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Abstract:
To acknowledge how public administration theory is constructed, the relationship between theory and research has to be addressed. This relationship is reciprocal because theory is developed to interpret and explain scientific research and, on the other hand, scientific research is conducted to test theory. Thus, the role of research is to test these hypotheses in order to refute or confirm them or to gather data, then build theory from the ground up. Scientific attempts aim to expand our understanding and knowledge about a particular situation which in turn leads to facilitating prediction and then controlling behavior (Miner, 2005).

Public administration theory is not far from the previous perspective which is about the relationship between theory and scientific research. However, it has to be said that public administration is a unique discipline since it is affected by other disciplines such as political science, business administration and social science. Therefore, the evolution of the field of public administration is intertwined with not only the evolution of public administration research but also social, management and organizational research. Denhardet (2008) points out that public administration has been viewed as a part of governmental process and that makes a theory of public organization related to studies in political science. He also states that public organizations have been considered as similar to their counterparts, private organizations and, accordingly, the public organizational theory is mostly influenced by theory of organization.
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Public administration theory and organization Theory:

1) Traditional (Old) Public Administration Approach:

It is true that the beginning of public administration theory was embedded into political pointof views. As Denhardet states, even before public administration was being studied formally, many theorists theorized about the role of administrative agencies according particularly to Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian viewpoints. Explicitly, Hamilton supports the unity of commands and tends toward a national executive while the Jeffersonian administrative theory goes on to support decentralization and generate the power to local government(Kettl, 2002 ). At the beginning of the 20th century, theorists wrote about the role of executive branches and how they might be a tool to implement public policy or it has to be businesslike. Woodrow Wilson’s essay, The Study of Administration, is considered a resounding call for a higher level of inquiry in studying the relationship of governance and American life (Stillman,2005). This perspective, given by Wilson in 1887, was the flame for a long debate regarding the tension between politics and public administration. In his point of view, public agencies have to be separated from politics and staple administrative principles will allow public agencies to operate efficiently (Fry,2008). Even though many theorists, such as Goodnow and Willoughby contribute to this new perspective “politics-administration dichotomy”, their efforts were not as rigid as many others. However, Willoughby’s 1927 text, Principles of Public Administration, turns attention to the study of public administration as only an operational branch. Even though his implication implicitly confirms the dichotomy perspective, his opinion limits the study of public administration to be in an institutional term (Denhardet, 2008).
Thus, public administration theory became mostly influenced by the evolution of organizational theory. In organizational theory, knowledge is created to develop understanding of organizational structures and personal interactions for precise prediction and control. Furthermore, organizational theories are mostly developed to secure efficiency as well as obedience and compliance of organizational members. Even though there are many organizational theories which are classified in different categories, such as classical, neoclassical, and human relation, they share the same purpose: providing better understanding and meaningful explanation to enhance productivity and efficiency (Latham, 2007). This point will be elaborated clearly by tracing the evolution of different research and tendencies in the organizational theories, beginning with Max Weber.

Max Weber is well known as one of the principal designers of most modern social science and his contributions have generated new academic disciplines. Public administration is not the only discipline that was, and even still is, influenced by him; his theories also played a large role in sociology, political science as well as religious studies (Fry, 2008). The “rationalization thesis” is one of Weber’s most famous contributions. Simply put, Weber thinks that all manifestations of human life and interactions depend on rationalizations. Rationalization, from his perspective, is a historical drive that makes someone able, in principle, to control all things by calculation (Beetham, 1989). He also links rationalization with domination as a way to maintain rational society. Domination, for Weber, has two forms: one is based on constellation of interests, which mostly exists in religious and economic associations, and the second one is based on authority (Fry, 2008).

Speaking of authority, according to Weber, societies are developed according to three types of authority which are traditional, charismatic and legal-rational authority. The legal-rational type of authority represents the foundation of Weber’s concept of bureaucracy as well as the basis of his perspective about modern civilization, a belief founded in the legitimacy of those who are in the top of a hierarchal system to issue commands (Beetham, 1989). Weber defines bureaucracy as the dominant organizational form that is generated because of the complexity of administrative tasks (Fry, 2008). He lists key features of the ideal type of bureaucracy as: having an hierarchal order; dividing labor; creating written documents; possessing trained staff and experts; appointing officials on the basis of their professional qualification; and controlling the work environment with impersonal rules (Hummel, 1998; Fry, 2008).

Fry (2008) states Weber’s bureaucracy is a tool that generates the most rational and efficient organizational forms. He sees it as rational because it constitutes control based on knowledge as well as clearly defined aspects of competence and operation based on intellectual rules and calculability. Moreover, he goes on to say that bureaucracy is efficient because it provides accuracy, speed, stability and unity in addition to the fact that it minimizes personal and material costs.

There is no doubt that each organization, either public or private, seeks efficiency. The contribution of the scientific management schools established by Fredrick Taylor has undeniably influenced not only private organizations and industries, but also public organizations. Frederick Taylor recognized absolute efficiency as “the one best way”. Scientific management evolved within the evolution of management in the beginning of the 19th century. He focuses on how to eliminate waste in the work process and managerial procedures. Taylor emphasizes the importance of developmental plans to eliminate this waste and the implementation of those plans. Such plans require administrative hierarchies, technocratic direction for traditional authority for craftsmen, and foremen as well as supervisors. Put simply, Taylor believes efficiency will not be completely gained unless there is control over labor, materials and production labor (Bruce, 1995).

There are many scholars who write about Taylor and his followers which enrich the management canon. Nilson (1992) states that the extraordinary amount of books and essays that have been written since the 1950s have focused on Frederick Taylor, implying that his influence is still alive and did not end with his death in 1915. Fry (2008) points out that the impact of the scientific management school goes beyond managers in the
private sector and engineers in industries to attract many in government who believe its techniques will provide greater efficiency. Schachter (1989) clarifies the previous concept when he states:

“His scientific Management is typically represented as managers getting the most out of workers by telling them how to do things the one best, “scientific” way and the workers doing it in obedience to management’s money authority. This is what one learns from modern public administration textbooks” (p.175).

If Max Weber and Frederick Taylor indirectly impacted the field of public administration, since Max Weber is a German social scholar and Frederic and Taylor was an engineer, the writing of Luther H. Gulick directly impacted the field of public administration. He had practical and academic experience in public administration since he had many positions as a public administrator and wrote many articles that enrich the literature of public administration. His writing is a reflection of what he was facing as changes happened between 1920 and 1990 (fry, 2008). The Paper on the Science of Administration, written in 1937, is the main theoretical contribution that Luther Gulick provides to the public administration field. He generates the definition of executive functions known by the acronym “PODSCORB” which the letters refer respectively to planning, organizing, directing, staffing, coordination, observation and budget. It should also be noted that Guliek’s contributions emerged after World War II and gave government managers a systematic approach to managing crises. Further, his contribution is considered important because it started to pull together the intellectual material for the study of public administration and demonstrates common perspectives from different academics (McConkieand & Boss, 2007).

However, Mary Paker Follet puts her finger on the shortcomings of previous classical schools that focus on production, instructions and individuals and ignore the role of groups and human interaction. She is recognized for her contribution to management theory, particularly in conflict management, group process and her pragmatic law of the situation. She developed the idea of "reciprocal relationships" to understand human relationships and interactions and she raises the importance of the principle of integration and sharing power as a way to enhance efficiency. Unfortunately, public administration and business have not taken advantages from the whole body of her work seriously (Morse,2006; Stivers, 2006).

As seen, the contribution of Follet is the beginning of a deviation from the classical view of organization. Her view is supported by the work of Elton Mayo at Western Electric's Hawthorne Plant, that has opened the door for the Human Relations Movement. Sarachek (1962) points out that there are two assumptions that Mayo makes based on his vision of the world on : 1) most men are intrinsically encouraged to seek some basis for social productive cooperation ; and 2) reasonable alterations in the workplace environment can increase individual satisfaction and foster more productivity either between individuals or between groups.

Chester Barnard agrees with what Follet and Mayo came up with, as seen in his theory of system of exchange. Gabor & Mahoney (2010) state that Barnard is well known as the author of the most influential books on management and leadership in the 20th century, The Functions of the Executive. According to them, Barnard offers a systems approach to the study of organization depending on his personal experience since he was working as a senior executive of ATT in the 1920s and 1930s. He stresses the role of the manager as both a professional and as a factor within many interdependent factors affecting the organization. Further, he sees authority as cumulative rising from below instead of emanating from the peak of the organization. Moreover, Barnard sensed that any organization faces the challenge of balancing both the technological and human dimensions of organization. In doing so, both formal and informal organizations have to be developed to communicate organizational goals effectively (Fry,2208; Gabor & Mahoney,2010). More importantly, Barnard discourages relying only on incentive orders to win cooperative behavior and urges executives to understand dialectical nature and facilitates synthesis to reconcile conflicting forces (Denhardet, 2008).
According to Denhardet (2008), Hawthorne’s experiments and the work of Barnard have shifted the interpretation of the efficiency of organizations as formal structures of authority to the behavior of workers and securing their cooperation as the main challenge facing the organization. Hence, the Human Relation movement has been developed through many recognized figures studying how organizations manage and interact with employees to improve organizational effectiveness. In this new shift, many studies hold both psychological satisfaction and social environment as main factors impacting productivity of the organization. As mentioned previously, it is assumed that people are motivated by themselves to work to fulfill their needs.

Accordingly, in 1943, Abraham Maslow thinks that human motives emerge according to a hierarchy of five needs: Psychological needs, safety/security, social or affiliation, achievement and esteem, and self-actualization needs. Maslow assumes that individuals cannot fulfill their top needs unless their low needs are satisfied. In other words, Maslow claims that once biological and safety needs as well as affiliation needs are satisfied, recognition and self-esteem can be fulfilled. In his view, satisfaction of bottom level needs and a desire to fulfill higher needs motivate an individual to do his/her best (Latham, 2007).

Speaking of job satisfaction, Herzberg distinguishes job satisfaction from job dissatisfaction. Accordingly, he identifies two groups of factors. He claims that factors that lead to job satisfaction are different from those that generate job dissatisfaction. Furthermore, this theory assumes that hygiene factors might avoid employees from being dissatisfied but it does not mean they might be satisfied, whereby intrinsic motivators might generate job satisfaction. Consequently, Herzberg sees factors generating job satisfaction as verbal recognition, achievement or even the challenges of work itself. Additionally, he emphasizes the importance of providing appropriate salary, supervision, job security, salary interpersonal relations to minimize dissatisfaction (Riley, 2005).

Chris Argyris’ early research raises the importance of considering the interaction between individuals and their organization. In his perspective, workers are treated differently according to their maturity. Explicitly, Argyris believes that adults or mature workers desire additional responsibilities and participation in decisions. He emphasizes a crucial point that most organizational problems emerge from implementing outdated practices with mature employees. His view provides a healthy approach for both management and individuals to facilitate growth and development and more interaction between individuals and their organization’s demands (Jensen & Markussen, 2007; Denhardet, 2008). His theory of organizational learning and organizational change emphasizes the role of leaders and interventionists in reconciling the organization’s demands with employees’ abilities in different situations. Further, he stresses learning about self and others as an effective way to facilitate organizational growth and producing knowledge to cope with modern life complexity. (Fulmer & Keys, 1998).

Notably, Argyris’s work highlights the importance of how individuals think and interact can impact the efficiency of their organization. Interestingly, this is also what cognitive theory partly assumes and impacts the tendency of organizational theory to present. The theory builds on recognizing human behavior as interaction of three factors: personal, behavior and the environment. In that sense, the interaction between the person and behavior reflects the connection between what a person holds as thoughts and beliefs and his or her actions. The interaction between the person and the environment refers to the interaction among social influences and structures and human beliefs in a particular environment. The third interaction means that the behavior can be modified by the environment as well as an impact on the environment. Therefore, how the person interprets the situations according to his/her beliefs and values generates different behaviors. This perspective provides an explanation to why people have distinct interactions although they are in the same situation and conditions. It is claimed that foresights of goals motivate people to regulate and manage themselves to attain each goal effectively (Latham, 2008).
Accordingly, the expectancy theory, established by Vroom in 1964, is based on the assumption that a particular type of behavior is selected to maximize the reward of fulfillment or minimizes dissatisfaction. Consequently, the theory claims that employees’ beliefs and perceptions derive their efforts whether towards achievement or avoidance of specific outcomes. So, the more the rewards are associated with individuals’ expectations, the higher productivity they will provide (Wart, 2008). On the other hand, the Goal-Setting theory shares a similar assumption with expectancy theory but goes far to emphasize the role of feedback and self-efficacy. It claims that if individuals are exposed to clear goals, they will perform effectively. Also effectiveness will not be achieved unless these goals are not associated with self-efficacy, one's belief in his ability to achieve the goals. That leads to the importance of feedback regarding employees’ accomplishments in meeting their goals. Goal-setting theory generates many studies that support employees’ participation in setting goals as a crucial impulse to attain the goals. It has to be said that the degree of participation depend on the maturity of employees as well as the task (Latham, 2007; Wart, 2008). Latham (2007) goes beyond that to emphasize the concept that each individual comes from a different culture, holds different beliefs and thoughts, thus they are motivated differently.

If some theorists focus on organizational structures and others on workers in a closed system to enhance efficiency, open systems theorists see all the components of an organization are intertwined. Simply put, they view organizations as open and ongoing systems that interact with not only the internal environment but also the external environment. In that sense, organizations are dynamic and have to adapt to unexpected changes. Even though the concept of open system provides a big picture and explanation, it adds more complexity to organizational theory (Senge, 1990).

There is no doubt that theorists provide extraordinary studies revealing the quality of effective leaders. Wart (2008) indicates three stages of the development of leadership studies: trait theories; behavioral and contingency theories. Trait theories deriving from the concept of “charismatic authority”, emphasized by Max Weber, focus on how leaders are distinguished according to their traits. Created by Thomas Carlyle, the Great Man theory of leadership was a famous theory during the 19th-century. It is assumed that effective leaders are those gifted and born with desired characteristics as well as inspiration. However, failures in determining a set of traits for all effective leaders lead us to think about leadership behavior. Behavioral researchers study leadership behavior and they classify leadership behavior as: task-oriented, people-oriented and organizational oriented. According to their studies, it is difficult to determine which leaders are effective:--those who focus on productivity, workers or the organizational process. Accordingly, situational or contingency leadership theory exists to say different circumstances demand different type of leaders (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009; Wart 2008).

Additionally, many researchers pay attention to the role of leaders in constructing ethical behavior. Ethical theories on leadership assert that the actions of leaders and their personality as the most influential factor impacting followers and the entire organization to generate ethical jobs. Wart (2012) states that moral manager components in the transactional approach mean that ethical leaders support normative behavior and discourage unethical behavior by explicitly setting ethical standards. On the other hand, transformational leaders constantly act according to their ethical principles, such as integrity and caring about others, to influence employees to act ethically.

Interestingly enough, leadership and gender has been studied for a long time and scholars have different perspectives on this issue. Wart (2008) states that some thinkers believe female and male leaders are equally effective since they have more similarities than differences in the leadership behaviors. However, there are prejudices as well as stereotypes that lead to the fact that women are unfavorable to be selected as leaders. These prejudices and thoughts could be constructed historically since “the great man theory” of leadership asserts that good leaders possess masculine traits and tend toward aggressiveness and dominance. In that sense,
women are usually seen as social and participative leaders and men are usually task-orientated and dominant. Moreover, the same leadership style is frequently appraised more positively when related to a male than to a female.

Leadership in public administration has been studied by many scholars. For instance, Eugene Lewis (1984) studies common keys of successful public administrative leaders in his book *Public Entrepreneurship: Toward a Theory of Bureaucratic Political Power*. Additionally, Norma Riccucci (1995) goes on with Lewis and she identifies in her essay, "Executcrats," Politics, and Public Policy: What Are the Ingredients for Successful Performance in the Federal Government” four categories of skill that are essential for effective public administrative leaders. They include political: management and leadership; technical; and strategies skills. On the other hand, Denhardet and Denhardet (2006) emphasize the concept that leadership is an art more than being a science in their book *The Dance of Leadership: The Art of Leading in Business, Government, And Society*. They explore the art of leadership and how could be learned as most artists in the fields of music and dance. Some public administration scholars go beyond that to stress the importance of ethics in especially public organizations. The Cooper Active Process (1998) approach which is developed mainly for use by public administrators is one of many of contributions of public administration researchers to analyze ethical issues and guide public organizational leaders to overcome ethical problems they face.

In her 1990 essay “Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory”, Camilla Stivers turns attention to public administration from a feminist perspective. Stivers emphasizes the role of gender as an essential analytical tool to enhance our understanding of the field of public administration. In addition to questioning and arguing the idea of assigning leadership as a masculine aspect, she voices her disagreement about the concept of dominance of power generating from hieratical authority. She calls for less hierarchical and more interactive. Stivers states that the more appropriate way to address and solve complex challenges is by engaging in collaboration instead of compliance of a chain of command.

How decisions are made is a question that is also studied by many researchers. Public choice theory is one of the most popular classical rational theories. It depends on the assumption that people usually act rationally to maximize their utility or satisfaction by using modern economic tools to study problems and select the best alternative. McCool (1995) states that although public choice theory is a very accurate and applicable theory, it depends on mathematical method and simplicity in dealing with human behavior which debunk public choice theory. “There is not a perfect human guidance” is the concept raised by Herbert Simon. In his book *Administrative Behavior* published in 1947, Simon challenges the classical approach in making rational, economic and utility-maximizing decisions and he thinks that the ability of the human mind is far less than giving rational decisions for complex problems. Accordingly, administrators make satisfactory and sufficient decisions instead of rational ones (Riccucci, 2010; Denhardet & Denhardet, 2008). Further, in that sense, Simon develops the concept of the “administrative man” that contracts the “economic man” as a comparison between bounded rational behavior and rational behavior perceptually (Denhardet & Denhardet, 2008).

His idea of bounded rationality paves ways for other scholars to interpret how decisions are made. Incremental decision making is developed by Lindblom (1959) depending on Simon’s concept of bounded rationality and satisfactory behavior in making decisions. He points out that decision makers usually tend to enact policies and decisions that involve small changes in existing policies rather than generating new ones. In other words, they usually make incremental decisions to avoid the consequences of uncertainty from giving new decisions and also the standards of procedures of bureaucracies tend to keep the existing practices (Howlett, Ramesh, & Perl, 2009).

Talking about the evolution of research and its impact on the study of public administration leads to mentioning Herbert Simon again, not just for his contribution to decision making theory but also to the field of public administration, either theoretically or methodologically. As Fry (2008) indicates, Even though Simon’s
work reflects the behavioral perspectives and provides continuity and similarities of preceded authors such as Weber, Barnard and Follett, his arguments and debates with his predecessors and counterparts add to public administration theory. It is remarkable that even though he shares with other authors similar concepts, he also contradicts them in some points. For instance, Simon builds his perspectives on Barnard’s view regarding authority and zone of acceptance but Simon’s ideas about decisions process and the bounded rationality are signs of inconsistence (Riccucci, 2010).

In his book *Administrative Behavior published* in 1947, he believes that every decision contains not only factual components but also ethical (value) elements. In his viewpoint, factual aspects could be studied by implementing scientific principles but decisions contain values that need more than factual propositions (Simon, 1947). Further, Simon states that Public Administration ought not to be studied only from the perspective of scientific principles as it was common in other social sciences (Riccucci, 2010). As Riccucci (2010) states, Simon calls for a Facts/Value dichotomy which was a foundation for many debates such as those with Waldo and Dehl. For such instance, Dwight Waldo was dedicated to developing a normative theory of public administration and he thinks normative theory is the best way to reflect the primacy of values as well as politics in the real practical management and political world. Hence, Waldo regarded Simon's tendency as a threat to the fundamental purpose of the public administration theory building (Dubnick, 1999).

Parenthetically, after long debates with Waldo and Dahal, Simon raises the importance of developing a new paradigm for public administration that depends on two kinds of public research: pure and applied research. Explicitly, while some scholars are interested in developing "a pure science of administration" by using scientific principles, other scholars are concerned with applied science as a good way to conducting the meaning of the social context (Henry, 1975). Importantly enough, Simon emphasizes that both scholars have to work in harmony to complement each other in order to effectively build public administration theory (Simon, 2001).

Waldo classified organizational theory into three stages, the first one being the classical stage that presents the rational model of human behavior and can be seen in the work of Weber, Taylor and Gulick. Other stages include: the neoclassical stage that starts with Hawthorn experiments and the rise of the human relations movement; and the modern organization theory as the final stage that begins with Simon’s organizational definition that is based on the natural system and emphasizes organizational growth and change and also adopts the methods of hard science seeking objectivity (Fry, 2008; Waldo, 2007).

As we have seen from tracing the evolution of organizational theory, the main concern is how to increase efficiency. It could be said that from classical and rational theories to behavioral theories through environmental and system approaches, many public administration theorists are influenced by this evolution and they agreeably focus on public organizational efficiency through hieratical structures to maintain high control. However, as mentioned before, public administration is affected not only by management but also by social science, especially regarding the concept of what is the best way to conduct public administration studies. Subsequently, Riccucci (2010) states that topics or issues in public administration are studied in the basis of interpretive, empiricism, rationalism, positivism, post-positivism, postmodernism or critical theory, and they can be studied inductively or deductively, qualitatively or quantitatively, or both. So, the acquisition of knowledge in public administration is distinguished by the epistemic tradition, which drives the methods and recording techniques of the research.

Up to this point, it is clear that there are many attempts to develop public organization theory and public administration theory and each one or group of theorists deals with public administration and organization from different angles. Explicitly, they might deal with bureaucracy and organizational structures, making decisions, leadership, or subordinates’ motivation by using qualitative or quantitative or even both studies. More importantly, each concept has agreements and conflicts which, in Fry’s (2008) view, urges Waldo and other theorists to see public administration as a heterodoxy since it has diversity of perspectives and relies on different social science disciplines. Riccucci (2010) insists these conflicts and debates ceased consensuses in the field which leads to the lack of a paradigm.
2) New public Management Approach:

The evolution of the research influences the tendency of public administration and generates different public administration approaches. Explicitly, Waldo states that the classical approach of public administration is characterized by five aspects: politics-administration dichotomy; orientation to scientific management; search for administrative principles through scientific analysis; centralization of authority (Waldo, 2007). As Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009) state that from the 1910s to the 1940s, a domination of “scientific management” impacted the tendency of public administration to focus on input and its relation to output to determine the efficiency of the organization and also see efficient management as a set of scientific principles. In addition to the movement of scientific management, bureaucratic theory has mostly influenced the classical approach and supporters of this approach see a bureaucratic and hierarchal system as the best way to achieve particular values such as efficiency, effectiveness and economy and the positivist and experimental methods are the most reliable methods to conduct research. Additionally, POSDRB theory represents an objective and rational view of administration that fits perfectly in the Great Depression and World War II that requires massive government administration. These theories and other studies related to that era contribute in shaping what is called old public administration. Denhardet and Denhardet (2011) summarize the main points of old public administration as the following:

- Public administration has a limited role in policy making and governance and they are responsible for the implementation of public policies.
- Public administrators are accountable to elected officials for delivering public services and have limited discretion.
- Public programs are administered through a hierarchical system with strict control from the top of the organization.
- Efficiency and rationality are the primary values and could be achieved in a closed organization with limited citizen involvement.
- The role of public administrators is defined in POSDCRB principles

Stortz (2009) states that POSDCORB was viewed as insufficient for the needs of the time that characterized the evolution of research in different social science disciplines such as business, social, political, and economy. This post-war period (1940-1960) became well known as “social science heterodoxy” that impacted, as mentioned before, the public administration field and produced a variety of theories in different social science disciplines, debates and contradictions. In this era many public administration thinkers try to benefit from other disciplines to produce a science of public administration. As such a witness, in 1947, Robert Dahl stresses the values of behavioralism and scientific rigor to be included in the study of public administration. As Stortz points out, this evaluation turns public administration thinkers’ attention to focus on effectiveness and economy in addition to the efficiency.

The next era, in Stortz view, is the post modern era, that emerges after World War II between the 1960s-1980s, which is characterized by the tendency toward democratic idealism in public administration as well as rejection of old public administration approach, heterodoxy of research and a gap between practice and theory. In that area, many scholars felt the challenges facing public administration approach and gathered at the Minnowbrook Conference in late 1968 to present their perspectives which are published under the title Toward a new Public Administration. The new Public administration criticizes the old approach for its lack of a clear ideological and philosophical framework that supports the role of administrators in implementing social equity (Denhardet, 2008). So, Waldo and supporters of New Public Administration approach oppose the politics-administration dichotomy and call for cooperation between the policy and administration by encouraging public administration researchers to find effective ways to develop effective cooperation.

Accordingly, supporters of the New Public Administration urge public administration scholars and students to study public policy to prepare themselves to be policy makers. Additionally, they argue for a
positive social science and call for reforming positivism and adopting normative and phenomenological approach. And they think that the old public administration approach which mainly focuses on efficiency as a main value could ruin other essential values such as participation and social equity. While equity refers to a sense of justice in the distribution of social interests, the participation value refers to either participating citizens in the operation of the agency or involving lower-level organizational participants in organizational making decisions (Denhardet, 2008). It has to be said that the proponents of New Public Administration point out particular problems in the existing public administration approach and they do not provide solutions or alternative focus which leads to considering it as a false paradigm shift.

In this present era, the world becomes more complex with the tendency toward global economy and information technology (Stillman, 2005). Stillman notes that those changes lead to adopting nonhierarchical systems and public administration has to reevaluate its theoretical perspective. Thus, the globalized world necessitates present-day administrators to adapt to modern challenges and a flat world (Stortz, 2009). Kettl (2002) states that the existing state of public administration is extremely different from the era of Wilson and what he advocated for: strong hierarchical organizations and separating policy making from policy administration. Conversely, today’s public agencies are tightly intertwined and interdependent as well as they gradually rely on third-party partners.

These four movements: POSDCORB, post war, the post modern and the Flat-world, are the four main areas of public administrative thought that, after Wilson’s contribution, shape the public administration theory from a management perspective. More importantly, these eras are related to each other and each theory is built on the previous theory whether among criticism or including a new idea. Wilson calls for the study of public administration and focusing on the function of public agencies, scientific management and the POSDCORB raise the idea of the importance of rationality and efficiency to move toward interpersonal and complexity of theory in the Heterodoxy social science in the Post War era. While most of these theories focus on how to increase efficiency and effectiveness, the importance of raising democratic concepts to public administration has emerged since the 1960s in the Post Modern era. In the present day, the complexity of globalization and technology cultivates undeniable change in the public administration heritage by breeding new management sub-approaches. However, before talking about these emerged approaches, the following table reflects the evolution of public administration thoughts from managerial perspective from the managerial perspective.

Table I: The evolution of the study of public administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era of Public Administration</th>
<th>Characteristics of the Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Essay (1887)</td>
<td>Raise the importance of a study of public administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics-Administration dichotomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSDCORB (1920’s – 1940’s)</td>
<td>Focusing on rational process of administration to enhance efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific management influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-War (1940’s – 1960’s)</td>
<td>Evolution in different Social Science disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evolution in organizational humanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempts to benefit from the wealth of social science to produce a science of public administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing on economy, efficiency and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post- Modern (1960’s – 1980’s)

- Attention given to the democratic participation in government;
- Starting rejection of Old Public Administration Approach.
- New Public Administration movement.
- Gap between theory and practice.
- Critical theory, action theory.
- Calling for different methodology such as grounded theory and normative and phenomenological approach.

Post-modern- Present day( Flat World)

- Globalization and evolution of information technology.
- Increased complexity.
- New Public Management and New Public Service
- No best way to conduct public administration study and research.

After more than a decade of the emergence of The New Public Administration concepts, many scholars see the world of public managers is different from what it was a few decades ago and old public administration methods do not work efficiently in contemporary times. Feldman & Khademian (2001) go on to say that the present world of public administration is characterized by heterogeneous and global communications and complex partnerships between public and private organizations which demand flexibility instead of rigidity. In their view, despite the fact that bureaucracy is capable of more efficient organization that aims to coordinate the sophisticated actions of hundreds or thousands of people, strict control, centralized rules and systematic policy responses do not function very well in our contemporary generation. Additionally, they think the progressive paradigm of government organization was designed and affected by the industrial revolution and was embodied in large scale bureaucracy to enhance efficiency, responsiveness to law and policy. But, in their view, the information revolution in the late 20th century necessitates flexible organizations that can function effectively.

Thus, as Pfiffner (2004) states, in contemporary times a market system is the most noticeable alternative to bureaucracies but the bureaucratic system is unavoidable in order to maintain an organizations’ existence over time. Accordingly, the tendency toward decentralization within government does not mean ending bureaucracy as a main form of public organization but, instead, it requires assigning some functions to smaller or geographically separated bureaucracies. The opponents of old public administration see top-down controlling behavior of workers inhibits those closest to service delivery from responding quickly. So, they see decentralization delegation of discretion as a remedy for this deficiency. However, these critiques were the flame for the existence of New Public Management.

New Public Management supports decentralized administration, delegation of discretion, focusing on measures of performance and controlling outputs, contracting, and implementing the market mechanisms of competition and customer as a way to enhance performance (Bilhim & Neves, 2005; O’Flynn). Pfiffner (2004) points out that:

“It aims to achieve accountability through the measurement of outcomes rather than accounting for inputs. Performance measures will take the place of tight control from the top through rules and regulations. Granting more discretion to managers to manage is necessary; if they are to be held accountable for their performance, they must have the flexibility to use their judgment” (p.5).
The movement begins as a result of Osborne and Gaebler’s work, *Reinventing the government* (1992), and becomes relevant to Bill Clinton’s administration’s National Performance Review (NPR) that is determined to modernize Public Administration in America. The NPR supporters see that Public Administration should adopt two features: mission and increasing productivity. While satisfying the needs of the customers is its primary concern, focusing on results and objectives, not only rules and resources, is the best way to improve productivity. It has to be mentioned that the use of market mechanisms to improve performance in the public sector is the most dominant theme of the new techniques. This includes privatization, in which government formerly attaches some functions to private sector or business organizations (Bilhim & Neves, 2005; Pfiffner, 2004).

If New Public Administration has been considered as collective opinions from some thinkers pointing out what the problems are and left us with no solutions (Denhardt, 2008), new public management is different. The late approach provides new techniques or doctrines to be adopted to overcome deficiencies of Old Public Administration-- such as Hood’s (1991) work that presents how foreign countries, such as Australia and New Zealand, adopt new public management successfully. He clarifies that there are seven doctrines of new public management, but not all of them are equally presented or fully consistent in all cases. Those doctrines are: shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector; shift to greater competition in public sector; stress on private sector styles of management practice; stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use; ‘Hands-on professional management’ in the public sector; explicit standards and measures of performance; and greater emphasis on output controls (Hood, 1991, p. 4).

Denhardt & Denhardt (2000) turn our attention to the fact that the concept of the movement of The New Public Management is not new; it is related to a longstanding heritage in public administration that stress the idea that “government should be run like a business.” However, in their view, the New Public Management goes beyond advising public agencies to adopt new managerial techniques such as total quality management to see that government must also adopt particular business values such as cost-effectiveness and responsiveness to customers.

As classical public administration approach is influenced by many research and theories, also New Public Management movement is a product of a combination of theories and research. Interestingly, not only is the old public administration approach influenced by the scientific management movement, but the New Public Management is as well. Hood (1991) clarifies its impact in his words:

“This movement helped to generate a set of administrative reform doctrines based on the ideas of 'professional management' expertise as portable paramount over technical expertise, requiring high discretionary power to achieve results ('free to manage') and central and indispensable to better organizational performance, through the development of appropriate cultures and the active measurement and adjustment of organizational outputs” (p.6).

Wise (2002) points out that new managerial revolution associated with decentralized decision making is a result of extraordinary studies in behavioral theory during the 1950s and 1960s. Those studies emphasize the value of employee participation, interpersonal relations, and concern with employee needs. The reinventing government debate ideally proves that no "one best way" exists to organize the public sector. On the other hand, Bunier (1994) states that, for a long time, feminist theorists have called for the importance of a redefinition of government practices. As seen previously, the feminist perspective mostly reflects values of the New Public Management approach.

Theorists in institutional economics such as rational choice and the principal agent theories impact New Public Management techniques. The New Public Management technique is clearly related to the public choice movement that emphasized the concept that self-interest dominates all human behavior. Public choice sees the government as markets and customers and serves as a kind of intellectual framework for practical efforts to make government less costly (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000). Public choice theory assumes that if the public
sector monopolizes service delivery, it will generate inefficient outcome. Correspondingly, public choice encourages contracting out to elevate market pressures and then improve performance (Eagle, 2005; Hood, 1991).

On the other hand, principal-agent theory proposes that the agent possesses more informational expertise than the principal. Accordingly, it has been seen that the bureaucracy (principle) is incapable of being efficient in providing public services, and some of public organizational functions have to attach to other organizations (agents) who have more experience and knowledge (Eagle, 2005; Hood, 1991). Further, both public choice and principle agent theories impact new public management in terms of utility maximization, if organization is more efficient than another it leads to more competition and then one gradually replaces the other. In the shadow of property rights theory, “privatization, corporatization, contracting out and performance-related pay are all likely to increase the sense of ‘ownership’ staff have for the services and products their organizations generate” (Pollitt, 2002, p.11).

From political and social standpoints, citizenship and democracy are essential and both theories raise the importance of developing active and involved citizenship (Barber, 1984). Denhardet & Denhardet (2000), state that the perspective of public choice economics and the New Public Management are consistent with the current model of the relationship between state and citizens. In that sense, this relationship is based on the idea that government is established to make sure that citizens are able to make choices that are associated with “their self-interest by guaranteeing certain procedures (such as voting) and individual rights” (p.552). Denhardet & Denhardet (2000, 2011) provide an alternative view of democratic citizenship that demands citizens be more actively engaged in governance. In this view, citizens go beyond self-interest to consider the larger public interest and accordingly, citizens have to have a sense of belonging and concern for the entire society as well as a knowledge of public affairs. They assert that administrators should not see citizens as clients (old public administration, or customers (New Public Management); instead they have to see them as citizens. Administrators, in their view, must share authority and trust in the efficacy of collaboration. Moreover, in contrast to the previous public management approaches that look for greater efficiency, it is suggested that public managers have to seek more responsiveness and citizen trust. This perspective is the root of the New Public Service.

3) The New Public Service:
The New Public Services is not just influenced by theories of democracy and citizenship but also models of community and civil society in addition to postmodernism. According to Denhardet & Denhardet (2000), the idea of community has to be regenerated and the sense of the community as unity and synthesis has to be renewed and, accordingly, public administration, especially in local government, has to create and support “community”. Community is highlighted as the role of small groups in developing a civil society in which people reflect their interests in the context of community concerns. In that sense, dialogue and deliberation are essential to facilitate citizens’ engagement and building a democratic community.

Speaking of the tendency toward critical theory, and postmodernism, while there are considerable differences among the a variety of postmodern theorists, they mostly have the similar conclusion that governance has to be based on honest and open discourse whether among political parties or citizens and administrators. They see dialogue as an essential factor to revive the public bureaucracy and restore legitimacy to the field of public administration. The tendency toward postmodernism and critical and advocacy theory is associated with the tendency toward organizational humanism and refusing the old concept that treats individuals as machines with strict rules and predetermined structures (Denhardet & Denhardet, 2000).

The New public service emerges as a critique of what is written in the public administration literature and opposes many principles adopted in previous approaches. However, Denhardet & Denhardet provide The New public Service outlines in their series publications (2000; 2011) and Denhardet (2008). They state that this approach conflicts with the New Public Management in the concept of the relationship between the government
and citizens as costumers. Denhardt & Denhardt (2000, 2011) state that there is a dilemma in determining who the customer is in the public sector. They attribute this to the fact that government serves not just the immediate customers but also those who will be future recipients. Further, in the private sector, they provide the service only to those who demand it but that is not acceptable in the public sector; government has to provide the service fairly to all citizens either those who can express their demands or others. The New public service goes beyond to emphasize the importance of not responding to only short term interests of customers and treating people as citizens to promote the quality of public service to fit into public interest by building open deliberation. Also it has been said that government does not provide a product line as in the private sector, but rather it provides services within the constraint of laws and resources. In that shadow the first key of The New Public Services is shaped as Serve citizens rather than customers by adopting shared values and responsibilities through strategies of deliberation and discretion and building trust among citizens.

**Focusing on the public interest as a goal rather than the by-product** is another suggestion provided by the New Public Service. Denhardt & Denhardt emphasize the importance of the way the public interests is defined and they oppose how The New Public Management limits it to individuals’ interests or politically determined and expressed by law, as in the classical approach. They see public interest will not be achieved unless there is a collective concept of the public interest. Building a collective and shared notion requires also shared responsibilities. Moreover, in addition to public administrators having to facilitate building shared opinion, they also have to assure solutions that are expressed and associated with norms of justice and fairness in one hand, and consistent with public interests on the other hand.

Denhardt & Denhardt go on to advise public administrators to think strategically by setting plans and strategies to achieve shared vision and act democratically by adopting collaborative processes. A collective vision requires establishing roles as well as responsibilities and classifying specific action and strategies to achieve the desired goals. Once more, the concept here is not as what was common that merely to launch a vision and then let those in the government develop implementation; rather, it is to collaborate with all parties as one to carry out the program. This idea demands renewing the sense of civic responsibilities and developing civic leaders.

**Emphasizing the value of not just productivity but also the people is too being raised in this approach.** In that sense, people will be more motivated and successful if there is more participation and collaboration and shared leadership. The new public Service goes with The New Public Management in adopting a process of managing people to improve productivity such as performance measurement and reengineering. However, it contradicts the New Public Management in accepting the idea that rationality can only control the subordinates’ behavior. It states that even though these strategies may have success, they are far from improving the sense of engagement. Denhardt & Denhardt goes far to say if it is expected that the public will treat citizens with respect, they have to be treated with respect. Moreover public administrators are seen not as employees desiring security or prestigious jobs (The Old Public Administration) or participants as in The New Public Management; rather, they want to cultivate differences and happiness in others’ lives. Further, The New Public Services necessitates public managers to be collaborative and empower and support their subordinates to accomplish organizational goals and vision.

Also, the New Public Service advises public administrators to Value citizenship as well as public service to go beyond entrepreneurship. Denhardt & Denhardt see entrepreneurship as the way that creates a narrow view focusing on just maximizing productivity and customers’ satisfaction and the managers as entrepreneurs treat the public organization as their own business. Conversely supporters of The New Public service see government as it is owned by citizens and, consequently, administrators are responsible to serve citizens and to act as bodyguards of public resources, facilitators of public dialogue and street- level leaders. That demands new skills that public administrators have to possess such as the ability to manage meeting and conflicts and how to be connected to other sources of support and assistance to facilitate engaging citizens and the community in the process. Risk in the public sector is different from that in the private sector and adopted by The New Public Management. In the New Public Service, risks and opportunities can be seen within the framework of democratic citizenship and shared responsibility. Explicitly, the administrator has to consider
when the citizens engagement is going on and how his action can impact citizens in terms of the sense of shared responsibility, trust and collaboration.

Serve, rather than steer is another principle in this approach. Old Public Administration limits the role of government to rowing public services and implementing public policy but the New Public Management emerges to say “no”; the public agencies have to steer rather than row and public service can be provided by relying on a third party to deliver the services. However, the New public Services goes on to say that according to the complexity of the world we live in, the role of government should not be limited to direct actions or establish a set of rules and incentives. Rather, government has to play a new role that facilitates collaboration between elected officials and public managers and citizens.

The New public service views accountability as complicated; It is not limited to being market driven, as in New Public Management, or giving responsibility to an elected official by a hierarchal system, as is seen in the Old Public Administration, rather, it is multifaceted in which the administrator has to attend to laws, community values, professional standards and citizens. Denhardet & Denhardet state that both the old public administration and the New Public Management lean to simplify the issue, and thus accountability has to be readdressed. Explicitly, in the classical approach, public administrators were directly responsible to political officials. It went further to say that the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats is limited to the concept that the politicians make decisions and the bureaucrats have to implement them. On the other hand, in The New public Management, attention given to the importance of an entrepreneurial role in which the new public managers are accountable mainly in terms of results, efficiency, responsiveness and cost effectiveness. However, Denhardet & Denhardet (2000) express how The New Public Service sees accountability, in their words:

“In our view, such models do not reflect the demands and realities of public service today. Rather, public administrators are and should be influenced by and held accountable to complex constellations of institutions and standards, including the public interest, statutory and constitutional law, other agencies, other levels of government, the media, professional standards, community values and standards, situational factors, democratic norms, and of course, citizens”(p.556).

Further, they point out that public administrators affect and are affected by all values and norms and have to be competent of the complex governance system. The New Public Service demands Public Administrators, to be transparent and make citizens familiar with conflicts, laws and parameters to gain realistic solutions and build citizenship and accountability.

Denhardet and Denhardet (2002) states that alteration in the role of government through the three approaches is also associated with a shift in the role and responsibility of elected and appointed public officials. They attribute this to the fact that each managerial approach is a associated with one of theses standards: legal or political, economic or market, and democratic. Explicitly, Traditional Public Administration relies on the legal and political. In this view, public officials are involved in both designing and implementing policies. These policies mostly focus on limited objectives that are politically defined. So, they, the Classical functions, are related to political realities, bound by the laws and limited to providing public service through public agencies. In that sense, limiting administrative discretion and depending on neutral expertise to implement policies derived from elected political leaders answer the question of accountability in the public service.

Economic and market considerations is the foundation of the New Public Management in which the role of government is continuing to steer. This approach, as mentioned before, depends on creating mechanisms to achieve policies through not just public organizations but also private and non-profit agencies. Accordingly, this approach sees government as responsible for satisfying their "customers" and therefore adopts high responsiveness to their personal preferences in order to provide the services efficiently and effectively. The New Public Services views the role of government as focusing on democratic standards. This view suggests that the public interest is a consequence of a dialogue about overlapping interests. The approach to accountability in this view could be seen as multifaceted in which that public administrators should attend to not just law or political and professional standards, but also to community values and citizen interests.
Denhardt & Denhardt (2002) stress the concept that not just national, state, and local governments are engaged in developing and implementing policy but there are also thousands of citizens, other public agencies as well as private and non-profit organizations which leads to the importance of studying governance process as well. Fourie & Jordaan (2007) defines governance as:

“… the exercise of authority, direction and control of an organization to ensure its goals are achieved. It refers to who is in charge of what; who sets the direction and the parameters within which the direction is to be pursued; who makes decisions; who sets performance indicators, monitoring of progress and evaluates results; and, who is accountable to whom for what. Governance includes the structures, responsibilities and processes of the organization to direct and manage its future operations. Good governance portrays good management, good performance and good stewardship of public money” (p.25).

The issue of governance and accountability becomes a dilemma in contemporary public administration. Kettl (2002), states that devolution and globalization have forced the government to create new policies to manage its relationships with the developed system. The essential dilemma is that “theorists once built their views about government’s role on a foundation of national sovereignty, but the rise of globalization in its numerous forms has, as least, transformed the meaning of national sovereignty and, at most, substantially eroded it” (p. 118). On the other hand, devolution and globalization have increasingly accumulated into a fundamental transformation of governance and provide challenges to the American public administration theory and practice. Consequently, these transformations have altered the foundation of the four public administration traditions and have been seeking guidance and answers to the questions—“who governs and how?”

Once again, in the classical model of public administration, primary control lies in the laws that are enacted by the legislature. The Executive branch has to carry out the laws throughout strict hierarchies. Accordingly, accountability is achieved by the superior control on each level of implementation. Therefore, if a policy is not truly implemented, examining each level of the process will easily assign accountability to whom is at fault. Accountability and control are best implemented in this type of system (Pfiffner, 2004). Regarding this issue, many theorists in public administration write extraordinary articles to support or even default the concept. One of the popular debates that emerges in that era is the Finer and Friedrich debate. Finer (1941) believes accountability has two meanings: one of them is “X is accountable for Y to Z” and another one means that “an inward personal sense of moral obligation” (p.336). Finer thinks those two meaning of accountability could be applied separately and emphasizes the importance of bureaucrats being accountable to politicians. Friedrich, however, goes on to support professionalism and ethical responsibility as a way to ensure accountability.

However, if the hierarchal system is great in implementing accountability, many theorists think it is not in terms of efficiency. As a result, The New Public Management aims to alleviate the problems of hierarchical control by calling for more flexibility and discretion to those on the front-line. In terms of discretion, in Pfiffner’s (2004) view, they would have control on how to spend money as well as hiring and firing personnel. Moreover, if implementation of the program is contracted, the third party has its own decisions and their decisions are acceptable since they legally produce the service. Kettl (2002) puts his finger on a sensitive fact that the federal government rapidly tends to contract the services to reach double, (80% in the end of 20th century comparing with 40% in the 1980s) and that creates the idea of network governance.

The conception of network governance generates debates concerning its importance to democracy. Many scholars believe network governance is a natural result of adaptation to complexity and development of knowledge. However, Bogason (2006) turns our attention to the hardship occurring in order to balance between applying real democracy through expansion of citizen participation and contracting and losing accountability.
Wilson (1994) stresses a crucial point when he questions how the government is able to trust others and pass power and at the same time still maintain accountability.

Kettl (2002) gives many real examples reflecting complicated problems that contemporary public administration daily faces. “StarLink” is one of those complicated cases that requires collaboration between governmental and non-governmental agencies. More importantly, those governmental agencies could not find solutions for applying control or even managing the problem. Kettl, however, attributes that remarkable failure to the idea that the “StarLink” case did not sync with the heritage of public administration built on hierarchal standards and authority. In that moment, policymakers recognized that the problem grew out of what they thought and paralyzed their ability to solve it. It is, as Kettl states, an evidence of the failure of public administration theory and this failure emerged because of the boundaries drawn around the public administration field.

Kettl (2002) goes on with Wilson in criticizing network governance and goes beyond that to raise crucial issues related to classical and contemporary public administration function. He raises these questions: How can the government be able to secure efficiency and responsiveness when there is no hierarchal authority or there are diffusive responsibilities due to the separation of powers? Also, how can the government play a central role and solve problems while it cannot indeed control that problem? Moreover, how can the government secure accountability in local agencies when there are blurred boundaries of accountability and responsibility which are limited to the national and political level? As he emphasizes, the four traditions create fuzzy boundaries either within governmental agencies or among these agencies and other public or non-governmental agencies, and even worse, the transformation of the government makes these boundaries more clouded.

In the attempt to deal with the complexity of public administration in the 21st century, Kettl points out that practitioners of the field create new strategies for new governance: challenge, capacity, sovereignty, legitimacy and public interest. While challenge relates to the challenges which the American government faces to design strategies that meet the demands of the day, capacity posits the need for building personnel capacity to provide the skill to deal with administrative problems of the time. On the other hand, government has to guarantee its legitimacy and sovereignty which is imbedded in public power and the authority to save public interest.

Certainly, The New Public Services shares with the previous approaches, The Old Public Administration and The New Public Management, some concepts and conflicts with them in many points. Proponents of the New Public Management develop their movement by arguing and contrasting with the old public administration. The New public services also attempts to find why those approaches, especially The New Public Management, have failures or deficient concepts and, consequently, provides solutions, suggestions or perspectives to overcome the complexity public administrators now face. Denhardt & Denhardt (2011) turn our attention to the fact that it seems that The New Public Management is an alternative model to the Old Public Administration but indeed they have much in common—specifically, both depend on rationality and enhance efficiency and rely on the basic theoretical foundation of rational choice.

It has to be said that The New Public Management movement has been affected by a variety of research of managerial, organizational or rational institutional economics. Reinventing government raises the concept of “no best way” which also reflects the concept that there is no best way to conduct public administration research. This concept emerges due to the fact that opponents of bureaucracy and positivism since the 1960s have called for alternative approaches to management and organization and an exploration of new approaches to knowledge acquisition such as interpretive theory, postmodernism, and critical theory. Correspondingly, a variety of methodology has been implemented to provide better understanding. Interpretative, exploratory, and grounded studies are being commonly discussed as attempts to narrow the gap between practice and theory and the search for alternative approaches (Stortz, 2009; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000). However, the New Public Management depends more on positive and quantitative research, depending on observation and experimental methods to conduct public administration study. On the other hand, The New Public Services relies on a variety of theories and approaches to conduct public administration study (Denhardt, 2000)
Specifically, Khodor (2005) states that since 1988, substantial attention was given to the subject of how the field of public administration can reconcile its academic efforts and practitioners desires and needs. Kettl (2002) also turns our attention to the fact that the field is still suffering from what has been known as its intellectual crisis and consequently, public administration has found itself under huge pressure from the practitioners as well. In his view, public managers recognize the insufficiency of most of classical theories and they looked for another way to survive. As a result, they embrace the Reinventing Government movement of the 1990s even though it was rejected by public administration scholars. The growing gap between the academic world and the practical one was unavoidable.

Even worse, Kettl (2002) states that the twentieth century provides more complexity that leads to a conflict between public policy and public administration theory. Unfortunately, the field became a tool that tries “to span growing gaps: between its intellectual heritage and the emerging realities of the twenty first century administration; and between its own intellectual pursuits and those of the other social sciences” (p.16).

According to him, public management use case studies to investigate and understand the behavior of top administration. Consequently, its researchers studied leadership skills, relations between the top executive and other political influences and the implementation of how bureaucrats play a role in frustrating the strategies of top officials; they, however, failed to provide clear a descriptive and normative analysis of how government gets its work done.

According to Khodor (2005), understanding American public administration begs referencing the political and legal approach. However, if political approach is considered, the focus has to be shifting to different values that are raised in the managerial approach. To be specific, representativeness, political responsiveness and accountability in the course of elected officials to citizenry are the values from the perspective of the political approach to the public administration (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009). Park & Perry (2013) point out that political approach could be related to the concept of bureaucracy. They attribute that to the fact that members for public services are selected through methods that just reflect the larger population in addition to bureaucracies being conceived as representative according to the extent of agreement with public opinion. Accordingly, it is claimed that if bureaucrats are representative, public administrators will be responsive and responsible to the elected official for the interests of the public.

However, Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009) state that there is also a tension with traditional public administration in managerial terms as well as the New Public Management in terms of efficiency as their main values. It is claimed that citizen participation and advisory committees are just time consuming and conflict with efficiency. On the other hand, public managers, especially in the New Public Management usually complain about congressional roles as well as the mechanism traditionally used to regulate public agencies. Also, “…public administrators are often, and always have been, confronted with intransigent political, legislative, and interest group forces” (Khodor, 2005, 272). The political approach emphasizes the importance of representativeness within Civil Service and demands public agencies to be pluralistic and reflect the variety of values, conflicts in society. That is because the public administration branch is considered as a policy making center that should be structured to give representative groups the opportunity to counteract each other. Further, many scholars attempt to describe the role of government or public administration from a political view; however Wilson describes it as independent and collective duties as he states:

“Supply the best possible life to a federal organization, to systems within systems; to make town, city, county, state, and federal governments live with a like strength and an equally assured healthfulness, keeping each unquestionably its own master and yet making all interdependent and cooperative” (p. 15).

More importantly, this approach sees individual as groups and identifies their interests as being similar to those considered in the same categories. Further, in that sense, finding solutions for conflicts tends to be more complex and raised to the chief executive, regulation and courts. Moreover, public organizations also become bigger by the time and this approach makes those organizations unmanageable. It has to be mentioned that this approach depends on incrementalism in making decisions that has been previously described by Lindblom.
and that contrasts what is common on the managerial approach especially in classical New public management that relies on rational approach. Explicitly, in terms of the rational approach, the old classical approach depends on selecting the most cost-effective choice from comprehensive alternatives while New Public Management depends on minimizing-cost. (Williams, 1979; Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009)

In terms of research methods, political approach tends to emphasize representativeness and responsiveness that are usually embodied in consensus found in the opinion of media, public and interest groups. That impacts public administration theory in adopting new methods different from what are common in the managerial approach that focuses on scientific methodology. It turns attention to the focus groups’ technique and more importantly enables public administration to set its own research agenda. It gives room for carrying out theoretical interpretations seeking to understand contemporary phenomena (Rhodes, 1991).

According to the United Nation Program in Public Administration and Finance Report (1995) “institutions of public administration are established by law, their competences and powers are defined by law, their duties regarding the rights guaranteed to legal subjects are regulated by law” (p.4). The report goes on to point out that these laws shape the legal approach that is considered as a framework for public management in determining the type of relationships between a variety of public authorities, and the conditions in which they have to accomplish their own goals efficiently. Rosenbloom (1989) states that the legal approach is mainly focused on defending basic constitutional rights of not only individuals but also safeguarding procedural due process.

This approach raises the idea of fairness and equity which can be seen in procedural due process to protect individuals from malicious and arbitrary and individual substitutive rights and equal protection of the laws. Rosenbloom states that the organizational structure regarding this approach prefers to use impartial examiners as well as the adversarial model to give the two sides chances to fight and clarify their positions. Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009) go on to say that this organizational structure is not associated with all the values embraced in the different approaches. It limits customer service to a legal procedure and goes against not just efficiency and effectiveness but also against representativeness, responsiveness and accountability. It focuses, rather, on affording high protection of the right of private parties against illegal and offensive administrative action. In that sense, it provides a network of laws to protect public interest from being abused.

Consequently, the legal approach views individuals as unique people and each one has his/her own situations and operate under unique circumstances. In this view, judicial decision making is a political approach depending on incrementalism that tends to rely on past decisions and analogize new issues to familiar circumstances. It has to be said that, as Rosenbloom states, the legal approach is not against scientific methods that depends on generalization but inductive methods in which cases are focused on and some social classification are viewed as suspect since they are assumed to threaten the constitutional requirement of equal protection. He also emphasizes the role of normative inquiry in generalizing case studies to develop broad legal principle in order to protect individuals and minorities’ rights.

**Proposed Approach:**

Up to this point, it is obvious that the three approaches contribute to building public administration theory and practice. However, Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009) attribute the lack of certain coherence to the fact that public administration embodies three distinctive approaches that attempt to explain the field from political, managerial and legal perspectives. While the managerial approach deals with public administration as similar to private sector, the political approach raises the importance of publicans of public administration and how it is related to political aspects. The legal approach emphasizes the Constitution and regulation in public administration as a legal matter. Moreover each approach has its own values, perspectives and epistemology: see the following table. Rosenbloom (1989) argues that three interconnected approaches to public
administration generate difficulties to government to perform effectively because with these tendencies government became paralyzed in identifying a problem, determining a solution and implementing that solution.

Table 2: The Characteristics of Each Approach Impacting Public Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Political Approach</th>
<th>Legal Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>theoretical and epistemological foundations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Public Administration</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
<td>New Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political theory, rational - scientific management</td>
<td>Economic theory, scientific management Rely more on positive social science.</td>
<td>Democratic theory, no best way to conduct the research, positive, interpretive, Critical, and postmodern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>public interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically defined and expressed in law</td>
<td>Responses to individual interests</td>
<td>Emerge from Shred values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>Serving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms for achieving objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering programs through existing government agencies</td>
<td>Creative incentive structures, achieved through a third party</td>
<td>Coalition of non-profit, private and public organizations to achieve agreed needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-bureaucracy</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Participation and collaborative structure, teamwork and shared leadership pluralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational decisions considering all comprehensive choices</td>
<td>Rational minimizing cost</td>
<td>Multiple rational and agreed mutually decisions that reflect citizens, political and organizational interests incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, effectiveness, economy</td>
<td>Cost-effectiveness-responsiveness</td>
<td>Participation, and responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>customers</td>
<td>citizens Member of group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the opposite opinion, adopting the three approaches is the best way to understand public administration theory and practice and overcome complexities and deficiencies. These approaches complement each other and provide competing ideologies that could be unified to build a grand theory of public administration. The three approaches provide a big picture about how public administrators have to be. Even though in the previous discussion we see that each approach has its own values that could conflict with other approaches’ values, that does not mean a combination of most of these values is impossible. According to the three approaches, administrators must be efficient, effective, responsive, participative and ethical to implement managerial, political and legal values perceptively. Accepting the three approaches as essential and equally important for the public administration study is the first step to embrace a right way. The following chart clarifies this concept.
It has to be said that accepting the three approaches as a framework to understand public administration theory demands accepting the concept that there is no best way to conduct a study of public administration. Riccucie (2010), in her book *Public Administration Tradition of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge*, goes on to strongly support this concept when she provides numerous quantitative and qualitative research that contribute in building public administration theory and provide deep understanding to narrow the gap between theory and practice.

This suggestion is associated with Kettl’s (2002) perspective in building connections between the public administration traditions to be efficient in solving current problems. He states that heterogeneities in public administration became, in one hand, an essential tool to root instability out of public administration in academic terms. On the other hand, hierarchy and authority might work within independent government; but definitively, it will not do so within government that depends on others to provide services. Nevertheless, the public trust in government has shifted to federal workers rather than officials, which necessitates that agencies be more responsive. In terms of separate political and administrative powers, simply, there is ambiguity as to whether both are stronger or weaker. So, these traditions make the field meddle through hierarchy, citizens and politics.

He points out that many theories and approaches are built on the tradeoff that traditional public administration created. In the nineteenth century, many theories articulated ideas to raise how to empower the executive and separate the powers, or at least eliminate the political influence on public administration. In the following decades, however, it was seen that traditional public administration failed in providing solutions to balance empowering bureaucrats and creating responsive bureaucracy. Despite the fact that formal theory has deficiencies, it paved the path for new approaches; for instance, it introduced the “reinventing government” approach. The Reinventing Government approach is based on the idea of empowering the front-line administrators to do their work effectively. However, this approach fails to secure accountability among collaborative agencies. The dilemma of accountability is getting more complex due to the role of interest groups, which have multiplied, and the policy administration, which has become intertwined with the private sector as well.

Kettle concludes that the prime issue in adopting these new challenges is not to abandon the public administrations traditions, but to build bridges that could cross wide divides. Kettl suggests ten principles to pave a path to building these bridges and creating a new agenda to enriching public administration research, such as: finding strategies to make hierarchy and authority be fitted to the transformation of governance;
relying on performance-based information to allocate responsibility for outcomes among network members; and transitioning and investing in human capital to enhance their skills in terms of negotiation and coordination to fit the job that they ought to perform. Kettl emphasizes the importance of couple hierarchical bureaucracy, with giving new capacity to allow public administrators manage and delivering service through both privatization and federalism. This indeed needs collaborative approaches with public, private, non-profit organizations in addition to enhancing ability and skills needed in coordination and its implications for accountability. Likewise, finding a bridge to connect the three approaches, managerial, political and legal, as well as the three managerial approaches is the first step to understand the theory of public administration and overcome the challenges facing public administration today.
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provides the following table to clarify this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctrine</th>
<th>Manning</th>
<th>Typical Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector</td>
<td>Break up of formerly 'Monolithic' units, unbundling of U-form management systems into corporatized units around products, operating on decentralized 'one-line' budgets and dealing with one another on an 'armslength' basis</td>
<td>Need to create 'managable' units, separate provision and production interests, gain efficiency advantages of use of contract or franchise arrangements inside as well as outside the public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to greater competition in public sector</td>
<td>Move to term contracts and public tendering procedures</td>
<td>Rivalry as the key to lower costs and better standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress on private sector styles of management practice</td>
<td>Move away from military-style 'public service ethic', greater flexibility in hiring cind rewards; greater use of PR techniques</td>
<td>Need to use 'proven' private sector management tools in the public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use</td>
<td>Cutting direct costs, raising labour discipline, resisting union demands, limiting 'compliance costs' to business</td>
<td>Need to check resource demands of public sector and 'do more with less'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Hands-on professional management' in the public sector</td>
<td>Active, visible, discretionary control of organizations from named persons at the top, 'free to manage'</td>
<td>Accountability requires clear assignment of responsibility for action, not diffusion of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit standards and measures of performance</td>
<td>Definition of goals, targets, indicators of success, preferably expressed in quantitative terms, especially for professional services</td>
<td>Accountability requires clear statement of goals, efficiency requires 'hard look' at objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater emphasis on output controls</td>
<td>Resource allocation and rewards linked to measured performance; breakup of centralized bureaucracy-wide personnel management</td>
<td>Need to stress results rather than procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>