and administration.⁵² A further challenge came in the *Elements of Public Administration* (1938) edited by F.M. Marx, Dwight Waldo in his *Administrative State* (1948) and John M. Gaus in an essay in the *Public Administration Review* (1950) were critical of the dichotomy. "The scholarly death blow to the simplistic formulation of the classic dichotomy and a new classic statement, came in Paul Appleby's *Policy and Administration* (1949)." ⁵³

The Principles were being challenged by the human relations school which emerged with the researches of Elton Mayo and his colleagues (1926-32). The relevant works in Public Administration were those of Rensis Likert, Daniel Katz, and Robert Kahn. Vincent Ostrom is of the view that Gullick himself found anomalies in the principles although he did not challenge them in the manner that Herbert Simon and others did after him. ⁵⁴ One year after Gullick and Urwisch published their *Papers* the work of Chester I. Barnard was published in *Functions of the Executive* (1938) and this is said to have inspired Herbert Simon later to challenge the principles paradigm. The idea of the politics-administration dichotomy was also swept aside by Simon when he said that what was involved was "the process of decision-making whatever it may be called, policy or administration." ⁵⁵

These challenges arose because of the experience, in the thirties and forties during the New Deal, Depression, and World War Two, of both the academics and practicing administrators. The academics, especially, found that their own theories and principles were inadequate to deal with the practical problems of administration and that there was no clear separation between policy-making and administration. Since the late forties the view of a rigid separation of politics and administration got almost obscured and administration began to be considered as a process permeated with politics; partly as a result of empirical investigations; partly as a result of increasing self-confidence of Public Administration; and also as a result of a "more charitable and optimistic view of the processes of politics" consequent to the popularity of New Deal politics.⁵⁶ This was also a period when the assertion that Public Administration was a

52 *Ibid*, p. 98

53 *Ibid*

54 Ostrom, *op.cit*, pp. 36-42

55 Dunsire, *op.cit.*, p. 100

56 Waldo, *op.cit*, p. 42

science was played down because, on the one hand, it was considered unnecessary to do so any more if it was a science and on the other the applicability of scientific methods appeared to be less plausible if it was permeated with politics.⁵⁷ The implication of these developments was that the belief in the existence of principles had to be "almost wholly abandoned"⁵⁸. The principles were also found to be empirically untrue and based on 'naturalistic fallacy'.⁵⁹ The concepts of economy and efficiency were criticised as narrow and inadequate goals and also had logically to be abandoned since their foundations were shattered. But Waldo says that these two concepts (economy and efficiency) are retained for 'strategic reasons'⁶⁰. Their practical utility cannot also be underestimated if viewed as means rather than as goals of administration.

Identity crisis

These challenges sapped the self-confidence of Public Administration in the thirties and it faced a real crisis of identity, which it is often claimed has not been solved so far. Herbert Simon not only challenged the previous assumption of a science of administration and the existence of principles, but also suggested two lines of development, having created a new dichotomy of facts (IS questions) and values (OUGHT questions). He believed that on the basis of facts and following a logical positivist approach (value-free factual and logical approach) a pure science of administration could be developed based on a thorough grounding in social psychology. The other line of development to be pursued was policy prescriptions by a larger group consisting of political scientists, economists, sociologists, and other experts from disciplines concerned with "prescribing for public policy."⁶¹ Although Simon criticised the principles, his introduction of logical positivism into Public Administration helped to reassert and defend the earlier doctrines and assert that principles can be found avoiding naturalistic fallacy; that politics and administration could be separated based on value-fact dichotomy; and that efficiency and economy should be conceived as effectiveness of means and not confused with ends.⁶² But the logical positivist approach has been the subject of criticism by the 'New Public Administrationists' as we shall see later in this article.

57 *Ibid* pp. 42-43

58 *Ibid*, p. 43

59 *Ibid*

60 *Ibid*

61 Henry, *op.cit.* p. 14

62 Waldo, *op.cit.* pp. 44-45

Two major paths of development

Henry maintains that the reaction of Public Administrationists⁶³ of the time to these challenges and suggestions was not to take up the challenge but to return to the fold of the mother discipline of political science and during the period of 1950 - 1970 Public Administration lost the opportunity to work out an identifiable definition of its own.⁶⁴ The political scientists pushed Public Administration into a second class status and were themselves concerned with the new behavioural approach in political science. The development in the sphere of Public Administration under the political science influence of this period was to be concerned with the politics of administration or the political role of the bureaucracy.

Perhaps as a result of the second class status and perhaps also taking up Simon's suggestion, a parallel development was seen in the emergence (or re-emergence) of the administrative science paradigm during the period 1956-1970 which was, though not favoured by many Public Administrationists, found to be a reliable alternative to many others. The main concern of this approach was with organization theory (drawing on the works of social psychologists, sociologists, and Business Administrationists,) and management science (drawing on the works of statisticians, system analysts, computer scientists and economists): that is, a concern with behaviour and techniques of administration.

The administrative science of the period concentrated on organization development (OD) as its specialty and its central values were decentralization of bureaucracies and self-actualization of individual members of organizations.⁶⁵ It would appear that this was a revival of the principles paradigm of the thirties albeit in a more sophisticated and behavioural form and shift to a theory of generic administration. The overarching focus of this paradigm is Organization Theory and is demonstrated in the writings of March and Simon (1958), Cyert and March (1963), March (1965), and Thompson (1967).

The outcome of these two streams of development seem to be politics of administration and organization theory which were both in the behavioural tradition. "But in both political science and administrative science paradigms, the essential thrust was one of Public Administration losing its identity and its uniqueness within the confines of some 'larger' concept."⁶⁶

63 Deriving from the use of terms referred to in Note 1 above the academic community engaged in the teaching of and research in Public Administration will be referred to as 'Public Administrationists' and the practitioners of public administration as 'public administrators.'

64 Henry, *op.cit.* pp. 14-15

65 *Ibid*, p. 16

66 *Ibid*, p. 15

Comparative Public Administration

In the same way that the self-confidence of the prewar Public Administrationists about the principles was shaken by their experience in practical administration during the late thirties and the forties; the self-confidence of American Public Administrationists about the efficacy of their principles and techniques seems to have been shattered by the experience of some of them in developing countries under technical assistance programmes. Whether this loss of confidence was necessary or not is a matter that needs to be argued separately, but the fact remains that it did, and in the process, gave rise to an important development in the study of Public Administration.

The major reason for this development was the doubts about the usefulness of principles and techniques, developed and refined in an industrial society, to the administrative needs of newly emerging states. These doubts began to be expressed after the Second World War in John M. Gaus' "Ecology of Government" (1974) and in Dwight Waldo's *Administrative State* (1948), but they were made more explicit in Robert Dahl's essay: "The Science of Public Administration; Three Problems" (1947). His argument was that principles derived from one environment cannot be applied to another, that without profound studies of administrative systems of various social systems no universal principles can be derived and therefore the study of Public Administration should be broad-based going beyond a narrowly defined knowledge of techniques and processes to varying historical, sociological, economic, and other conditioning factors peculiar to each country⁶⁸. Dunsire comments that "scores of American professors become personally aware of a whole universe of ways in which the universal principles did not fit which were almost totally useless."⁶⁹ What had been ignored in the 'export' of tools of public administration, according to another scholar, was that tools and working of those tools presupposed a context and a set of assumptions about certain basic values (ideology) which were embedded in them and which were lacking in developing countries.⁷⁰

A second reason for the rise of comparative administration may be that it was necessary to fill the inadequacies of the 'new administrative science' of the fifties which was mainly concerned with Organization Theory and its behavioural approach which was based on the assumptions of a highly developed industrial society; which then were irrelevant to the developing societies.

67 Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.* p. 45

68 Dunsire, *op.cit.* p. 135

69 *Ibid*, p. 136

70 Siffin. William J., "Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries" in *Public Administration Review*, vol. 36, no. 1 (January/February, 1976) p. 62

Even if the American Public Administrationists were aware of these shortcomings, they were helpless until the publication of Fred Riggs' essay "Agraria and Industria."⁷¹ Which provided a framework for the analysis of administrative systems in different types of societies.⁷² Fred Riggs in "Agraria and Industria" provided a breakthrough for comparative studies in a structural functional approach. The framework provided by him consisted of three types of society; Agraria (traditional, fused), Industria (industrial, refracted), and Transitia (transitional, prismatic), and corresponding to these three societies he provided sub-models of bureaucracies which were called 'chamber' 'office', and 'sala' models. The 'agraria' and 'industria' are ideal-types and most of the developing countries belong to the 'transitia' and would be anywhere on the range between the agraria and industria.⁷³

Not all comparative studies, however, are in the structural-functional approach or follow the Riggs' models. Some scholars use the post-Weberian bureaucratic approach, some use economic models (equilibrium or input-output or information-energy model), and yet others use organization theory, decision theory, administrative culture, policies and practices.⁷⁴ Although there are no universal principles, all would accept the 'ecological' assumptions.

The three major trends in comparative administration which Riggs has noted are: (a) a shift from normative to empirical approaches, (b) a shift from idiographic - unique cases - towards nomothetic approaches - generalized laws -, and (c) the ecological approach. The normative approach, according to Riggs, contains three 'mirrors' : (i) the mirror for Americans (ii) the mirror for others, and (iii) the mirror for all, which are represented respectively in the writings of (i) Wilson and Eaton, (ii) the early United Nations and United States Public Administration experts, and (iii) the United Nations *Handbook* of 1961. Apart from the idiographic and nomothetic approaches there is an intermediate approach called the 'classified data' approach as represented by the writings of such authors as Brian Chapman (in Britain). This intermediate approach itself has two sub-divisions: homological, which is the study of the different structures performing a constant function; and analogical, which is concerned with the study of function rather than the structure.⁷⁵ Fred Riggs who, according to Ferrel Heady, has contributed the largest amount of writing to the literature on comparative administration, has included his own works in the nomothetic approach.

71 In *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration*, William J. Siffin, (ed)

72 Dunsire, *op.cit.* p. 134

73 The model has been further refined, elaborated and published as *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company (1964)

74 Dunsire, *op.cit.* p,141; Richardson and Baldwin. *op. cit.* pp. 46-51

75 Heady, Ferrel and Sybil Stokes (eds) *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, Michigan, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan; Institute of Public Administration, (1962) p.2

Thus we find that comparative administration is concerned with cross-cultural studies of different administrative situations and systems which has helped to identify similarities and differences; the reasons for such differences and similarities; and with arriving at some generalized knowledge which in turn helps to go beyond the narrowly confined Public Administration of the United States. The rise of the comparative study of Public Administration has also contributed to the study in developing countries and understanding their specific problems in the given socio-economic conditions and the particular political and cultural context.

Development Administration

Comparative study of administration was encouraged by the 'development movement' and is largely concerned with theory-building and its practical perspective is sometimes considered to be 'development administration' which emerged also as a reaction to the system-maintenance context of conventional Public Administration and was inadequate to the needs of the developing countries whose priorities are those of socio-economic change and whose needs are for action-oriented and goal-oriented administrative systems.⁷⁶ This would seem to give the impression that while comparative administration is purely theoretical, development administration is completely practical. Although the former assumption is correct, the latter is not. The concept 'development administration' has several meanings which puts it both within the practical as well as the theoretical sphere. According to Weidner, "development administration in government refers to the processes of guiding an organization toward the achievement of progressive political, economic, and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another."⁷⁷ This refers to the administration of development policies and is concerned with the practical administrative activity. "As an academic area of enquiry, development administration is... an aspect of public administration that is centrally concerned with one of the many values men seek and which varies in the strength and kind of allegiance it commands country to country, group to group, and person to person."⁷⁸

The concern of development administration is with the administration of social, political, cultural, and economic development and in this it has also to be concerned with the modernization of the administrative system of backward countries and the use of modern techniques for the formulation and implementation of development plans, programmes, and projects.

76 Weidner, Edward W. "Development Administration: A New Focus for Research" in Heady and Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.98'

77 *Ibid*

78 *Ibid.* p.100

The heyday of development administration was in the sixties and early seventies. With the decline in technical assistance from the United States, the interest in this field seems to have waned in academic circles and has shifted to the much wider and all-embracing approaches to the study of Public Administration which are represented by the terms such as 'policy studies', 'public affairs' and 'policy sciences' which seem to subsume not only development administration but also mainstream Public Administration. These developments seem to have been encouraged by the realization that development administration or even Public Administration, as such, is an inadequate perspective to understand the problems of implementation of policies, unless policies themselves are 'implementable' and therefore needs greater attention to their formulation.

Public policy approach

Lessons of history and current needs seem to shift the focus of attention in the study of Public Administration to new grounds. American Public Administration was initially concerned with the improvement of *execution* of public policy and therefore was concerned with the search for principles and techniques of implementation. This was the main focus of the politics-administration dichotomy and 'principles of administration' days. In the process, it completely overlooked the need for improvements in the formulation of policies themselves. When it was realized that effectiveness of implementation of policy depends not only on the capacity of the administration, but also on the nature of policies themselves and therefore policy formulation also needed improvement, attention is now being increasingly paid to policy-formulation and the processes involved in this area. It would appear that the initial attention to this aspect was focussed by Herbert Simon who held the view that irrespective of whether one calls an activity politics or administration, what was involved was decision-making. To Simon, organization is a decision - making environment and administrative behaviour is a matter of decision-making within the organization setting.⁷⁹ Although Simon was not a follower of the Scientific Management Movement, just as to its followers, 'rationality' was a central concept to Simon as well, but he advanced the view that the 'administrative man' had to take decisions in imperfect conditions because of the constraints of time, circumstantial pressure, and the limitation of human capacity to take account of all alternatives and their consequences. So a 'satisficing' solution had to be found and because of organizational *givens* it was possible for the administrator to make decisions that were in conformity with 'organizational rationality'.⁸⁰ But even this 'limited rationality' view of *synoptic* decision-making was criticized by Charles

79 Dunsire, *op.cit* p.115

80 *Ibid.* p.117

Lindblom who maintained that what in fact happens is the making of remedial 'incremental' decisions adding to or changing existing policies. This type of decision-making is spread out in various agencies of government and there is no conscious coordination of these decisions. Lindblom called this 'dis-jointed incrementalism'. This in fact is either a call for or a representation of the free market-mechanism type of decision-making. A marriage between the synoptic and incremental model of decision-making is sought to be brought about by Amitai Etzioni in his 'mixed scanning' model of policy-making. "He suggests using incrementalist approaches to the preparation of important decisions, synoptic method for the decisions themselves, and incrementalism again for implementation and adjustment of detail."⁸¹

The mistakes made earlier in the politics-administration dichotomy days in relation to policies seems to have been realized and therefore policy perspective in gaining increasing importance. However, there seems to be a neglect of the implementation aspect in the Lindblom and Etzioni models. The total process of (a) policies of policy-making, (b) policy making, and (c) implementation and review, will be properly integrated in theoretical literature if simultaneous attention is paid by scholars to all these aspects. But in a situation where the latest fashions become the more rewarding fields for study and research, certain areas tend to get neglected. Thus in the new public policy approach, the implementation aspects and the techniques may have a tendency to fall by the wayside.

This tendency, however, seems to be remedied by the optimal model of policy-making advanced by Y. Dror in his *Public Policymaking Re-examined* (1968). In this model there are three stages: meta-policy-making, policy-making, and post-policy-making. The meta-policy-making phase is concerned with policies of policy making and identifying the values of society including the determination of the strategy of policy-making. The policy-making phase is concerned with the evaluation of a set of 'good' alternatives within the framework of the values of the society determined earlier and the choice of the 'best' alternatives. The third phase of the model consists of motivating the execution of the policy, executing the policy, evaluating policy-making after executing the policy, and communication and feedback channels inter-connecting all three phases and elements. This last phase is the implementation stage which under conventional definition would be considered administration. It is integrated with the earlier phases making the whole process a systemic one.⁸² This is an elaborate model which claims to neglect none of the elements of the total process, but the practicability of this model is yet to be tested in many countries of the world, especially in developing countries.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, p.126

⁸² Dror, Yezekiel, *Public Policy-making Re-examined*, San Francisco, Chandler Publishing Co. (1968) pp.163-164.

The 'New' Public Administration

A development in the academic field of Public Administration that had its perspective expressed in a conference held in 1968 sponsored by Dwight Waldo at the instance of 'young Public Administrationists' of the time was what has been called 'The New Public Administration' which is concerned with the internal and external ethics of public administration. It would appear that this group of Public Administrationists were dissatisfied with the mainstream Public Administration's concern with such phenomena as "efficiency, effectiveness, budgeting and administrative techniques" and were concerned with normative theory and raises questions concerned with "values, ethics, the development of the individual member in the organization, the relation of the client to the bureaucracy and the broad problems of urbanism, technology and violence."⁸³ According to Frederickson, the background to the rise of this trend is as follows:

New public administration emerged in the late (1960s) and early 1970s as a response to several stimuli, most notably the Vietnam War, continuing racial unrest, continuing dissatisfaction with the intellectual basis of public administration, and the general shift going on in the social science disciplines."

The key work in this focus is the volume entitled "*The New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*" (1971) edited by Frank Marini. Other works that are generally identified with 'The New Public Administration' are Frank Marini's *Toward a New Public Administration* (1971) and Dwight Waldo's *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* (1971). Frederickson who identifies himself with this school says that there is no 'new public administration', but an array of new developments in the social sciences applicable to public problems and says "new public administration proceeds logically from the aggregation of new knowledge in the social sciences and the focussing of these sciences on public problems." However, in a rejoinder to Frederickson, Gary L. Wamsley says that Frederickson has overlooked the significant developments and that there are some identifiable elements that have emerged. They include a critical tone towards pluralist democracy and a concern for social equity; advocacy of widespread participation and sensitivity to clients and employees; concern for values and norms over processes; questioning the validity of electoral interest group democracy; and raising serious issues of responsiveness and responsibility; concern for organizational viability through non-bureaucratic forms; subordination of the positive state to normative values; and a "concern for the relationship between knowledge and action and critical outlook toward logical positivism and empiricism." This view seems to be supported by the following statement by Richardson and Baldwin:

83 Henry, *op.cit.* p.28

84 Frederickson, *op.cit.* p.150

85 *Ibid*

86 Wamsley, *op.cit.* pp.386-387

“The charges include the misuse of authority and the dysfunctional impact of the authority structure itself, the undue emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness, the emphasis on rationality to the exclusion of other human characteristics, organizational and bureaucratic tendencies to regain the status quo, the trust placed in theoretically value-free professionalism improper goal setting to accommodate the politically powerful at the expense of those who lack political and economic resources, the absence of participation by employees and client groups in decision-making and goal setting, the elitism of the merit system in personnel administration, the morality of organizations and the dehumanizing impact bureaucratic organizations have on workers and client groups, to name some.”⁸⁷

Wamsley, however, sees that those associated with ‘The New Public Administration’ equate all social science with extreme logical positivism which is the weakness in the approach. But the new approaches in social sciences have taken on values which are absent in logical positivism and empiricism.⁸⁸

Although mainstream Public Administrationists may not be prepared or willing to assess the impact of this new trend, it seems to have given the impetus for many Public Administrationists to be concerned with ethical behaviour and even talk of public affairs as a wider field of study subsuming public administration and public interest and the related moral issues. Nicholas Henry’s *Public Administration and Public Affairs* (1975), he says, is aimed at defining this new perspective, and this will perhaps be a complementary development to the other major line of development into the policy sciences.

The postwar developments have taken various paths from the time of the beginning of identity crisis. The search for new paradigms has resulted in the shift of the study to a behavioural direction both under political science and administrative science approaches, but the shortcomings of those two approaches seem to have compelled the emergence of the sub-streams of comparative administration, development administration and new public administration, which are, in the late seventies, directing the study into the parallel developments of a policy science and public affairs focus. In spite of all these developments, many scholars believe that Public Administration as an academic discipline in its own right has not found its identity so far although it is possible to indicate a subject matter and programmes of Public Administration education. It is this lack of independent identity that has led some scholars to suggest a “professional approach or perspective” borrowing from all other social sciences in the same way that medicine is considered a profession although it has no separate discipline of its own except to draw from other physical and biological sciences.”⁸⁹

87 Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.*, p.185

88 Wamsley, *op.cit.*, pp.390.391

89 Waldo, Dwight, “Scope of the Theory of Public Administration” in James C.Charlesworth (ed), *op.cit.*, p.24

Perspectives on the study of Public Administration

Using the various approaches that different scholars have taken, over time, in their contributions to the study of Public Administration Richardson and Baldwin have advanced "seven fruitful perspectives or frames of reference" for a fuller understanding of the nature of Public Administration. These perspectives are not merely alternatives but are complementary and "help avoid becoming shackled to a narrow and dogmatic conception of public administration", and "while no single perspective is sufficient, a perspective or better still, a combination of perspectives, is necessary in the pursuit of wisdom."⁹⁰ The seven perspectives are: historical, legal, management - process, behavioural, political, comparative, and ecological. These approaches to the study of Public Administration allow for a fuller understanding of the nature and scope of Public Administration and therefore it is useful to examine the nature of these perspectives.

Historical perspective

The historical perspective helps us to understand how we arrived at where we are and thus get out of the 'ostrich-like' concern with only the current problems. Public Administration has existed for thousands of years under great civilizations of various countries and ages and the present is a stage in the historical stream. Even if one does not go into the history of other countries to search for their administrative practices and systems, one has to look at the administrative history of one's own country and also at that of the country (or countries) from which one borrows principles, techniques and practices, to get an understanding of the context in which those principles and practices have developed which, in turn, would enable one to adapt them to suit one's needs. Perusal of history is searching the memory and "without memory we operate in the dark, repeating errors of the past."⁹¹ In fact all the other perspectives are in a sense subsumed in the historical perspective since they have arisen in the process of historical development of the study of Public Administration, which means that even if we are concerned only with some other perspective, that itself has its historical development, and when they are taken together the total historical evolution of the study comes out and their interconnections become clear.

Legal perspective

Public administration is concerned with law at every stage of its operations. It has to work within the constitutional and statutory norms of the society (or decrees of even unconstitutional governments) and those norms have to be

⁹⁰ Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.* pp.9-10

⁹¹ *Ibid*, p. 11

particularized and applied through rules and regulations within a legal framework. Some hold the view that the roots of public administration are in law and "view public administration as the systematic execution of public law. Law is the beginning of public administration... Public administration as the expression of law is the means toward the objectives sought through the instrumentality of law. It would be unrealistic to build the discipline on on any other foundation.⁹²" Law can never be separated from the practice of public administration and therefore if theory is based on practice, the connection is obvious. This is perhaps a basic reason why administrative law is predominant in Continental Public Administration; although administrative law is only one aspect of either public administration or law. In the contemporary administrative state, where public officials exercise a great deal of discretion, the legal norms within which this has to be exercised assumes immense significance. When we remember that public administration consists of a complex body of legal norms, rights, obligations, and standards, of performance, that are expected to be observed by government officials- the importance of the legal perspective in the study of Public Administration is evident.

Management - process perspective

The classical conception of public administration during its politics-administration dichotomy and principles of administration days seems to have been synonymous with management and was concerned with work tasks, the search for general principles or criteria of efficiency and the mechanistic model of organization and it was this conception that prompted Luther Gullick to coin the acronym POSDCORB to represent the ideas and practices of management. The Scientific Management Movement strengthened the management-process perspective. Although the 'principles' as such have been discredited by later scholars, the influence of the management-process school and its utility for practitioners of administration seem to persist. The management-process perspective is concerned with the model of work tasks and problems of bureaucrats, technical work processes, bureaucratic rules and regulations and tangible technology, with work and action.⁹³ And it was these techniques and technologies that American Public Administrationists took with them on their missions of technical assistance when they introduced personnel administration, budgetary and financial administration, information technology, and sophisticated techniques of administrative planning and scheduling.⁹⁴ The focus of the model was not on *public* but rather on *administration* and was less concerned with the political, moral, ethical,

92 *Ibid*

93 *Ibid*, p.16

94 Siffin, *op.cit.*, p.2

and ideological nature of administrative work in government, and its highly empirical nature was hostile to philosophical speculation.⁹⁵ These tools and techniques are still useful for the internal working of administrative organizations, even though one should not be overwhelmed by them to the exclusion of other needs for effectiveness of administration.

Behavioural perspective

The behavioural perspective which pervaded the study of Public Administration after World War Two had its beginnings in the early human relations school which was a reaction to the mechanistic Scientific Management Movement, but the post-war developments were the result of the concern of the scholars with increasing bureaucratization, inadequacy of conventional Public Administration to guide action during the war and its aftermath. the explosion of knowledge in various social sciences, and the development of cybernetics and computer science which provided powerful new research instruments for behavioural sciences. "The behavioural perspective in public administration was, therefore, both a response to changes in the world as well as a challenge to established thinking and practice within public administration⁹⁶ and the momentum for this upsurge was given by Herbert Simon's attack on the 'principles school' and his work on administrative behaviour.⁹⁷ This perspective is contra history, contra law and contra management-process, because of its concern with current issues, making a distinction between ethical evaluation and empirical explanation of people interacting in organizational settings.⁹⁸

Perspective of politics

Whether one considers the close connection Public Administration has with political science as a discipline or the nature of the work of public administration, one cannot fail to recognize its deep involvement with politics, in spite of the attempts of early Public Administrationists to make a separation between the two and treat public administration as a neutral and passive tool of politics. Homer Durham asserts that the "discipline of public administration, in or out of a professional school, is a subdiscipline of political science. Unless public administration is viewed as a discipline of importance as a body of phenomena, relating to governmental administration, to political theory, to the problems of man, state, government, and politics, then I think that we have cut loose from our moorings."⁹⁹

95 Richardson and Baldwin, *op. cit.* p. 17

96 *Ibid*, p. 18

97 Herbert Simon's argument is presented in his *Administrative Behaviour*, New York, The Free Press, (1965)

98 Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.* p. 20

99 Durham. *op.cit.* pp. 245-246

Conflict resolution internally and externally, is said to be one of the major concerns of a public administrator and this has been defined as politics by Lowell.¹⁰⁰ Wide ranging activities of governments automatically bring public administrators into the political sphere where it has to be concerned not only with conflict resolution but also with distributive justice and maintenance as well, which are all in the realm of politics. According to Riggs, the authoritative prescription of norms at each level of the hierarchy in a bureaucracy as premises of action for each lower level is a political function,¹⁰¹ and therefore public administration is immersed in politics. In developing countries, also according to Riggs, "the public bureaucracies are deeply and unavoidably involved in politics at every level, and it makes no sense to analyse public administration except in a political context, nor does it make sense to study politics there except in an administrative context. These are two aspects of a single phenomenon."¹⁰² More than any other perspective, therefore, this is crucial to the understanding of and action in public administration.

Ecological perspective

Dissatisfaction with the narrow management-process perspective of Public Administration gave rise, after World War Two, to several other perspectives by which Public Administration was sought to be defined or redefined. We have already noted the rise of the behavioural perspective and reemergence of the perspective of politics. Another perspective which is theoretically associated with the latter, but much wider in scope, is the ecological approach which focuses attention "on the interactive relationships between the individual, human institutions and the physical and social environment"¹⁰³ John M. Gaus' environmental factors which he termed "the raw materials of politics: people, area, social structure, technology, ideology, and catastrophe" and Chester I. Barnard's view of administrative organization in systemic terms is said to have provided the impetus for the development of the ecological perspective. While the environment is a constraint on administration, the latter affects the environment, which means that there are transactions between the two. It is the environment that provides administration with the perception of problems to be solved, the alternative choices to be made, resources to be employed and support or opposition to the policies and programmes while the clients, markets, and interests are to be found in the environment which also feels the impact of public administration. "When one approaches

100 Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.*, p.20

101 Riggs, Fred W. "Professionalism, Political Science, and the Scope of Public Administration in James C. Charlesworth (ed) *op. cit.*, pp.32-62

102 *Ibid*, pp.250-251

103 Richardson and Baldwin, *op.cit.* p.28

public administration through the perspective of ecology one's attention is directed to change rather than to stability, to macro- and micro-analytical relationships and to the product, output and consequences of public administration rather than the instruments, means, and methods"¹⁰⁴.

The environment consists of many aspects which are specifically physical, economic, political, social, psychological, and ideological. This is the complex world of public administration which in a way brings the interdisciplinary nature of the study to light: but one has to isolate the significant ecological factors in order not to diffuse attention too widely and although this perspective contains a highly theoretical quality as to render it impracticable, its neglect can lead to an 'ecological crisis' resulting in the viability of public administration and its agencies being endangered by the failure of the bureaucracy to respond to the changes in the environment and by the bureaucracy attempting imprudent changes causing disruptive or irreversible changes in the environments.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, the student of Public Administration cannot now neglect this perspective and this is in a way as wide perspective as the historical approach; the difference between the two being that while the historical perspective provides the background of the past the ecological perspective provides the focus on the present and the two are therefore complementary. The ecological perspective is also systemic in its approach.

Comparative perspective

The development of the comparative study of public administration was another outcome of the post-World War II challenge to the conventional theory of Public Administration as reflected in the Scientific Management Movement and the mechanistic model of organizations. More than a challenge to the prewar assumptions, it was also a development that was necessitated by the inadequacies of American Public Administration 'exported' to developing countries. Also, comparative studies were called for in the United States-internally, i.e. the comparison of administration at national, subnational, and local levels. "It emerged as an after-thought and as an attempted remedy"¹⁰⁶.

The comparative perspective is a mode of analysis and is much more than the listing of similarities and differences but attempts to understand the reasons for such similarities and differences for which an explanatory frame of reference is necessary. Comparative perspective involves also the use of abstract concepts and is largely concerned with theoretical exercises, and in fact one can consider this perspective and the ecological perspective inseparable except for analytical purposes.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* p.24

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* p.25

¹⁰⁶ van Nieuwenhuijze, *op.cit.* p.29

These seven perspectives throw light on different facets of reality but are not mutually exclusive or sharply compartmentalized. For instance, both ecological and comparative perspectives are concerned with significant cultural and environmental conditions. The management-process and behavioural perspectives were both reactions to the legalistic and formalistic character of early Public Administration and both tend towards a 'generic' administration rather than public administration as such. Both behavioural and political perspectives are concerned with conflict in human relations, albeit at different levels and areas. However, each perspective helps to complement and bring out aspects that are overlooked by other perspectives.

An additional perspective

It would appear that Richardson and Baldwin have not mentioned other perspectives which have emerged in the field of Public Administration, namely, development administration, public policy (or policy science), and public affairs perspectives: nor is there any indication as to which other perspective or perspectives that they have delineated, subsume these developments. Assuming that development administration is not a distinct perspective but can be integrated into comparative administration, and that public affairs is not yet a clearly defined paradigm although its roots can be found in the 'New Public Administration Movement', on the one hand, or subsumed under the public policy perspective on the other; we are still left with the public policy perspective which can neither be subsumed under any other approach, nor (can it) be left out as yet another obscure concept. In fact, this approach is very much there and a great deal of progress has been made in its theoretical area, so that it is as broad a perspective as the ecological perspective embracing not only policy and administration (the conventional dichotomy) but also the environment of policy-making.

Therefore, in addition to the seven approaches mentioned by Richardson and Baldwin, it is necessary to add the policy sciences approach as well. We would then have eight perspectives from which to approach the study of Public Administration.

Conclusion

In this paper an attempt has been made to trace some major trends in the evolution of the study of public administration over the last one hundred years. The focus has been on the developments in Europe, United Kingdom and the United States of America. The survey of literature on the subject indicates that the study of public administration has passed through several distinct stages and taken several different approaches. It has also shown that the study could be approached from several different perspectives. In spite (or because) of this it is also evident that it is very difficult to identify a single coherent body of knowledge called Public Administration. What becomes clear is that Public Administration is an interdisciplinary 'science' which has to draw from several disciplines in the social sciences.