



International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences

Vol: 10, Issue: 37, pp. (995-1007).

Compilation

Received: 14.05.2019

Accepted: 22.09.2019

THE DISCIPLINE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

Bekir TAVAS

Dr., bekirtavas@hotmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5773-6583

ABSTRACT

The discipline of public administration is defined as an interdisciplinary field. This aspect of public administration, which uses the theories, methods and approaches of the disciplines of political science, administrative law and business management, has recently been cited as the cause of public administration crisis. In this study, the question of whether interdisciplinary position of public administration affects discipline positively or negatively. Since the establishment of public administration, the relations with different disciplines are examined; the separation of political science and administrative law from the discipline in the foundation period and its approach to the management of the enterprise were examined. The relationship between the administration and the management of the company, which was expressed as the most affected by the discipline, was discussed and the positive and negative effects of these relations were discussed.

Keywords: Public administration, interdisciplinary public administration, public management.

INTRODUCTION

Public administration is an interdisciplinary discipline; In particular, it is a generally accepted finding that it has benefited from political science, administrative law and business administration. It is known that political science from these close disciplines is the source of public administration, in other words public administration is distinguished from political science.

While public administration is an approach taken together with political science in the context of state administration, another discipline in the field of state administration has been administrative law. Although it is not intertwined as much as political science, it is known that public administration constitutes two aspects of the same management field as administrative law. On the one hand, the administrative law that sets out the legal and legal rules to be governed by the administration, on the other hand, the public administration on the management activity based on the legal and administrative rules, represent two areas very close to each other.

In the emergence of public administration as a separate discipline, it is known that there are studies that reveal their differences to differentiate from political science and administrative law. In order for public administration to be distinct as a discipline, it was necessary to differentiate from the disciplines that it was close to and emphasized the different aspects of these two disciplines. The first interdisciplinary debates on this discipline were realized within this framework.

While emphasizing the aspects that differ from administrative law and political science, it has been tried to reveal that public administration is close to the management of business, and proximity to this discipline or identity has been used as a tool to reveal differences with other disciplines. Woodrow Wilson was the first to emphasize identity with business management. The fact that business administration and public administration both contain management functions as the main subject and they are identical in the context of organization management have caused the innovations occurring in one of these areas to spread to the other field. In this way, there has been a certain degree of identity in terms of the subjects that constitute the content of both disciplines.

Although there is a more recent discipline compared to public administration, the rapidly developing business management due to the great advances in the field of industrial corporation has left public administration under influence and has transferred a significant part of its principles and rules to this discipline with a public management approach.

At this point, the claims of the fact that the discipline of the public administration was losing its originality, under the influence of the management of the enterprise and began to fall away from its main subject. It has also been suggested that there is a crisis in discipline, black days are experienced and problems cannot be found in their original line.

Is it possible to qualify as a crisis in the search for solutions to the problems faced by public administration and to benefit from the theories, methods and practices of the close disciplines? As it is known, crisis is not a solution, but a solution where there is no solution. For this reason, it does not seem like an appropriate approach to see the discipline of public administration as a problem and even as a crisis, in the context of finding solutions to the problems in its field.

In this study, the relationship of public administration with close disciplines has been discussed and after evaluating how these relations are evaluated in the related literature, the subject is evaluated from a different perspective. The efforts of the public administration to solve the problems by using the solutions and approaches of other disciplines are not perceived as a problem; the discipline has opportunities beyond its own field studies and it has been evaluated in the manner of improving the problem solving capacity by using new and different methods to solve the problems.

Interdisciplinary Aspect of Public Administration

When the disciplines of social science and public administration are examined with a scientific perspective, negative responses can be found and interdisciplinary approach cannot be mentioned (Rutgers, 1995). On the other hand, it is a fact that the prerequisite to say that public administration is an interdisciplinary approach is a discipline.

How does a science discipline emerge? Generally; a discipline it can be said that it is formed by determining its methodology, terminology, processes, fields of inquiry and content (Ulusoy, 2007). From this perspective, the main feature that differentiates public administration from other disciplines is that it takes the state as an object of study (Raadschelders, 1999: 296).

It is important to define the relationship of public administration with other disciplines in terms of self-definition. Raadschelders (1999: 296), after expressing that public administration is both based on other studies and disciplines and benefiting from them, considers it useful to differentiate the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approach to determine the level of relationship with other disciplines. According to him, both the multidisciplinary approach and the interdisciplinary approach point to a certain level of compliance with other disciplines in the knowledge content.

In multidisciplinary approach, there is a similarity with other disciplines focusing on the same research subjects, but it is in the interest of using methods and approaches in interdisciplinary approach. According to this, public administration; it can be considered as a multidisciplinary field when it conducts research in areas related to politics, management and sociology. On the other hand, other disciplines in their research; It is also an interdisciplinary discipline when it uses concepts, theories and approaches (Raadschelders (1999: 296).

Taking this distinction into consideration, it is a multidisciplinary field that public administration focuses on organizational theories because it does not address public organizations, whereas it is an interdisciplinary

discipline that enterprise management uses some concepts and methods such as efficiency, customer and performance.

According to Raadschelders (1999: 284, 298), the crisis of public administration stems from the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature of the field. The multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approach is not necessary for public administration, but if an integrated and unified theory is created in the style of induction, it will have to dig into its own grave.

Previously, the field was both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary. In his later research (Raadschelders, 2008; Raadschelders, 2011) he defines only the interdisciplinary concept. However, the author does not specify the reason for this.

As in Raadschelders' recent work, a significant part of the researchers see public administration as an interdisciplinary discipline. (Vigoda, 2003; Lelebici, 2001; Eryilmaz, 2010, Wright, 2011). It can be said that public administration benefits from the theories, methods and approaches of other disciplines, whereas its multidisciplinary character is not dominant. This implies the interdisciplinary nature of the area in question and requires the use of interdisciplinary definition when it is related to other disciplines.

According to Raadschelders (2008: 944), epistemological and methodological pluralism, which leads to the multiplicity of theories and concepts used in public administration, necessitates that the discipline should be an interdisciplinary field. In a later study (Raadschelders, 2011: 922), the author states that the field of public administration has gained a lot of sources of information in our time, so it is naturally interdisciplinary. According to him, as academicians of the field reach a wider range of information, public administration should do better at the point of becoming a discipline of interdisciplinary umbrellas.

Public administration has a clear form of interdisciplinary characteristics in terms of education and research. The departments of public administration of the faculties have departments such as management sciences, political science, administrative law, urbanization and environmental problems, and this constitutes an interdisciplinary educational environment. Learning the theories and methods of different disciplines is important in terms of providing interdisciplinary work to the public administration practitioner and researcher.

In terms of research; The discovery of interdisciplinary research is gaining importance as the problems of confrontation and the existing disciplines alone cannot cope with these problems (Ulusoy, 2007: 397).

The relationship of public administration with other disciplines; Although it is mostly expressed in the interdisciplinary concept, it is considered useful to examine how the relationship of the field with other fields has evolved in the historical process. For this purpose, the development of the interaction of public administration with other disciplines has been discussed below.

Discipline Discrimination from Political Science and Law

The separation of government from politics and law is based on the principle of separation of powers by Montesquieu. First French public authorities, including Bonnin and Vivien, forces have tried to systematize the principle of separation in the context of public administration (Rutgers, 2000). For this reason, it should be seen that the emergence of the distinction between politics-management and especially management-law in Europe, where the principle of separation of powers is developed and realized.

Politics - Management Distinction

In 1852, published by Vivien on Administrative Studies titled 2 The volume study included detailed explanations in the main areas of discussion of public administration, as well as the dichotomy of politics-administration (Karasu, 2004: 5). Since we have no knowledge of the distinction between politics and management in earlier periods, this work of Vivien can be regarded as the first study in which politics - management distinction is made.

Vivien, the execution of the legislative, executive and judicial powers in the context of the separation of powers; it has also been described as managerial in terms of the effective realization of political and public services for the general interests of the nation (Martin, 1987). This distinction made by Vivien shows that the distinction between politics and administration has been clearly demonstrated in the subject.

Bluntschli in 1864, Politik in his work, public administration both political science and public law. Wilson (1877: 209-210) states that after the public administration is separated from politics and law, this distinction belongs to German authors, who are the high authorities of the field, and refers to Bluntschli; He states that his public administration should be separated from politics and law.

Bluntschli, a leading lawyer of his time, is famous for his organic state theory. Bluntschli (1875: 1-3) foresees the harmonization between the state and its components. They are divided into two as public law and political science for a better understanding of the state. international law, administration (public administration), security and political statistics.

The theory of public administration; Bluntsch, who examined the constitutional-administration, legislative-executive and political administration dichotomies, revealed the importance of public administration by saying that nothing can do without the help of political administration. From this statement, it can be concluded that political decisions should be implemented by the public administration, otherwise they will not have the chance to implement it (Rosser, 2011).

According to Bluntschli, politics is for large and universal issues. Public administration deals with state activities related to individual and minor issues. Thus, while politics is the area of activity of the statesman, management is the work of technical officers (Wilson 1877: 210-211).

How should they understand these expressions of Bluntschli? How can the author say that public administration cannot do anything without public administration? As far as it is understood, it is the general

principles of international politics and domestic politics that Bluntschli understands as politics. Public administration should be characterized as small and individual in the sense that these general principles are divided into practice areas and implemented in small pieces and that public services are delivered to individuals.

When Bluntschli and Vivien's views are compared, it can be seen that the field of politics that Vivienchingen has designated as expedients is revealed by Bluntschli as large and universal subjects. Both expressions are close to each other; it is understood that the authors have similar views in defining the field of politics. While Vivien sees the field of public administration as a managerial area for effective public services, Bluntschli considers technical and technical matters as small and small. When Vivien refers to the quality of public administration, Bluntschli points to the scope and practical face of Bluntschli. As a result, public administration, with the contribution of both authors, has started to be seen as a discipline separate from law and politics.

Wilson adopting the politics-management distinction from Bluntschli (1887) declares that the area of administration is separate from politics and management questions are different from political questions. Accordingly, politics will determine tasks for public administration, but it will not manipulate governing bodies.

Goodnow (1900: 18) states that the state has two different functions and states that they are politics and administration. They state that politics should create policies and decisions on behalf of the state and that management should implement these policies.

In France and Germany, where the discipline of public administration emerged, and in the United States where it developed, it is understood that the discipline is trying to be separated from other disciplines. The reason for this is that it aims to develop the discipline as a specific area by revealing the differences from the close disciplines.

However, as independent from political science brings discipline closer to organizational theories and management, some researchers, such as Waldo, consider public administration to be identical and intertwined with political science (Şaylan, 2000: 7).

Şaylan (2000: 8) stated that public service is the main subject of the discipline of public administration, and that the discipline is related to political science in terms of the concepts of public service and accountability. It states that every public service reflects a political decision or preference and that political science has a predominant position in the public administration that is responsible for the public services.

Leblebici (2001: 17) argues that the traditional approach, which distinguishes the politics and administration from each other and evaluates them as separate functions, suggests that these two functions cannot be completely separated from each other in the context of democracy and the arguments of legitimacy. Indeed, considering that nation is the source of legitimacy in state life, the idea of an administration independent of the political power that represents the nation will reveal a legitimacy problem in public administration.

It is claimed that public administration practices may be a problem of legitimacy as well as the problem of a paradigm in the point where they can move away from politics and private sector. Şaylan (2000: 17) argues that political theory, which is one of the main pillars of public administration, has been disabled with the introduction of public management approach, and argues that this is a paradigm shift and has resulted in a paradigm crisis.

Kettl (2011: 5), on the other hand, mentions that there is a tension between the administration of politics and the administration of political decisions and the administration of politics as a decision-maker, and the administration's task to implement these decisions requires an understanding between the politicians and the administrations. However, the peculiar value perception and priorities of the political perspective are often not shared by the public administration and cause tension.

One reason is that the politician and the public manager's point of view can not be seen from the point of view of the difference, the other reason may be considered as the difference of expertise. It is necessary for the public administrator to remain in the public office and to be an expert in his / her field. The politician, however, is in contact with public administration issues when he is elected and he / she often draws an inadequate view in terms of expert knowledge. This difference in expertise is a source of various problems in practice.

At this point, it seems a necessity for public administration to differentiate and differ from political theory, as it is needed at the time of birth, as well as to take advantage of political theory as well as to stand close to it. Political and administrative disintegration; is related to the existence of common areas and the existence of both approaches under the concept of state administration. As a result, the debates on the issue of the state administration as a political and administrative split from the point that it would be more useful to act, although it is not able to ignore the uniqueness of the state administration.

Public Administration and Administrative Law

The concept of the rule of law requires all state activities to be based on the law and to comply with the law. As the administrative activities and practices of the state constitute the field of public administration discipline, it is concluded that this discipline should be in close relation with the field of law, especially constitutional law and administrative law.

According to Şaylan (2000: 18), the main feature that differentiates public administration from the field of private administration (business administration) is the control of the law and control by the judiciary. The fact that public activities can only be carried out on the basis of law means that no public activity without legal basis will be made. On the other hand, it is a fact that public administration activities, unlike the private sector, are subject to a number of legal inspections, particularly the Council of State and the Court of Accounts.

According to Rutgers (2000), there are insights that base the distinction of politics-rule on Montesquieu's approach to power. Although the separation of powers is based on the separation of the legislative, executive

and judiciary, it does not seem reasonable to base the separation of politics and administration, both of which are within the executive power, on this principle. In addition, the separation of the executive with the legislative and the judiciary, the separation of public administration which is a part of the executive, can be considered as a result of the principle of separation of powers.

It was mentioned above that decisions and practices based on political representations should be made in order to realize public administration activities without legitimacy. In accordance with the principle of the rule of law, the fact that administrative practices have a legal basis determines the relationship between public administration and legislative power. The obligation to act lawfully in the administration is an extremely important principle for administrative legitimacy. On the other hand, the relationship between the public administration and the judiciary emerges in terms of controlling the lawfulness of the administrative practices.

The public administration, which has a legal relationship with both the legislative and the judiciary, should be able to fulfill the duties imposed by the state on it. For this reason, the constitution and administrative law have to be in a certain relationship with public administration.

Generally speaking, public administration shares state administration with politics. For this reason, the legal rules and law practices introduced in the state administration, public administration should be created by considering their applications.

Public Administration and Business Management

After Vivien and Bluntschli have made clear that public administration is a separate field from political science and law, they have drawn a managerial and practical perspective in the definition of the field. Emphasizing the managerial and practical character of the discipline in terms of the field means that it is positioned within the science of management.

Wilson (1887: 198, 209), in addition to the views of the French and German theorists, stated that the field of public administration was a field of business management. It was not claimed that public administration had taken part in the same scientific field as business management. For this reason, Wilson appears to be the owner of the idea that the disciplinary separation from political science and law was identical with the management of the enterprise, while previously carried out by Vivien and Bluntschli.

N. Abadan, Wilson's article titled Investigation of Administration, It is claimed that the author used a phrase that would make state work different from private enterprise. This statement contains the opposite of the original expression we have taken up, the original of the text has been examined and a translation error has been seen. Accordingly, Wilson (1887: 201- 202) uses a phrase daha to make government affairs less different than business bu and thus does not contradict the above statement. In other words, the author insists that the field of public administration is the same as the field of business management.

The two approaches, which are seen closely by Wilson and have been identified with identity, have reached the emphasis on identity at the peak point with the development of the new public management approach. The new public administration (or operation) dated to the period between 1980-2005 is expressed in the concept of public management in English and wants to refer to the economic interpretation of referral and management behavior. According to Güler (2005), this is the approach that gives color to public administration reforms today.

According to Drechsler (2005), the transfer of new public management business and market and business management techniques from private sector to the public sector. This understanding is based on a neo-liberal perception of the state and the economy. According to this approach, where public activities are reduced and implemented with operating efficiency principles; a weak, reduced and minimal state is envisaged.

The new public management approach, the citizen as a customer by approaching his political personality and private sector techniques as well as transferring values of the public sector are reported (cited by Sener, 2007: 37). From this point of view, it can be considered natural to have problems in identifying private sector approaches and values with the public sector with profit motivation.

Denhardt and Denhardt argue that public servants serve not the client, but democracy, and state that public administration should be based on the concepts of democracy and citizens as much as the market and the customers. According to this approach, which keeps the service rather than governing; public administration provides services to the citizen and not the consumer and aims to the public benefit. The new Public Service also emphasizes democracy and accountability (cited by Young, 2010: 153-158).

Drechsler (2005) stated that it is legitimate to say that it has completed the transfer of the new Public Management approach; however, it is observed that this approach does not work well even when it has its own stringent criteria. The new Public Administration, in addition to creating an effective state, cannot provide better operating efficiency; In addition to being expensive, disruptive and impractical, it has been stated that it has very simple and economical features with severe ideological aspects.

These fundamental problems arising from the transfer of private enterprise management principles and practices to public management do not change the fact that the two management approaches are identical in the point of being the management of the organization. For this reason, public administration and business management will continue to exist as two management disciplines which are close to each other with their identities and differences.

Relationship with Other Disciplines

It is understood that public administration was formed on the intersection of politics, society and organization theories (Şaylan, 2000: 4-5), and that the relationship between constitution and administrative law has moved to a different dimension with the development of the concept of the state of law (Özer, 2006: 11). It is

expressed that the discipline is traditionally related; Beyond its relations with the discipline of politics, law and business (and also of organization theories), there are views that it is related to other disciplines and disciplines.

Samier (2005) argued that public administration should be treated as a social science discipline; the basic social science disciplines of public administration problems; He tried to prove that history can be dealt with philosophy anthropology and fine arts disciplines.

Samier (2005: 21-28), who states that the nature and purpose of public administration questions are partly related to history, indicates that many administrative phenomena contain historical issues, and that the changing external social conditions present significant differences in terms of historical periods.

The author, who claims that public administration is also partly a philosophical field, states that he should approach philosophical approach to understanding thought, behavior and knowledge. He states that anthropology, which examines belief systems, symbols, values, myths, legends and cultures, is important in understanding human beings, and that management behavior can be read with cultural lenses. The aesthetic critique of the administration has been an important part of the modern historical period since German idealism.

Public administration is related to every field of social sciences and also to sociology and social psychology as it is an activity carried out in human relations. Public administration, which has an orientation towards the state and society, has to keep the social psychology, individual characteristics and psychologies in the field as well as to take into account the social characteristics. In particular, social psychological characteristics will be more important in providing public services to citizens with specific situations and barriers.

Social-psychological approach; Bright and Sobacı (2005: 12), who put forth the interaction between the bureaucratic structure and the employee in this structure, states that this approach is based on Hawthorne experiments and aims to study human behavior in the organization with the help of disciplines such as sociology and psychology.

Since there are people in the organization and organization in public administration, the relationship between this discipline and sociology and social psychology disciplines is shaped in this framework.

As science branches close to public administration; Eryilmaz (2010: 51-60), who considers political science, sociology, administrative law, history and management, refers to the necessity of using various social science data to examine the public administration which he defines as a multifaceted social phenomenon.

Parlak and Sobacı (2005: 9), as the elements of public administration, people, organization, public policy, norm order, financial resources and public officials are counted. People and public officials from these elements include sociology and social psychology; organizational management sciences; public policy; political science; norm order law; financial resources require the inclusion of economic discipline in public administration.

Eryilmaz (2010: 57) states that human beings are under the influence of the past while thinking about the present and the future, and that the science and the science of economics and sociology, politics and management are history. Through history, it can be possible to compare the past management values and institutions of a society with other examples which are then contemporary in themselves and finally with today's management forms. Besides these; disciplines such as psychology, economics and finance can be stated to have relations with public administration.

CONCLUSION

The discipline of public administration is defined as an interdisciplinary approach and is mainly characterized as close to political science, administrative law and management. The wide range of disciplines in the relations with these three disciplines, the methods and practices of these disciplines and especially the management of the enterprise is shown as the cause of the discipline.

In the absence of an answer within the framework of the theoretical framework of the discipline, the problems that arise within the framework of public administration practices are utilized in close disciplines. As a matter of fact, when criticisms of public organizations in inefficient, cumbersome and bureaucratic inadequacies became widespread, a long time did not find a solution to these criticisms. In the end, it has been observed that the practices of business management that develop efficient and flexible applications are reflected in public administration. As a result of this, performance and result-oriented approaches have been developed that take the lead in efficiency and low-cost work in the public administration and act with customer perception. As can be seen, in the face of emerging problems, solutions are taken from close disciplines.

In the face of the problems that it cannot solve with its own theories and practices, public administration benefits from the methods, approaches and solutions of close disciplines. From the three aspects expressed here, how public administration has benefited from close disciplines has been tried. It has been concluded that benefiting from the methods, approaches and analyzes of the close disciplines does not push the public administration to depression, but rather strengthens the problem solving capacity and ability.

REFERENCES

- Bluntschli, J. C. (1875). *The Theory of the State*, Oxford, (Printed at the Clarendon Press, London).
- Drechsler, W. (2005), "The Rise and Demise of the New Public Management", *Post-Autistic Economics Review*, No. 33, 14 September 2005, pp. 17-28; <http://www.paecon.net/PAERReview/issue33/Drechsler33.htm>; 08.09.2011.
- Eryilmaz, B. (2010). *Kamu Yönetimi: Düşünceler, Yapılar, Fonksiyonlar*, Okutman Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Genç, N. (2010). "Yeni Kamu Hizmeti Yaklaşımı", *Türk İdare Dergisi*, S.466, Mart 2010, ss.145-159; <http://www.tid.gov.tr/Makaleler/466fnevalgenc.pdf>; 07.09.2011.

- Goodnow, F. J. (1900). *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, The Macmillan Company, NewYork; <http://www.archive.org/download/politicsadminist00goodrich/politicsadminist00goodrich.pdf> 03.09.2011.
- Güler, B. A. (2005). *Kamu Yönetimi Yaklaşımları Nasıl Sınıflandırılabilir?; Yaklaşımları Sınıflandırmak*, Çalışma notu, 1 Kasım 2005; <http://80.251.40.59/politics.ankara.edu.tr/bguler/pdf/kysiniflan.pdf>; 07.09.2011.
- Karasu, K. (2004). *Kamu Yönetimi Disiplininin Kökenine İlişkin Bir Not*, II.Kamu Yönetimi Forumu, Ankara; <http://kamyon.politics.ankara.edu.tr/bulten/belgeler/04.pdf>; 14.07.2011.
- Keskin, N. E. (2006). "Türkiye’de Kamu Yönetimi Disiplininin Köken Sorunu", *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 39, Sayı 2, Haziran 2006, s. 1-28.
- Kettl, D. F. (2011). "The Future of Public Administration", *Humanities & Social Sciences Online*; www.h-net.org/~pubadmin/tfreport/kettl.pdf; 03.09.2011.
- Leblebici, D. N. (2001). "Disiplin ve Uygulama Açısından Kamu Yönetiminin "Kimlik Krizine" Yeni Bir Bakış", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Mayıs 2001, C.25, No.1, ss. 15-24.
- Martin, D. W. (1987). "Deja Vu: French Antecedents of American Public Administration", *Public Administration Review*, V. 47, No. 4, July - August 1987’den aktaran
- Martin, D. W. (1988). "The Fading Legacy of Woodrow Wilson", *Public Administration Review*, V. 48, No. 2, March – April 1988, pp. 631-636.
- Özer, M. A. (2006). "Kamu Yönetiminde Kimlik Bunalımı Üzerine Değerlendirmeler", *Sayıştay Dergisi*, Sayı: 61, Nisan-Haziran 2006.
- Parlak, B. and Sobacı, Z. (2005). *Kuram ve Uygulamalarda Kamu Yönetimi: Ulusal ve Global Perspektif*, Alfa Akademi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Pestritto, R. J. (2005). *Woodrow Wilson and the roots of modern liberalism*, (Rowman & Littlefield Publisher Inc.).
- Raadschelders, J. C. N. (1999). "A Coherent Framework for the Study of Public Administration", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 9, pp.281-303.
- Raadschelders, J. C. N. (2008). "Understanding Government: Four Intellectual Traditions in The Study of Public Administration", *Public Administration* V. 86, No. 4, 2008, pp.925–949.
- Raadschelders, J. C. N. (2011). "The Future of the Study of Public Administration: Embedding Research Object and Methodology in Epistemology and Ontology", *Public Administration Review*, November - December 2011, pp.916-924.
- Rutgers, M. R. (1995). "Seven Sins in Thinking about the Study of Public Administration", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 17, No. 1 pp. 67-85.
- Rosser, C. (2011). *Johann Caspar Bluntschl’s Organic Theory of State and Public Administration*; http://www.irspm2010.com/workshops/papers/16_johanncaspar.pdf; 10.08.2011.
- Rutgers, M. R. (2000). "Public Administration and the Separation of Powers in a Cross-Atlantic Perspective", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, V.22, No. 2, (June, 2000)’den aktaran Karasu, Koray, (2004), *Kamu*

- Yönetimi Disiplininin Kökenine İlişkin Bir Not, II.Kamu Yönetimi Forumu, Ankara; <http://kamyon.politics.ankara.edu.tr/bulten/belgeler/04.pdf>; 14.07.2011.
- Rutgers, M. R. (2010). "Theory and Scope of Public Administration: An Introduction to the Study's Epistemology", Public Administration Review, Foundations of Public Administration Series; <http://www.aspanet.org/scriptcontent/pdfs/FPA-Theory-Article.pdf>; 11.08.2011.
- Samier, E. (2005). "Toward Public Administration as a Humanities Discipline: A Humanistic Manifesto", Halduskultuur, 2005, V. 6, pp.6-59.
- Small, A. W. (2001). The Cameralists: The Pioneers of German Social Polity, (Batoche Books, Kitchener – Ontario)
- Şaylan, G. (1996). "Bağımsız Bir Disiplin Olarak Kamu Yönetimi: Yeni Paradigma Arayışları", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, C. 29, S.3, Eylül 1996, ss.3-16.
- Şaylan, G. (2000). "Kamu Yönetimi Disiplininde Bunalım ve Yeni Açılımlar Üzerine Düşünceler", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, C. 33, S.2, Haziran 2000, ss.1-22.
- Şener, H. E. (2007). "Kamu Yönetiminde Postmodernizm", Kamu Yönetimi: Yöntem ve Sorunlar, (Ed. Şinasi Aksoy,Yılmaz Üstüner), Nobel, Ankara, ss.31-47.
- Thies, C. F. and Pecquet, G. M. (2010). "The Shaping of a Future President's Economic Thought: Richard T. Ely and Woodrow Wilson at 'The Hopkins'"; Independent Review, September 2010, V. 15, No.2, pp.257-277; http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_15_02_06_thies.pdf; 11.08.2011.
- Ulusoy, G. (2007). "Disiplinlerarası Araştırma ve Eğitim", Değişim Çağında Yüksek Öğretim: Global Trendler – Paradigmatik Yönelimler, Coşkun Can Aktan (Ed.), İzmir: Yasar Üniversitesi, Mart 2007, ss. 389-398.
- Van Der Eyden, T. (2003). Public Management of Society: Rediscovering French Institutional Engineering in The European Context, (IOS Press).
- Vigoda, E. (2003). "Rethinking the Identity of Public Administration: Interdisciplinary Reflections and Thoughts on Managerial Reconstruction", Public Administration & Management: An Interactive Journal, 8, 1, 2003, pp. 1-22; <http://www.spaef.com/file.php?id=261>; (02.04.2012).
- White, L. D. (1945). "The Just Official", Public Administration Review, Book Review (Bonnin, Principios de Administración Pública); <http://www.cjbonnin.org/REFERENCIAS/whitebonnin.pdf>; 11.08.2011.
- Wilson, W. (1887). "The Study of Administration", Political Science Quarterly, V.II, No.2, June 1887.
- Wilson, W. (1961). "İdarenin İncelenmesi", Woodrow Wilson Seçme Parçalar, (Çev. N. Abadan), Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayını, İstanbul.
- Wright, Bradley E. (2011). "Public Administration as an Interdisciplinary Field: Assessing its Relationship with the Fields of Law, Management, and Political Science", Public Administration Review, January - February 2011, pp. 96-101.