PAR Public Administration Review

Jos C. N. Raadschelders
Kwang-Hoon Lee
University of Oklahoma

Trends in the Study of Public Administration: Empirical and Qualitative Observations from *Public Administration Review,* 2000–2009

Recent Trends in Public Administration Research

Jos C. N. Raadschelders is a professor of public administration and Henry Bellmon Chair of Public Service at the University of Oklahoma. His interests include administrative history, comparative government, and the nature and development of the study of public administration.
E-mail: raadschelders@ou.edu

Kwang-Hoon Lee is a doctoral student at the University of Oklahoma. Currently, he is finishing his dissertation on the intellectual history of the study of public administration in the United states.
E-mail: kwlst7@ou.edu

What are the apparent research and methodological trends in PAR*'s content over the past decade? From the perspective of the journal's 70-year history, with its aim to "mesh" practitioner and academic knowledge creation, topical coverage since 2000 reflects striking continuity, emphasizing many of the "bread and butter" administrative issues such as planning, human resources, budgeting, and public management. A marked increase in coverage is apparent in the application of more sophisticated quantitative statistical methodology, as well as in the number of female authors, while the number of practitioner authors declined sharply. Throughout the first turbulent decade of the twenty-first century, three intellectual themes stood out: evaluations of New Public Management, connections between practitioners and academicians, and responsiveness to immediate social, economic, and political challenges. Given the constant demand for usable knowledge, scholars seem to have marginalized attention to the historical context and epistemological foundations of the study. The central challenge in the years ahead will be to effectively use research methods in response to the big questions of government and society that defy measurement.*

> *Since many [empiricists], especially the younger, do not know very much about epistemology, they tend to be quite dogmatic about the one set of canons that dominate them.*
>
> —C. Wright Mills, 1959

The past decade undoubtedly ranks among the most tumultuous in American history. The year 2000 opened with worldwide anxiety about the Y2K problem, a contested presidential election, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 that prompted ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and corporate scandals involving companies such as Enron and WorldCom. The decade also witnessed major natural disasters such as the Katrina and Rita hurricanes, and ended with the election of a president of African American descent and an unprecedented economic, financial, and regulatory crisis. (The massive oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico is just beyond the period we consider.) As a consequence, the role and position of American government in society increased significantly with, among other things, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003. (The passage of the health care bill is just beyond our period.) Few decades demanded more from government, and practitioners and academicians were challenged to respond.

> Few decades [apart from the most recent] demanded more from government, and practitioners and academicians were challenged to respond. How has *Public Administration Review* . . . the journal dedicated to fostering academician–practitioner exchange, responded to this rapidly changing environment?

How has *Public Administration Review* (*PAR*), the journal dedicated to fostering academician–practitioner exchange, responded to this rapidly changing environment? What are the quantitative and qualitative trends in its publications? How effectively do its contents respond to the turbulent times and the needs of policy makers, the public, and nonprofit organizations? While *PAR*'s content should reflect current concerns and needs in society, do its pages recognize that the journal and the study not only should be motivated by what is in the news, but also address longer-term trends in government and public administration, as well the foundations of their knowledge? Hence, what is missing in *PAR*? What topics, issues, and ideas ought to receive much more attention? Do *PAR* articles adequately explore longer-term trends and the conceptual foundations of the study?

Every now and then, it is useful for a study or discipline to take stock of recent developments and to gauge future directions. This has occurred since *PAR*'s beginning in 1940 in two different yet complementary ways. First, previous editors sometimes took measure (Newland 2000; Stivers 2000; Terry 2005; Waldo 1974), and sometimes they commissioned others or received submissions concerning the development of the journal in a particular decade (e.g., Caldwell 1965; Gaus 1950; Sayre 1951, 1958). Second, *PAR* has also been subject to empirical analyses of its topical and theoretical development (Bingham and Bowen 1994; Perry and Kraemer 1986), sometimes in comparison to other journals (Bowman and Hajjar 1978a, 1978b; Colson 1990), or of its prestige among journals (Bernick and Krueger 2010; Forrester and Watson 1994; Vocino and Elliott 1982, 1984).

Every now and then, it is useful for a study or discipline to take stock of recent developments and to gauge future directions. This has occurred since *PAR*'s beginning in 1940 in two different yet complementary ways.

PAR is not the only journal that engages in stock taking. Among related journals, one can point to *Administration Science Quarterly* (Boulding 1958; Palmer 2006) and *Organization Studies* (Augier, March, and Sullivan 2005; Daft and Lewin 1990). Within political science, articles by Giles, Mizell, and Patterson (1989), Norris and Crewe (1993), Bennett and Ikenberry (2006), and Sigelman (2006) come to mind. Within sociology, stocktaking articles appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology* (Clemens et al. 1995) and the *American Sociological Review* (Jacobs 2005). Such self-reflection is not found only in the United States, as illustrated by articles on the British journal *Public Administration* (Dargie and Rhodes 1996; Rhodes et al. 1995), on the *Australian Journal of Public Administration* (Wettenhall 1997), and on the Dutch journal *Bestuurswetenschappen* (Raadschelders 1998). Often, journal editors ask authors to write about the state of the study in their country at-large—for example, in the United States (Golembiewski 1996), France (Chevallier 1996), Germany (Seibel 1996), the Netherlands (Kickert 1996), Denmark (Jørgensen 1996), and the United Kingdom (Pollitt 1996). Recently, an article was published on the limited influence of Max Weber in and on German public administration (Seibel 2010). The British journal *Public Administration* carried articles by Siffin (1956) and Raadschelders (forthcoming) on American public administration.

Taking stock was described in 1996 by then-editor of *Administrative Science Quarterly* Karl Weick, as "a complex mixture of appreciation, wariness, anticipation, regret, and pride, all fused into thoughts of renewal" (quoted in Palmer 2006, 535). It is an important and useful activity because it allows for a pause in the normal work of scholars, which is to produce research articles in specialized areas. Stock taking is focused on trends in a study as a whole and holds the potential of identifying what topics and methods are emerging, prevailing, and declining. It enables the reviewer to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a journal: Does the journal publish articles that are relevant to every specialization in a study, effectively reaching broad audiences of both practitioners and academicians?[1] Does the journal provide room for diverse methodological approaches, or is it dominated by a specific set of approaches? Are the motives and perspectives on which a journal was founded still important, or have its environmental circumstances changed to such extent that it has felt it necessary to develop new grounding?

Our assessment of *PAR*'s past 10 years, with specific attention to quantitative and qualitative developments and to strengths and weaknesses, is developed later in the article. First, we need to describe how the topical analysis of *PAR*'s articles between 2000 and 2009 was conducted. Obviously, the past decade can be separated only artificially from the previous decades. Therefore, we must be aware that intellectual developments throughout the past decade are part of larger trends that began even before *PAR* was created.

Methodological Challenge: Assessing *PAR*'s Topical Development

To capture developments in a study by categorizing publications according to subject matter is a tricky business. Should we focus on selecting "timeless" concepts and topical interests, such as organization theory, policy analysis, personnel management, public management, budgeting and finance, intergovernmental relations, ethics, and citizen participation, among others? These rather general categories may serve well over time. For instance, one can marvel at the consistency of chapter topics in American textbooks from the late 1920s up to the present, but are they reflective of significant changes in topical interest? By way of example, consider the public management literature, which, up to the 1970s, was conceptualized as functions of public management (e.g., Gulick's acronym POSDCORB). In the 1980s, though, public management was approached as "New Public Management" (NPM), and since the 2000s, as collaborative management and network management. Do NPM and collaborative and network management represent new trends, or are they merely public management re-dressed with new labels? Traditional labels may not capture the reality of current intellectual developments. One can, instead, categorize developments by looking at article titles. This is equally dissatisfying, however, because of the risk of displaying only the current fashions, such as risk and emergency management, e-government, homeland security, administrative capacity, knowledge networks, and so on.

If this appears already quite complicated, it gets worse. For instance, a category such as e-government may be regarded as too fashionable, inviting an attempt to "fit" it into one of the more traditional categories. The question obviously becomes, which category is most appropriate? With regard to e-government, that determination depends not only on the title of the article, but also on its content. For example, is an e-government article focusing on consequences of electronic filing for organizational structure and/or functioning: best categorized or labeled as "organization theory"? If, however, an e-government piece explores the extent to which government–citizen interaction is improved, "citizen participation" may be a more appropriate label. In other words, clear definition of categories is and remains the challenge of analysis.

Typically, we assume that categories should be not only clearly defined, but also mutually exclusive. To systematically develop distinct categories is difficult enough in itself, but every category can be defined differently by different scholars. Topics may further be classified by subdiscipline or specialization (Chubin 1976, 451) or by research area or subspecialties, which, again, risks focusing on today's fashions (Bechler and Trowler 2001, 66–67). Whitley distinguished *specializations* from *research areas* as follows: "While research areas are sets of problem situations with a common core of uncertainty delineated by the applications of models, specialties are cognitive units dealing with a particular aspect of reality" (1974, 85). Research areas are large clusters of several closely linked publications and collaborations (Crane 1972) as defined by the most active and productive scholars. In recent years, one can think of the public sector motivation literature that started with Perry and Wise (1990), as well as the public management studies that have been inspired by O'Toole and Meier's collaborations (1999). Specializations often spawn their own associations and conferences, and even new journals, such as the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* Scholars in such associations and journals may categorize articles radically differently than others who identify more with a generalist's perspective.

Third, a conceptual classification of topics is not always consistent with empirical observation. That is, when defining new categories, we should be aware of the difference between taxonomy, which is inductive because it classifies and measures characteristics on the basis of empirical observations, and typology, which is deductive because it defines theoretical concepts with dimensions based on an ideal type (Bailey 1994; Lee and Raadschelders 2008, 430; Smith 2002). Typologies are most common in public administration.

Fourth, many categorizations do not show whether a publication represents vertical or lateral development of knowledge. Vertical development corresponds to what Kuhn (1996) called normal, cumulative science, in which one article builds on another. Lateral development represents an effort to modify and reshape previous knowledge and to discover new knowledge. Lateral development mainly occurs in two realms: (1) in the uncertain and unpredictable reality and at the limits of application of theory to practice, and (2) in conceptual development, comparative study, and multi- and interdisciplinary study.

Several scholars evaluated *PAR* article topics during the periods 1970–76 (Bowman and Hajjar 1978a, 1978b), 1975–84 (Perry and Kraemer 1986), 1940–91 (Bingham and Bowen 1994), and 2000–2005 (Terry 2005) (see table 1). The number of topics examined increasingly has reflected changes in topics and developments of research areas. Bowman and Hajjar (1978b) compared the articles of *PAR* with those of other public administration journals in terms of nine topics; Perry and Kraemer (1986) and Bingham and Bowen (1994) examined *PAR* articles distinguishing 13 and 14 topics, respectively; and Terry (2005) listed 31 topics. Terry's categorization included not only various contemporary research subjects, but also *PAR*'s efforts to create a greater diversity of topics. In other words, the variation in topical development is easier demonstrated with a larger number of topics distinguished. At the same time, the continuity of major topics in public administration, such as management and organization, should not be overlooked. The topical categorization of public administration reflects both the development of subfields and research areas and the changes in topics,[2] but this does not mean the attention to major topics diminishes. Rather, there is continuity as well as variation.

For the analysis of trends in *PAR* topics, we chose to combine the specializations or traditional textbook topics with research areas and new topical interests, thus hoping to capture both continuity and change.[3] Both typology as a deductive categorization and taxonomy as an inductive categorization are employed. Typology demonstrates traditional textbook topics and established research areas, whereas taxonomy shows new topic interests or research areas. Articles are classified primarily along typological lines, identifying 15 topics that mix traditional textbook topics and current research areas (see table 1). An article that does not really fit any of these topics is recorded as a new taxonomical topic. However, a taxonomical topic is not always new, as the topic may have been unnoticed or previously categorized under either one of the traditional textbook topics or one of the established research areas. In other words, taxonomical topics reflect emerging or recurring scholarly or editorial interests in research areas. Six taxonomical topics—politics, society, education, *PAR*, terrorism, and development administration—were distinguished and will be discussed in the next section. Our categorization closely matches those developed previously.

Quantitative Observations on *PAR,* 2000–2009

As we mentioned before, analyses of publication trends in journals are quite common. Earlier analyses—that is, before the late 1970s—are predominantly qualitative by nature, while from that time on, analyses are overwhelmingly focused on capturing trends quantitatively. In this article, we will use both, as we believe that quantitative analysis alone cannot capture intellectual developments adequately.

Total Number of Publications

Up to the early 1990s, *PAR* received about 400 submissions annually. This declined to just above 200 per year by the late 1990s, because the number of high-quality specialized journals had increased substantially (Newland 2000, 27). The number of annual submissions to *PAR* in the first six years of this decade is unknown, but between August 2005 (when the current editorial team started receiving submissions) and December 2009, a total of 977 submissions were received. Though it is beyond the period analyzed in this article, it is important to note that between August 2005 and April 5, 2010, there were 1,208 submissions. This suggests that submissions are steadily increasing.

Between 2000 and 2009, a total of 999 articles, book reviews, and replies were published in *PAR*. Replies include responses to articles, letters to the editor, lectures, interviews, special reports, and public documents. Previous evaluations of academician journals have focused on articles and generally excluded replies and book reviews. These two types of publications were included because the subject matter of a journal is best evaluated when considering all types of publications (nota bene: editorials and brief editorial introductions to articles are not included). Of these 999 documents, 95 were published in special issues (i.e., on September 11 in 2002, on collaborative public management in 2006, on Hurricane Katrina and disaster and risk management in 2007, on the Winter Commission report in 2008, and on comparative Chinese/American public administration in 2009); these were also excluded from this analysis, because

Table 1 Topics in *PAR*, 1970–2009

1970–76	1975–84	1940–91	2000–2005	2000–2009
Discipline		Introspection	PA as a field of study	Study
			PAR report	*PAR* report
		Testimonials	Big questions	Education
			Reflective practitioner	History
Methodology			Methodology	Development administration
			PA theory	
	Administrative theory, bureaucracy, organizational theory,	Government, organizational behavior	Governance	Governance
			Representative bureaucracy	Bureaucracy
		Decision making	Bureaucracy	
Organizational theory			Organizational theory	Organization
			Leadership	
			Reinventing	
			Public/private sector	
	Citizen participation		Citizen participation	Citizen participation
			Nonprofit management	
Management	Management, managerial roles	Management	Management	Management
		Management science and technology	Performance	
			Privatization	Information, e-government
			Technology, e-government	
Policy, planning, programming	Policy making, analysis, evaluation	Policy analysis	Policy	Policy
		Implementation		
	Planning, administrative systems	Program evaluation, planning	Environmental policy	
Personnel	Personnel	Human resources	Human resource	Personnel
			Public service	
Budgeting	Budgeting	Budgeting	Budgeting	Budgeting
	IGR	IGR		IGR
	Urban/regional		Local	
	State			
	Federal		Federal	
Law		Law		Law
	Accountability, responsiveness, public interest values		Accountability	Accountability
		Ethics	Ethics	Ethics
			Comparative	Politics
			Homeland security	Society
Other	Other		Other	Terrorism

Sources: For 1970–76, Bowman and Hajjar (1978b); for 1975–84, Perry and Kraemer (1986); for 1940–91, Bingham and Bowen (1994); for 2000–2005, Terry (2005).

they would skew the numbers. For instance, the special issue on collaborative public management (2006) included 13 articles. When added to the total count, such essays would significantly raise the "share" of public management articles in the overall proportion and thereby disproportionately skew the final tabulation. Of the remaining 904 publications (see table 2), there were 601 articles (66.5 percent), 224 book reviews (24.8 percent), and 79 replies (8.7 percent).

Rise of Foreign Contributions and Gender Diversity, but Decline of Practitioner Authors

The authors are classified in four groups: American academicians and practitioners and foreign academicians and practitioners. When an author belongs to either a research institute or a school, he or she is classified as an academician. Practitioners include civil servants and employees in nonprofit or business organizations. As table 2 underscores, 1,133 American academicians (80.3 percent), 159 foreign academicians (11.3 percent), 106 American practitioners (7.5 percent), and 13 foreign practitioners (0.9 percent) contributed to *PAR* during this period.[4] Foreign contributions mostly came from the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, China, Hong Kong, and South Korea. Focusing only on articles, 985 were written by academicians (93.2 percent) and 72 by practitioners (6.8 percent)—a percentage far smaller than in previous decades.

Earlier, practitioners frequently contributed to the review, but their participation has declined steadily since the 1970s (see table 3). In the 1970s, Bowman and Hajjar (1978a, 222) found that 32 percent of articles in 10 public administration journals were authored by practitioners. Van Wart and Cayer reported that between 1982 and 1986 in five flagship journals—*PAR*, *Public Administration, Canadian Public Administration, Australian Journal of Public*

Table 2 Publication Types and Authors in *PAR*, 2000–2009

	American Academician	Foreign Academician	American Practitioner	Foreign Practitioner
601 articles	854	131	61	11
224 book reviews	204	18	14	0
79 replies	75	10	31	2
904 total	1,133	159	106	13

Table 3 Proportion of Practitioners Writing Public Administration Journal Articles (percent)

	Country	Journal	Academician	Practitioner
1940–69[a]	US	*Public Administration Review*	54.1	45.9
1945–69[b]	UK	*Public Administration*	43.5	53.8
1966–75[c]	US	*Public Administration Review*	65.0	35.0
1970–76[d]	US	Public administration journals	69.5	30.5
1970–76[e]	Canada England India France US	English-language journals in public administration	63.0	32.0
1970s[f]	Australia	*Australian Journal of Public Administration*	43.1	41.9
	Brazil	*Revista de Administação Pública*	34.6	42.2
	Canada	*Canadian Public Administration*	50.7	42.3
1980s[f]	Australia	*Australian Journal of Public Administration*	50.6	40.8
	Brazil	*Revista de Administação Pública*	64.0	18.6
	Canada	*Canadian Public Administration*	62.9	32.7
1970–94[g]	UK	*Public Administration*	79.1	19.3
1989–95[h]	Australia	*Australian Journal of Public Administration*	61.0	39.0
1990–2002[f]	Australia	*Australian Journal of Public Administration*	51.6	36.8
	Brazil	*Revista de Administação Pública*	76.1	17.5
	Canada	*Canadian Public Administration*	69.5	25.0
2000–2009	US	*Public Administration Review*	93.2	6.8

a. Goodall, Barry, and Westing (1972, 54): In the original data, practitioners were employees in federal, state, and local governments, armed forces, consultative agency, business, and foundations.
b. Dargie and Rhodes (1996, 327): Academicians included scholars and research students, whereas practitioners included civil servants, local government officials, and other practitioners. The rest were politicians.
c. Jones and Doss (1977, 274).
d. Bowman and Hajjar (1978b, 158): We added the ratio of researcher to that of academicians.
e. Bowman and Hajjar (1978a, 208): We also added the ratio of researchers to that of academicians. Practitioners were employees in both governments and international and business organizations (222). The remainder (5 percent) belonged to others (222).
f. Candler (2006, 336): We took the ratios of domestic academicians and practitioners from the original data, which also included foreign authors and unspecified authors. Because the author did not separate foreign authors into academicians and practitioners, we excluded them. In addition, we did not take the data of 1958–69 because the ratio of unspecified authors was too considerable.
g. Rhodes et al. (1995, 4): Academicians included scholars and research students, whereas practitioners included civil servants, local government officials, and other practitioners. The rest were politicians.
h. Wettenhall (1997, 191): The percentages were approximate. There were three categories: academicians, public servants, and the rest, which included politicians, journalists, consultants, and so on. The author did not provide the number of the rest. If the rest were counted, the number of Australian practitioner would increase a little bit more.

Administration (*AJPA*), and *International Review of Administrative Sciences*)—and in six political science journals, 17 percent of articles were penned by practitioners (1990, 242). Ross Curnow (1984, 315) observed that in the early 1980s, about 25 percent of articles in the Australian journal were written by practitioner authors. However, 10 years later, and against a trend visible elsewhere, Wettenhall (1997, 191) noted that 39 percent of *AJPA* articles in the 1989–95 period were written by practitioners. Looking at authorship in the Dutch journal *Bestuurswetenschappen* between 1947 and 1996, Raadschelders pointed out that practitioner authorship declined from more than 21 percent between 1947 and 1951 to less than 12 percent between 1992 and 1996 (1998, 29). With regard to the leading British journal, *Public Administration,* Rhodes et al. (1995, 4) and Dargie and Rhodes (1996) discovered that 53.8 percent of articles between 1945 and 1969 were written by practitioners, while between 1970 and 1994, only 19.3 percent came from such authors.

In terms of gender, during the last decade, 405 out of 1,411 authors (28.7 percent) published in *PAR* were female. When only looking at articles, 323 out of 1,059 authors (30.5 percent) were women; this is comparable to the finding of Kellough and Pitts (2005, 4) that 27.7 percent of articles between 2000 and 2003 were written by women. This also compares well to *AJPA,* with 730 males and 200 (21.5 percent) females between 1989 and 1995 (Wettenhall 1997, 191). It is possible that in Australia, too, the number of female authors publishing in *AJPA* has since increased.

Continuity of Topical Interests

Table 4 outlines six taxonomical topics—development administration, education, *PAR*, politics, society, and terrorism—in addition to the traditional 15 typological topics. Among these 21 topics, the top 10 were management (16.8 percent), policy (12.5 percent), personnel management (10.7 percent), organization (10.2 percent), the nature of the study (7.9 percent), bureaucracy (7.0 percent), budget and finance (5 percent), politics (4.8 percent), ethics (3.7 percent), and governance (3.4 percent). When only considering articles, the top 10 topics were management, personnel, organization, policy, study, bureaucracy, budgeting and finance, citizen participation, information and e-governance, and ethics (in this order). *PAR* articles in most cases concerned management, organization, personnel, policy, the nature of the study, and budgeting and finance. This is little different from what Bowman and Hajjar (1978b), Perry and Kraemer (1986), and Bingham and Bowen (1994) discovered, and thus illustrates the continuity of scholarly interests and research topics in the study.

Some small differences, however, were revealed when looking at topical concerns in replies and book reviews. The top five book

Table 4 Number of Publications in *PAR* by Topic, 2000–2009

Topic	Article	Book Review	Reply	Total
Accountability	8	3	0	11
Bureaucracy	39	20	4	63
Citizen participation	23	5	0	28
Development administration	1	0	1	2
Education	10	0	0	10
Ethics	22	8	3	33
Budget/finance	34	8	3	45
Governance	13	12	6	31
Administrative history	4	15	0	19
Intergovernmental relations	14	2	1	17
Information/e-government	23	7	0	30
Administrative law	14	5	1	20
Management	112	30	10	152
Organization	70	12	10	92
PAR	2	0	1	3
Personnel management	79	13	5	97
Policy	64	43	6	113
Politics	19	13	11	43
Society	3	15	0	18
Nature of the study	42	13	16	71
Terrorism	5	0	1	6
Total	601	224	79	904

review topics were policy (19.2 percent), management (13.4 percent), bureaucracy (8.9 percent), administrative history (6.7 percent), and society (6.7 percent). The biggest proportion of replies (20.8 percent) concerned obituary reports and critical responses to published articles; politics was among the top five topics.

Attention to specific taxonomical topics was fairly low: politics (4.8 percent), society (2 percent), and education (1.1 percent). Articles and replies categorized as politics paid attention to chief executives and their legal rights, political and administrative responsibilities, presidential transition, and election systems. Articles and book reviews about society were concerned with social values and issues, such as race and crime. Ten articles on education included attention to curriculum and graduate programs, doctoral dissertations, and career development in public administration. While these articles are closely associated with the academician status of the field, they are significant enough to be classified as a separate research area.

One complicated topic is local and state government as compared to federal government. The categorization in this article differs from that used in previous studies. For instance, Perry and Kraemer (1986) listed intergovernmental relations, urban and regional government, state government, and federal government as separate topics; Bingham and Bowen (1994) counted only intergovernmental relations; and Terry (2005) recorded local government and federal government separately. This topic is difficult to categorize because of its obvious overlap with other topics, such as management and organization. Thus, while intergovernmental relations is counted here as one of 15 primary topics, local and state governments are considered a secondary category.

When an article focused primarily on local and state governments, it was counted as a local or state topic. As a result, among the primary topics, only 17 publications (1.9 percent) were classified as intergovernmental relations, but as a secondary topic, 106 (11.7 percent) and 41 (4.5 percent) publications were concerned with local and state governments, respectively. Local government publications mostly concerned management (27.4 percent), organization (16.0 percent), information and e-government (8.5 percent), citizen participation (7.5 percent), and personnel management (7.5 percent), while state government pieces focused on policy (31.7 percent), management (17.1 percent), budgeting and finance (14.6 percent), personnel management (9.8 percent), and information and e-government (7.3 percent).

Patterns in Methodological Approaches and Comparative Analyses

Earlier stock-taking articles also looked at the research methodology in the study. Bowman and Hajjar (1978b, 161) divided methodologies into the *historical-descriptive, behavioral-empirical, and normative-prescriptive* approaches. They found that the dominant methodology in *PAR* articles was the behavioral-empirical approach (75.4 percent); it is not clear in their article what percentage of these use quantitative-statistical analyses. Perry and Kraemer (1986, 220) classified the methods of 289 articles published between 1975 and 1984 as empirical (52.2 percent), deductive reasoning (broken down into mathematical and logical pieces) (19.0 percent), legal (18.9 percent), historical (3.5 percent), descriptive (3.1 percent), and literature and heuristic analyses (2.1 percent). They broke down the empirical category further into five subcategories,[5] and two of these appeared to include mainly quantitative-statistical pieces (27.3 percent).

We categorized methodologies as historical, biographical, descriptive, normative, critical review, legal, analytical, empirical, and quantitative/statistical.[6] During the last decade, quantitative-statistical (33.4 percent), empirical (27.8 percent), and analytical (18.1 percent) approaches dominated. The remainder included critical review (6.3 percent), normative (4 percent), descriptive (3.3 percent), biographical (3.2 percent), historical (2.7 percent), and legal (1.2 percent) approaches. It seems that quantitative-statistical and empirical pieces have increased since the 1980s, although they clearly are not as prominent in *PAR* as they are, for instance, in the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* Compared to the 1970s and 1980s, the legal approach decreased remarkably in the past decade.

We categorized methodologies as historical, biographical, descriptive, normative, critical review, legal, analytical, empirical, and quantitative/statistical. . . . Because the study of public administration is both culturally and nationally bound as well as a global phenomenon, a comparative and international perspective is important.

Because the study of public administration is both culturally and nationally bound as well as a global phenomenon, a comparative and international perspective is important. An article was labeled comparative when it concerned foreign countries or provided a comparison with the United States. A comparative perspective appeared in 123 out of 904 publications (13.6 percent). Interestingly, the comparative perspective in *PAR* was not categorized separately until Larry Terry's editorial tenure (2000–2005). He counted 24 out of 350 articles (6.9 percent) between 2000 and 2005 as comparative and/or international contributions, ranking this topic second in his 31 categories overall (2005, 644). By contrast, a comparative perspective in *Public Administration* was evaluated as a substantial topic, with 14 percent of articles between 1970 and 1995 (Rhodes et al. 1995, 3–6).

Qualitative Observations about the Past Decade: Three Important Themes

What observations can be made about the past decade? Several themes come to mind. Overall, *PAR* in the past decade hardly showed dramatic changes in the topical development since the 1970s. However, some salient themes cannot be overlooked that identify the past decade but do not show up when looking at topical development in a quantitative manner only. The first is the assessment of New Public Management. While research continued to advance NPM, its critics dramatically increased during the past decade. The second theme is administrative responsiveness to social, economic, and political events. As mentioned earlier, the past decade was among the most tumultuous periods in American history, and the demand for immediate responses and solutions was higher than during "normal" periods. In relation to that, a third theme is the connection between academicians and practitioners.

Assessment of New Public Management

The first theme, New Public Management, dominated the study and practice of public administration over the last three decades. Its advocates touted market-oriented administrative reform and reinvention, results-oriented performance, contracting out and privatization, customer-focused service, more discretion for managers, and the removal of red tape. These ideas and initiatives addressed efforts to solve governmental inefficiency and ineffectiveness, as well as to deal with citizen grievances. During the past decade, however, NPM increasingly met with criticism of its limitations and disadvantages.

NPM supporters and skeptics scrutinized whether their theory and practice were appropriate or satisfying, expressed disappointment with its practices, criticized NPM ideas and underlying assumptions, and formulated several alternatives. Some factors and contexts relevant to NPM were explored in depth to strengthen as well as to refine its theory and practice. First, citizen attitudes and preferences toward NPM were surveyed (Alford 2002; Battaglio and Legge 2009). Second, the success of NPM was found to depend on administrative capacity (Brown and Potoski 2003; Yang, Hsieh, and Li 2009). Third, attention was given to institutional contexts, including legislatures (Kellough and Selden 2003; Ni and Bretschneider 2007; Bourdeaux and Chikoto 2008). At the same time, it was suggested that NPM should focus more on politics (Riccucci and Thompson 2008), law (Kassel 2008), and culture (Haruna 2003). While emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness, NPM was found to be less efficient and effective in its implementation (Leland and Smirnova 2009; Lenkowsky and Perry 2000; Moynihan 2006; Thompson 2000), and the inconsistency between the theory and practice was highlighted (Van Slyke 2003; Williams 2000). Moreover, observers argued that NPM undermined accountability to citizens and civil society (Eikenberry and Kluver 2004; Kelly 2005; Romzek and Johnston 2005), and that legislative and judicial constraints were overlooked (Reed and Meyer 2004). Also, skeptics recommended alternatives to NPM principles, while underlining the importance of publicness (Bozeman 2002; deLeon and Denhardt 2000; Haque 2001; Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller 2000; Van der Wal 2009), citizenship and civil society (Spicer 2004; Vigoda 2002), "substantive democracy" (Box et al. 2001), constitutional democracy (Rosenbloom 2007), public service (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Jos and Tompkins 2009), and "the whole-of-government approach" (Christensen and Lægreid 2007).

By way of summary, both supporters and skeptics generally suggested that NPM goals and practices were often detached from their public and institutional contexts while only focusing on market-based results. Supporters frequently attempted to elaborate on NPM ideas by exploring relevant variables, while skeptics endeavored to remedy the market model by connecting NPM ideas, principles, and theories to other theories as well as to the broader societal context.

Administrative Responsiveness to Social, Economic, and Political Events

The second theme, responsiveness to social, economic, and political events, is not new to the study of public administration. Events in the past decade, mentioned in the introduction, directly or indirectly required urgently needed, ideas, theories, and solutions. Emergency management and homeland security were among the most pressing concerns demanding attention from theory and practice. *PAR* responded to that demand.

First, special issues on September 11 in 2002 and on Hurricane Katrina in 2007 were published in *PAR*. In addition, the special issue on collaborative public management in 2006 also included essays that dealt with emergency management and homeland security. These special issues represented *PAR*'s serious efforts to bring academicians' and practitioners' interests, knowledge, and research together. Also, terrorism and homeland security were studied in relation to, among others topics, administrative reorganization (Wise 2002, 2006), constitutional democracy (Newland 2001), public health policy (Avery 2004), liberty (Lewis 2005), and federalism (Caruson and MacManus 2006; Eisinger 2006). Emergency management was analyzed in terms of administrative leadership (Boin and 't Hart 2003), administrative breakdowns (Schneider 2005), local government (Somers and Svara 2009), and collaboration (Kapucu, Augustin, and Garayev 2009).

In addition to these emergent concerns, notable attention went to political and economic matters, such as election administration (Moynihan 2004; Wise 2001), presidential transitions (Johnson 2008; Kumar 2008; Wellford 2008), and financial crises. *PAR* ran a special symposium on election administration prior to the November 2008 presidential election (September/October) and another on the financial crisis in 2009 (July/August). Administrative responsiveness was reflected in mini-symposia on the federal budget process (March/April 2009) and on the financial crisis (July/August 2009).

Practitioner–Academician Relationships

The third theme concerns the declining contributions of practitioners to the journal. Indeed, both *PAR* and the American Society of Public Administration have struggled to connect the two groups for a long time (Newland 2000). While considered "an impossible job," the connection is believed to be imperative to the study (Stivers 2000). In the last decade, *PAR* editors endeavored to connect the two groups through special sections such as "The Reflective Practitioner," "Academic–Practitioner Exchange," "Theory to Practice," "Administrative Profile," and "Administrative Case Study."

Along with these editorial efforts to connect the two main audiences, academician–practitioner relationships were explored through such topics as research (Bolton and Stolcis 2003; Ospina and Dodge 2005a, 2005b; Streib, Slotkin, and Rivera 2001), theory (Englehart 2001), curriculum (McSwite 2001; Milam 2003), career transition (Handley 2005), and policy (Graffy 2008; Lidman and Sommers 2005). The relations between the two groups were characterized as "the chasm between science and practice" (Bolton and Stolcis 2003, 629) and as "two separate worlds" (Ospina and Dodge 2005b, 412). Despite difficulties in making linkages, all authors emphasized that connecting academicians and practitioners is essential and suggested alternatives for narrowing the gap (Bolton and Stolcis 2003), bringing practical experience into the classroom (Milam 2003), calling for theoretical and research usefulness in practice (Lidman and Sommers 2005; Ospina and Dodge 2005a, 2005b), and marrying (Englehart 2001) or bridging (Graffy 2008) the two groups.

There is no simple answer to the question of why practitioners are contributing less and less to *PAR*. Several explanations come to mind. First, public administration research advanced considerably in the twentieth and early twenty-first century, both in terms of scope and specialization as well in terms of the sophistication of methods. Unintentionally, this has resulted in compartmentalization of knowledge and, possibly, an alienation of practice from the study. To what extent are practitioners disappointed with research and its applicability or usefulness? Does more sophisticated research (in terms of modeling and methods) lead to better application, or does it result in more alienation? Is there empirical research that testifies to a decreasing use of academician work in the government environment? What do we really know about the gap between practitioners and academicians? These questions cannot be answered in the context of this article, but clearly, empirical support is needed for the statement that the gap between practitioners and academicians is widening.

A second possible explanation for declining practitioner authorship is that since the Civil Service Act of 1978, the emphasis has shifted from public service values (including contributing to scholarly journals) to economic rewards (e.g., pay for performance). This might attract a different type of professional to the public service (i.e., one who is less interested in writing). Third, those practitioners who write usually occupy higher-level positions, but these have become increasingly politicized. Perhaps this politicization of higher to top ranks in the career civil service has resulted in a workforce that is more politically and commercially motivated. Fourth, governments increasingly draw on private contractors to do much of their work, including production of their own publications. Contractors who write may overlook or ignore such public service–oriented venues as *PAR*. Fifth, quite simply, recent severe cutbacks in public services in many areas require practitioners to do more with less—hence they have less spare time for the luxury of scholarship. No doubt other explanations are conceivable, but of these five (tentative) explanations, it is only the first that *PAR*'s editors can actively influence.

More Qualitative Observations: What Topics Should Receive More Attention in *PAR*?

While the number of pages in *PAR* has increased considerably (from 96 to 128 pages per issue in 2001, and from 128 to 160 in 2006), thus enabling the publication of more articles, and while the range of topics addressed is quite satisfactory, we want to suggest some topics that require more attention.

First, although the topic has been discussed in *PAR*'s pages, more attention should be given to political–administrative relations, because their interaction cannot help but evolve with the constantly changing larger environment. Administrative problems are not just technical or instrumental challenges, but must be evaluated in their fundamentally political, value-laden context, especially when so many issues divide rather than unite people. Having said that, more research is needed on the influence of civil servants on public policy making and regulation. How proactive are they, and how proactive should they be? There is some evidence that they wield considerable influence, and not just during the implementation phase (Page and Jenkins 2005; Raadschelders and Stillman 2007).

Second, although the nature of the study was one of the top topics during the last decade, we want to suggest more attention to public administration's ontological and epistemological foundations. Perhaps there is less concern about the so-called identity crisis than there was 30–40 years ago, as illustrated by the increasing number of empirical studies using quantitative-statistical research methods. The strong preference for such evidence-based research invites a focus on methods—that is, the tools and techniques used to do research. However, the methods selected are seldom accompanied by statements about the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying the choice of methods. Quantitative research depends on the notion that reality can be objectively known, and thus is independent of researcher bias. That assumption is characteristic of the positivist and empiricist approaches to knowledge,[7] and simply disregards other ways of knowing (e.g., interpretative knowledge characteristics of critical theory, postmodernism, etc.). We encourage authors to briefly reflect on the ontological (what is reality) and epistemological (how can we know reality) basis of their methodology (Raadschelders 2010a). This is facilitated when *PAR* provides a platform for debate about the question of whether and in what sense public administration is a science/discipline or an interdiscipline (Raadschelders 2010a). The emphasis on methodology, without reference to ontology and epistemology, is tantamount to placing the cart before the horse.

Third, *PAR* should encourage generalist articles, given that civic education requires a "broader view . . . of the relation of government to the other social sciences" (Merriam 1934, 97), that "the proper training of 'administrators lies not in the narrow field of administrative theory, but in the broader field of the social sciences generally (Simon 1957, 247), and that "administrative thought must establish a working relationship with every major province in the realm of human learning" (Waldo 1984, 203). In addition, this would also encourage a focus on long-term trends. Generalist views should be provided for any policy area in which government actively provides services and/or regulates. It is true that there are many specialist journals for these and numerous other topics. One of the most difficult tasks for *PAR* is to shine the generalist perspective on these specialized topics.

Fourth, we know little to nothing about how academician articles are received by the community of practitioners. Was Starbuck correct when he observed that there is less attention to the usefulness of research (2006, 3)? By way of example, academician research on diversity management policies and programs confirms Starbuck's statement (Pitts and Wise 2010). We assume that articles are relevant to practice, but is it investigated whether practitioners actually use academician articles as a source of information or inspiration for policy making? That type of investigation has been done in political science. Bennett and Ikenberry found that articles in the *American Political Science Review* after the 1950s normally have been written and consumed by scholars only, with low and indirect relevance to U.S. policy, while practitioners depend on other sources of information (2006, 651–52). With respect to public administration, Van Wart and Cayer found that few articles scored high on policy recommendations (1990, 243), and we suggest that, consequently, practitioners turn elsewhere. Granted, that article was published more than 20 years ago, but is there reason to believe that anything has changed? Practitioners at the specialist level in their career may find specialized journals more useful than a generalist journal such as *PAR*. That, obviously, raises the question of whether *PAR* and other comparable journals reach practitioners who are in the generalist phase of their careers. At this point, we have no clue, although the declining number of practitioner authors may be some indication that *PAR* and other journals are reaching practitioners less and less. Thus, we need to refine our understanding about what practitioners read and want from *PAR*. Has the editorial policy in the past 10 years, encouraging practitioners to read *PAR* (by way of special features) and to write for *PAR*, been successful? Are *PAR* articles accessible, or do they suffer from too much social science jargon and increasingly complex quantitative methodologies?

[PAR's] topical content in the past decade reflects continuity with the previous decades. The majority of submissions remain squarely within the old POSDCORB categories, although the names often may be different.

Fifth, in the past 10 years, there have only been a few historical articles in *PAR*. This may be partially attributable to the use of quantifiable information that usually concerns the recent past. Because there are very few consistent and coherent time series that span at least several decades, longitudinal analyses are few and far between. Developing data sets that span centuries (e.g., Raadschelders 1994) requires a familiarity with archival records and historical research that takes years to acquire and generally is not part of a doctoral curriculum in public administration. Most publications with a historical bent concern either a single organization or the development of a specific political theory over time. What can *PAR* do to increase the use of historical research? (Raadschelders 2010b).

Finally, a historical approach is basically a cross-time comparison, next to the more common cross-level, cross-policy, and cross-national comparisons. While the number of comparative articles in *PAR* may seem decent (123, or 13.6 percent), one could argue that in a globalizing world, more international and comparative articles would be welcome (also recognized at Minnowbrook III). Such comparisons should not be limited to single-country and single-organization studies, as is so often the case. In the most recent decade, *PAR* has received submissions from all over the globe, and this should be encouraged even more.

Concluding Observations: Trends and Future

Trends in the Past Decade

What will be future of public administration as a study? First, let us respond to the questions raised in the introduction, and next reflect on broader issues that are relevant to *PAR*'s future.

PAR publishes articles on every specialization in the study. Its topical content in the past decade reflects continuity with the previous decades. The majority of submissions remain squarely within the old POSDCORB categories, although the names often may be different. "Planning" is frequently addressed as "policy planning," "staffing" as "human resource management," "directing" as "collaborative management," and "reporting" as "e-government."

Also, the journal continues to welcome diverse methodological approaches, although the quantitative-statistical and empirical approaches seem to have increased (61 percent) and are now dominant. The number of female and foreign authors also has increased significantly, but fewer and fewer practitioner authors are contributing to *PAR*. Whether the journal's contents effectively speaks to both practitioners and academicians is more difficult to assess, but editors in the past decade actively continued to reach out to practitioners through such features as "The Reflective Practitioner," "Administrative Profiles," case studies, "Theory to Practice," and so forth. In relation to this, it is important to note that little is known about who reads *PAR*, how its contents are used outside the immediate academic environment, and what practitioners want or expect from *PAR*, as well as how *PAR* compares in the eyes of its readers to more specialized public administration journals.

Despite the expanded number of pages per issue, several subject areas remain underserved, particularly those related to the "core" functions of the modern administrative state, such as science and technology innovation, regulatory oversight, national security affairs, local criminal justice, tax administration, the administration of foreign affairs (especially in relation to international organizations), and economic management. Also, there is little attention in the study to long-term trends, but this is something that is not easily repaired because of a lack of interest in and knowledge about the past. Missing as well is a concern for the conceptual foundations of the study, a topic that is perhaps more important to academicians than to practitioners. Nonetheless, policy-making processes are squarely buttressed by truth claims about the knowledge that academicians develop. In their article "Recovering, Restoring, and Renewing the Foundations of American Public Administration: The Contributions of Herbert J. Storing," Morgan et al. argue that more attention should be given in the public administration curricula to constitutional law, political history, political theory, and political biography (2010, 632).

This leads to a question: What is the nature and future of the study, and how can *PAR* help shape that nature and future? Based on the findings about trends in *PAR*'s past decade, substantive continuity, as well as continuity in the perspectives on the nature of the study, is evident. Interestingly, the Simon–Waldo debate about science versus profession is as relevant today as it was 60 years ago.

The Future of the Study: Facts and Technique over Values and Purpose?

Historical, political theory, comparative, legal, biographical, and generalist articles based on qualitative research are less pursued by scholars publishing in *PAR* today than articles employing rigorous quantitative and empirical analysis (more than 60 percent of articles). Why is that? Are the latter considered superior to, say, methodologies derived from law, history, or philosophy, or to such newer approaches as critical theory, postmodernism, hermeneutics, narratives, and so forth? If considered superior, on what grounds? Public administration scholars explicitly address methods and methodology, yet they pay much less attention—if any at all—to the ontological (Wamsley 1996) and epistemological foundations on which their choice of methods and, ultimately, administrative knowledge rests. Thus, the quality of knowledge is seen as determined by methods and methodology. What does it mean that one-third of *PAR* articles employ quantitative-statistical techniques and that another 28 percent of articles are empirical by nature? How can this increasing domination of "science," narrowly defined, be understood? How can we understand the method-driven nature of public administration research and comprehend its ever-greater reliance on expert knowledge? Most critical, does this salient trend serve to advance the study as a whole?

The emphasis on rigor, objectivity (i.e., independence of observation), factual nature, and the evidence-based character of findings, all facilitated by a focus on methods (i.e., method-driven research), is motivated by the desire to develop public administration as a "scientific" discipline that is clearly demarcated from other disciplines (Shapiro 2005, 86). Scholars using "quants" are well acquainted with the limitations of such methods (generalizability, reductionism), yet the knowledge generated through analyzing data sets by means of quantitative methods and mathematical models is considered more scientific. Why is that?

Up to the late eighteenth century, "science" generally was defined as a "body of organized knowledge"; since then, "science" increasingly is defined as a "certain type and quality of knowledge and procedure" (Waldo 1984, 182 n. 50) Thus, "science" drifted more and more toward narrowly defined positivist and empirical knowledge that is based on facts that are established independently from the observer's or researcher's personal biases (Bond 2007, 897). This drive for better "science" was in large part a function of the increased desire of governments for facts and was matched by the scholarly desire to emulate the Newtonian model of the natural sciences. Scholarship prioritized the discovery of better methods (tools and techniques of research) and better methodology (guidelines for the use of methods) over epistemology. This approach to knowledge was supported by David Hume's conviction that fact and value should be distinguished if not separated (see Bond 2007, 899), with major consequences for public policy and for scholarship.

Practitioners believed that policy should be more scientifically based, allowing the legitimacy of government action to rely on expert authority. Run by experts, the state should base policy on observed empirical facts, not on subjective opinions. From the late eighteenth century on, government officials started to collect and analyze data statistically (Scott 1998). How quickly data and "stats" became important is captured well by Dr. Faust: "What you can't calculate, you believe not to be true; What you can't weigh, has no weight for you; What you can't cost, has no value for you" (Goethe 1832, 12).[8] At the same time, though, Kant noted and warned that the contemporary scholar was like a Cyclops who knows many facts but disregards philosophy—that is, disregards attention to (1) the values and ends served by knowledge and (2) how to valuate knowledge.[9] We assume that Kant's observation targeted scholars, but it is just as applicable to practitioners.[10] Have Hume's distinction and Faust's observation triumphed to the point that the positivist and empirical aspects of science dominate contemporary administrative research and policy? Has Kant's warning about the narrowing of "science" fallen by the wayside? The increased use of the phrase "evidence-based research" seems to suggest this. What are the consequences of this narrower definition of science as far as public administration is concerned?

The answer to this question takes us into the topic of increased reliance on expert knowledge. In the course of the nineteenth century, governments increasingly looked for expertise generated by scholars. The emergent social sciences were regarded as the natural home for mapping society's challenges and problems and steering the state. Stimulated by impressive discoveries in astronomy, biology, and physics, social scientists tried to emulate the Newtonian "natural science" model. They hoped and searched for the greater precision and more reliable methods achieved by their natural science colleagues. The need for expertise fueled specialization, both in terms of knowledge of a specific area of research (as evidenced by literature reviews showing the gaps in knowledge and/or approach on which an article or book is written) and of specific methods (as evidenced in the level of sophistication and parsimony).

Specialization, however, may well lead to, as Mead recently called it, "scholasticism," or the tendency to be overly specialized and ingrown (2010, 453). Potentially, the drive to specialize may well isolate one body of knowledge from that of others. Some indications already exist that public administration research is isolated from (some) other fields of study (see Wright 2011). Specialization also runs counter to the practitioner's need for applied generalist knowledge that helps one cope with the immediate concerns of government. Is there a widening gap between theory generation and the day-to-day practices of public administration?

A narrower definition of science also emphasizes a focus on gathering and analyzing measurable facts only, pretending that the valuation of them is best left to political, administrative, and judicial authorities. Was Robert Oppenheimer correct in disregarding the political and societal ramifications of the Manhattan Project that led to the development of the atom bomb? In later years, he regretted this disinterest. In public administration research, is it really possible to sever factual and value judgments? Can democratic, constitutional values be set aside when conducting quantitative-statistical and empirical research into any administrative topic? Specialization, which seems so natural to quantitative and empirical research, results in microscopic research, knowing more about less, the content, methods and literature only understood by a small group of experts.[11]

When public administration scholars focus on what is measurable, they risk losing sight of big questions about issues that do not allow for measurement. Big questions can be answered through macroscopic research, as Mills called it (1959, 125), that defines social problems and challenges in terms of their specific and historical structures and contexts. In this approach, theory is used to conceptualize and define the research topic, while methods provide the procedures and techniques to pursue the research (Walker 2010, 444). This kind of problem-oriented research, tackling issues and problems larger than any single approach could handle, was favored by German scholars such as Max Weber (Lindenfeld 1997, 296), as well as by such American scholars as Leonard White, Luther Gulick, and Dwight Waldo. Macroscopic research tackles the big questions that practitioners would like to see answered. They can be raised, if not answered, in pieces that are oriented to the more generalist audience of policy and decision makers and interested and engaged citizens. The multifaceted nature of the society that public servants deal with requires that public administration students should be systematically exposed to interdisciplinarity. They have to learn how to search for and process information about social problems and public policy challenges across the entire range of the social sciences. Only by embracing interdisciplinarity can the study of public administration map, discuss, and address the big questions that government faces.

The American Society for Public Administration and *Public Administration Review* were established more than seven decades ago by professionally oriented academicians and practitioners who recognized the importance of nurturing and strengthening both the science and the art of public administration. The increasing intertwinement and complexity of government and society warrant that *PAR* continue to attempt to bridge practitioners and academicians by publishing research and ideas useful to both audiences. When the study of public administration is regarded as merely a science, narrowly defined and increasingly specialized, and when *PAR* editors do not actively seek and encourage a range of approaches to understanding public sector issues, *PAR*'s unique role and value of connecting academe and praxis will suffer. Indeed, the study may well become irrelevant to practice. If quantitative-statistical, empirical, specialized, studies eclipse a generalist administrative science, practitioner input and interest in the study of public administration will decline, if not end.

The increasing intertwinement and complexity of government and society warrant that *PAR* continue to attempt to bridge practitioners and academicians by publishing research and ideas useful to both audiences.

Acknowledgments
The authors would like to thank the following reviewers for their insightful comments: Guy Adams, Chet Newland, David Rosenbloom, Curt Ventriss, and Gary Wamsley.

Notes
1. Public administration is not a traditional discipline, but rather a field of both study and practice.
2. By way of contrast, the investigation of the British journal *Public Administration* for the period 1945–95 used the same topic categorization, thus capturing nicely the long-term development (Dargie and Rhodes 1996; Rhodes et al. 1995). In light of the total number of articles in *PAR* since 1940 (4,668; see Björkman 2010), we have refrained from providing a more systematic contrast between the previous six decades and the last decade.
3. The traditional textbook topics include the nature of the study, organization, management, personnel management, budgeting and finance, policy, intergovernmental relations, administrative law, and ethics and accountability. These topics are not always clearly separated from established research areas. For instance, bureaucracy can be a traditional topic as well as a research area.
4. The real number of authors is lower than the numbers reported here because some authors published two or more articles in *PAR* during this period.
5. Case study; cross-sectional, correlational analysis; structural equations (e.g., Path analysis, LISREL); controlled field or laboratory analysis.
6. Although these approaches are not mutually exclusive, we are focused on the primary methodology of articles. An article containing some survey data without quantitative-statistical analysis was classified as empirical, as were case studies. The analytical approach refers to theoretical and conceptual analyses of concepts and topics with limited empirical material. A piece was considered normative when prescriptive. Descriptive pieces lack any reflection on theoretical meaning and lack a literature review, but are more reports on a salient issue (e.g., Toregas 2000). When an article examined some scholarly writing or previously published articles, it was categorized as the critical review approach. Articles using legal cases and laws were categorized as the legal approach. The biographical pieces profiled a practitioner or academician in the larger context of a specific institutional history.
7. In his comment on chapter 3 in the fourth edition of his *Administrative Behavior,* Simon suggested that "positivism" could easily be replaced with "empiricism" (1997, 66). There is a difference, though. A positivist approach is based on the idea that knowledge can be acquired through empirical testing and verification of hypotheses; an empiricist approach is based on the (Lockean) notion that knowledge can be acquired through sensory experience.
8. The same thought is found in Postman's characterization of Taylor's scientific management: "That what cannot be measured either does not exist or is of no value" (1993, 51).
9. Kant's regard for the changing definition of science in his time is quite strident, as is clear from the following two remarks: "cyclopean erudition . . . lacks one eye, the eye of philosophy; and a cyclops of mathematics, history, natural history, philology, and languages is a learned man who is great in all these fields but takes philosophy to be dispensable (1988, 50); and "Nobody cares about wisdom, because it makes science, which is a tool of vanity, rather small" (1996, 28 n. 30).
10. The increasing focus on facts, science (in the narrow sense), and expertise has had perverse as well as puzzling consequences. For scholars, it produced the belief that they are not responsible for the use of their research in the day-to-day practice of government; for practitioners, it produced the behavior of "hiding" behind "science" and expertise when presenting policy ideas instead of outlining what values prompted a policy choice and what values a policy choice is supposed to support. In the words of Price, "science cannot either solve our policy problems for us or stand aside from them" (1967, 275). In a way, it is puzzling that practitioners hammer the anvil of facts and science, as they often need immediate information that, even when incomplete, helps them cope with and muddle through present challenges; the "scientist" requires solid data sets and rigorous analyses that take the kind of time not often available to public policy makers who are pressed for quick responses to social problems.
11. That research appears to be more and more microscopic in scope is not only a consequence of specialization, but also, as Mead describes, of nonempiricism (i.e., lack of "hands-on" inquiry), methodologism, and a focus on literature (i.e., past research) (2010, 453–55). Specialization and focus on (recent) literature are enabled by the technology provided by the Internet and has major consequences for the ability to deeply process wide-ranging information. It appears that the increased use of "hypermedia" such as the Internet (clicking, zapping, skipping, skimming, scanning) "is already damaging the long-term memory

consolidation that is the basis for true intelligence. Only be combing data stored deep within our brain can we forge new ideas. No amount of magpie assemblage can compensate for this slow, synthetic creativity" (*Newsweek* 2010, 88). The capacity for concentration, contemplation, and reflection is slowly but surely eroding (Carr 2010, 141; Greenfield 2009, 71). This superficial absorption of literature is facilitated by online availability of journal publications, resulting in a narrowing of science and scholarship: "articles referenced tend to be more recent, fewer journals and articles were cited, and more of those citations were to fewer journals and articles." As a consequence, older and seemingly less relevant literature is overlooked, and "[f]indings and ideas that do not become consensus quickly will be forgotten quickly" (Evans 2008, 395, 398). Does analysis of data sets sufficiently compensate for the type of deep and wide-ranging thinking so characteristic of the works of, only by way of example, Harold Berman, Shmuel Eisenstadt, Norbert Elias, Robert Heilbroner, Barrington Moore, Karl Polanyi, Joseph Schumpeter, Theda Skocpol, Charles Tilly, Thorstein Veblen, and Max Weber?

References

Alford, John. 2002. Defining the Client in the Public Sector: A Social-Exchange Perspective. *Public Administration Review* 62(3): 337–46.

Augier, Mie, James G. March, and Bilian Ni Sullivan. 2005. Notes on the Evolution of a Research Community: Organization Studies in Anglophone North America, 1945–2000. *Organization Studies* 16(1): 85–95.

Avery, George. 2004. Bioterrorism, Fear, and Public Health Reform: Matching a Policy Solution to the Wrong Window. *Public Administration Review* 64(3): 275–88.

Bailey, Kenneth D. 1994. *Typologies and Taxonomies: An Introduction to Classification Techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Battaglio, R. Paul, Jr., and Jerome S. Legge, Jr. 2009. Self-Interest, Ideological/Symbolic Politics, and Citizen Characteristics: A Cross-National Analysis of Support for Privatization. *Public Administration Review* 69(4): 697–709.

Becher, Tony, and Paul R. Trowler. 2001. *Academician Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines.* 2nd ed. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Bennett, Andrew, and G. John Ikenberry. 2006. The *Review*'s Evolving Relevance for U.S. Foreign Policy 1906–2006. *American Political Science Review* 100(4): 651–58.

Bernick, Ethan, and Skip Krueger. 2010. An Assessment of Journal Quality in Public Administration. *International Journal of Public Administration* 33(2): 98–106.

Bingham, Richard D., and William M. Bowen. 1994. "Mainstream" Public Administration over Time: A Topical Content Analysis of *Public Administration Review*. *Public Administration Review* 54(2): 204–8.

Björkman, Jame Warner. 2010. Comparative Public Administration. Foundations of Public Administration Series. http://www.aspanet.org/scriptcontent/index_par_foundationsseries.cfm [accessed October 5, 2010].

Boin, Arjen, and Paul 't Hart. 2003. Public Leadership in Times of Crisis: Mission Impossible? *Public Administration Review* 63(5): 544–53.

Bolton, Michael J., and Gregory B. Stolcis. 2003. Ties That Do Not Bind: Musings on the Specious Relevance of Academician Research. *Public Administration Review* 63(5): 626–30.

Bond, Jon R. 2007. The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Revolution in Political Science. *Journal of Politics* 69(4): 897–907.

Boulding, Kenneth. 1958. Evidences for an Administrative Science: A Review of the *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Volumes 1 and 2. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 3(1): 1–22.

Bourdeaux, Carolyn, and Grace Chikoto. 2008. Legislative Influences on Performance Management Reform. *Public Administration Review* 68(2): 253–65.

Bowman, James S., and Sami G. Hajjar. 1978a. English-Language Journals in Public Administration: An Analysis. *Public Administration* 56(2): 203–25.

———. 1978b. The Literature of American Public Administration: Its Contents and Contributors. *Public Administration Review* 38(2): 156–65.

Box, Richard C., Gary S. Marshall, B. J. Reed, and Christine M. Reed. 2001. New Public Management and Substantive Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 61(5): 608–19.

Bozeman, Barry. 2002. Public-Value Failure: When Efficient Markets May Not Do. *Public Administration Review* 62(2): 145–61.

Brown, Trevor L., and Matthew Potoski. 2003. Contract-Management Capacity in Municipal and County Governments. *Public Administration Review* 63(2): 153–64.

Caldwell, Lynton K. 1965. Public Administration and the Universities: A Half-Century of Development. *Public Administration Review* 25(1): 52–60.

Candler, G. G. 2006. The Comparative Evolution of Public Administration in Australia, Brazil, and Canada. *Canadian Public Administration/Administration Publique du Canada* 49(3): 334–49.

Carr, Nicholas. 2010. *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Caruson, Kiki, and Susan A. MacManus. 2006. Mandates and Management Challenges in the Trenches: An Intergovernmental Perspective on Homeland Security. *Public Administration Review* 66(4): 522–36.

Chevallier, Jacques. 1996. Public Administration in Statist France. *Public Administration Review* 56(1): 67–74.

Christensen, Tom, and Per Lægreid. 2007. The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review* 67(6): 1059–66.

Chubin, Daryl E. 1976. The Conceptualization of Scientific Specialties. *Sociological Quarterly* 17(4): 448–76.

Clemens, Elisabeth S., Walter W. Powell, Kris McIlwaine, and Dina Okamoto. 1995. Careers in Print: Books, Journals, and Scholarly Reputations. *American Journal of Sociology* 101(2): 433–94.

Colson, Harold. 1990. Citation Rankings of Public Administration Journals. *Administration & Society* 21(4): 452–71.

Crane, Diana. 1972. *Invisible Colleges: Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Curnow, Ross. 1984. Journals of Public Administration: Conflicting Constituencies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 43(4): 311–19.

Daft, Richard L., and Arie Y. Lewin. 1990. Can Organization Studies Begin to Break Out of the Normal Science Straightjacket? *Organization Studies* 1(1): 1–9.

Dargie, Charlotte, and R. A. W. Rhodes. 1996. *Public Administration* 1945–1969. *Public Administration* 74(2): 325–32.

deLeon, Linda, and Robert B. Denhardt. 2000. The Political Theory of Reinvention. *Public Administration Review* 60(2): 89–97.

Denhardt, Robert B., and Janet Vinzant Denhardt. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 549–59.

Eikenberry, Angela M., and Jodie Drapal Kluver. 2004. The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review* 64(2): 132–40.

Eisinger, Peter. 2006. Imperfect Federalism: The Intergovernmental Partnership for Homeland Security. *Public Administration Review* 66(4): 537–45.

Englehart, Judith K. 2001. The Marriage between Theory and Practice. *Public Administration Review* 61(3): 371–74.

Evans, James A. 2008. Electronic Publication and the Narrowing of Scholarship. *Science,* July 18, 395–99.

Forrester, John P., and Sheilah S. Watson. 1994. An Assessment of Public Administration Journals: The Perspective of Editors and Editorial Board Members. *Public Administration Review* 54(5): 474–82.

Gaus, John M. 1950. Trends in the Theory of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 10(3): 161–68.

Giles, Michael W., Francie Mizell, and David Patterson. 1989. Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22(3): 613–17.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. 1832. *Faust: Der Tragödie. Zweiter Teil in fünf Akten.* Boston: D. C. Heath, 1955.

Golembiewski, Robert T. 1996. The Future of Public Administration: End of a Short Stay in the Sun? Or a New Day A-Dawning? *Public Administration Review* 56(2): 139–48.

Goodall, Merrill R., James Barry, and Marilyn B. Westing. 1972. *Public Administration Review*: 1940 through 1969. *Public Administration Review* 32(1): 52–57.

Graffy, Elisabeth A. 2008. Meeting the Challenges of Policy-Relevant Science: Bridging Theory and Practice. *Public Administration Review* 68(6): 1087–1100.

Greenfield, Patricia M. 2009. Technology and Informal Education: What Is Taught, What Is Learned. *Science*, January 2, 69–71.

Handley, Donna Milam. 2005. The Best of Both Worlds: A Former Practitioner Transitions to Life as a Full-Time Academician. *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 624–27.

Haque, M. Shamsul. 2001. The Diminishing Publicness of Public Service under the Current Mode of Governance. *Public Administration Review* 61(1): 65–82.

Haruna, Peter Fuseini. 2003. Reforming Ghana's Public Service: Issues and Experiences in Comparative Perspective. *Public Administration Review* 63(3): 343–54.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 2005. ASR's Greatest Hits: Editor's Comment. *American Sociological Review* 70(1): 1–3.

Johnson, Clay. 2008. Recommendations for an Effective 2008 Transition. *Public Administration Review* 68(4): 624–26.

Jones, William A., Jr., and C. Bradley Doss, Jr. 1977. Contributions to the *Public Administration Review:* 1966–1975. *Public Administration Review* 37(3): 270–75.

Jørgensen, Torben Beck. 1996. From Continental Law to Anglo-Saxon Behaviorism: Scandinavian Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(1): 94–103.

Jos, Philip H., and Mark E. Tompkins. 2009. Keeping It Public: Defending Public Service Values in a Customer Service Age. *Public Administration Review* 69(6): 1077–86.

Kant, Immanuel. 1988. *Logic.* Trans. Robert S. Hartman and Wolfgang Schwarz. New York: Dover.

———. 1996. *Critique of Pure Reason.* Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Kapucu, Naim, Maria-Elena Augustin, and Vener Garayev. 2009. Interstate Partnerships in Emergency Management: Emergency Management Assistance Compact in Response to Catastrophic Disasters. *Public Administration Review* 69(2): 297–313.

Kassel, David S. 2008. Performance, Accountability, and the Debate over Rules. *Public Administration Review* 68(2): 241–52.

Kellough, J. Edward, and David W. Pitts. 2005. Who Contributes to *Public Administration Review*? Examining the Characteristics of Authors Who Submit Manuscripts to the Journal. *Public Administration Review* 65(1): 3–7.

Kellough, J. Edward, and Sally Coleman Selden. 2003. The Reinvention of Public Personnel Administration: An Analysis of the Diffusion of Personnel Management Reforms in the States. *Public Administration Review* 63(2): 165–76.

Kelly, Janet M. 2005. The Dilemma of the Unsatisfied Customer in a Market Model of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 65(1): 76–84.

Kickert, Walter J. M. 1996. Expansion and Diversification of Public Administration in the Postwar Welfare State: The Case of the Netherlands. *Public Administration Review* 56(1): 88–94.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumar, Martha Joynt. 2008. Getting Ready for Day One: Taking Advantage of the Opportunities and Minimizing the Hazards of a Presidential Transition. *Public Administration Review* 68(4): 603–17.

Lee, Kwang-Hoon, and Jos C. N. Raadschelders. 2008. Political–Administrative Relations: Impact of and Puzzles in Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman, 1981. *Governance* 21(3): 419–38.

Leland, Suzanne, and Olga Smirnova. 2009. Reassessing Privatization Strategies 25 Years Later: Revisiting Perry and Babitsky's Comparative Performance Study of Urban Bus Transit Services. *Public Administration Review* 69(5): 855–67.

Lenkowsky, Leslie, and James L. Perry. 2000. Reinventing Government: The Case of National Service. *Public Administration Review* 60(4): 298–307.

Lewis, Carol W. 2005. The Clash between Security and Liberty in the U.S. Response to Terror. *Public Administration Review* 65(1): 18–30.

Lidman, Russell, and Paul Sommers. 2005. The "Compleat" Policy Analyst: A Top 10 List. *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 628–34.

Lindenfeld, David F. 1997. *The Practical Imagination. The German Sciences of State in the Nineteenth Century.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, Lawrence M. 2010. Scholasticism in Political Science. *Perspectives on Politics* 8(2): 453–64.

McSwite, O. C. 2001. Theory Competency for MPA-Educated Practitioners. *Public Administration Review* 61(1): 100–115.

Merriam, Charles E. 1934. *Civic Education in the United States.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Milam, Donna M. 2003. Practitioner in the Classroom: Bringing Local Government Experience into the Public Administration Curriculum. *Public Administration Review* 63(3): 364–69.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, Douglas F., Kent A. Kirwan, John A. Rohr, David H. Rosenbloom, and David Lewis Schaefer. 2010. Recovering, Restoring, and Renewing the Foundations of American Public Administration: The Contributions of Herbert J. Storing. *Public Administration Review* 70(4): 621–33.

Moynihan, Donald P. 2004. Building Secure Elections: E-Voting, Security, and Systems Theory. *Public Administration Review* 64(5): 515–28.

———. 2006. Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 77–89.

Newland, Chester A. 2000. The *Public Administration Review* and Ongoing Struggles for Connectedness. *Public Administration Review* 60(1): 20–38.

———. 2001. Fanatical Terrorism versus Disciplines of Constitutional Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 61(6): 643–50.

Newsweek. 2010. The Effects of the Internet: Fast Forward. June 24, 88.

Ni, Anna Ya, and Stuart Bretschneider. 2007. The Decision to Contract Out: A Study of Contracting for E-Government Services in State Governments. *Public Administration Review* 67(3): 531–44.

Norris, Pippa, and Ivor Crewe. 1993. The Reputation of Political Science Journals: Pluralist and Consensus Views. *Political Studies* 41(1): 5–23.

Ospina, Sonia M., and Jennifer Dodge. 2005a. It's About Time: Catching Method Up to Meaning—The Usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research. *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 143–57.

———. 2005b. Narrative Inquiry and the Search for Connectedness: Practitioners and Academicians Developing Public Administration Scholarship. *Public Administration Review* 65(4): 409–23.

O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr., and Kenneth J. Meier. 1999. Modeling the Impact of Public Management: The Implications of Structural Context. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(4): 505–26.

Page, Edward C., and Bill Jenkins. 2005. *Policy Bureaucracy: Government with a Cast of Thousands.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, Donald. 2006. Taking Stock of the Criteria We Use to Evaluate One Another's Work: *ASQ* 50 Years Out. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 51(4): 535–59.

Perry, James L., and Kenneth L. Kraemer. 1986. Research Methodology in the *Public Administration Review,* 1975–1984. *Public Administration Review* 46(3): 215–26.

Perry, James L., and Lois Recascino Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367–73.

Pitts, David W., and Lois Recascino Wise. 2010. Workforce Diversity in the New Millennium: Prospects for Research. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 30(1): 44–69.

Pollitt, Christopher. 1996. Antistatist Reforms and New Administrative Directions: Public Administration in the United Kingdom. *Public Administration Review* 56(1): 81–87.

Postman, Neil. 1993. *Technopoly. The Surrender of Culture to Technology.* New York: Vintage.

Price, Don K. 1967. *The Scientific Estate.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Raadschelders, Jos C. N. 1994. Understanding the Development of Local Government: Theory and Evidence from the Dutch Case. *Administration & Society* 25(4): 410–42.

———. 1998. Vijftig Jaar Bestuurswetenschappen, 1947–1996. In *Bestuurswetenschappen. Een analyse van 50 Jaar Bestuurswetenschappen,* edited by H. M. de Jong, 4–39. Den Haag: VNG-Uitgeverij.

———. 2010a. Identity without Boundaries: Public Administration's Canon(s) of Integration. *Administration & Society* 42(2): 131–59.

———. 2010b. Is American Public Administration Detached from Historical Context? On the Nature of Time and the Need to Understand It in Government and Its Study. *American Review of Public Administration* 40(3): 235–60.

———. Forthcoming. The Study of Public Administration in the United States. *Public Administration* 89(1).

Raadschelders, Jos C. N., and Richard J. Stillman II. 2007. Towards a Conceptual Framework for Studying Administrative Authority. *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 29(1): 4–40.

Reed, Christine M., and Kyle P. Meyer. 2004. Medicaid Managed Care for Children with Special Health Care Needs: Examining Legislative and Judicial Constraints on Privatization. *Public Administration Review* 64(2): 234–42.

Rhodes, R. A. W., Charlotte Dargie, Abigail Melville, and Brian Tutt. 1995. The State of Public Administration: A Professional History, 1970–1995. *Public Administration* 73(1): 1–16.

Riccucci, Norma M., and Frank J. Thompson. 2008. The New Public Management, Homeland Security, and the Politics of Civil Service Reform. *Public Administration Review* 68(5): 877–90.

Romzek, Barbara S., and Jocelyn M. Johnston. 2005. State Social Services Contracting: Exploring the Determinants of Effective Contract Accountability. *Public Administration Review* 65(4): 436–49.

Rosenbloom, David H. 2007. Reinventing Administrative Prescriptions: The Case for Democratic-Constitutional Impact Statements and Scorecards. *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 28–39.

Sayre, Wallace S. 1951. Trends of a Decade in Administrative Values. *Public Administration Review* 11(1): 1–9.

———. 1958. Premises of Public Administration: Past and Emerging. *Public Administration Review* 18(2): 102–5.

Schneider, Saundra K. 2005. Administrative Breakdowns in the Governmental Response to Hurricane Katrina. *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 515–16.

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Seibel, Wolfgang. 1996. Administrative Science as Reform: German Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(1): 74–81.

———. 2010. Beyond Bureaucracy—Public Administration as Political Integrator and Non-Weberian Thought in Germany. *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 719–30.

Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sigelman, Lee. 2006. The Coevolution of American Political Science and the American Political Science Review. *American Political Science* Review 100(4): 463–78.

Siffin, William J. 1956. The New Public Administration: Its Study in the United States. *Public Administration* 34(4): 365–76.

Simon, Herbert A. 1957. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization.* 2nd ed. New York: Free Press.

———. 1997. *Administrative Behavior. A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization.* 4th ed. New York: Free Press.

Smith, Kevin B. 2002. Typologies, Taxonomies, and the Benefits of Policy Classification. *Policy Studies Journal* 30(3): 379–95.

Somers, Scott, and James H. Svara. 2009. Assessing and Managing Environmental Risk: Connecting Local Government Management with Emergency Management. *Public Administration Review* 69(2): 181–93.

Spicer, Michael. 2004. Public Administration, the History of Ideas, and the Reinventing Government Movement. *Public Administration Review* 64(3): 353–62.

Starbuck, William H. 2006. *The Production of Knowledge: The Challenge of Social Science.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stivers, Camilla. 2000. "An Impossible Job": Report on the Building Bridges Tour. *Public Administration Review* 60(3): 194–99.

Storing, Herbert J. 1962. The Sciences of Administration: Herbert A. Simon. In *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics,* edited by Herbert J. Storing, 63–150. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Streib, Gregory, Bert J. Slotkin, and Mark Rivera. 2001. Public Administration Research from a Practitioner Perspective. *Public Administration Review* 61(5): 515–25.

Terry, Larry D. 2005. Reflections and Assessment: *Public Administration Review,* 2000–05. *Public Administration Review* 65(6): 643–45.

Thompson, James R. 2000. Reinvention as Reform: Assessing the National Performance Review. *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 508–21.

Toregas, Costis. 2000. Lessons from the "Y2K and You" Campaign for the Local Government Community. *Public Administration Review* 60(2): 84–88.

Van der Wal, Zeger. 2009. Public Value Privatized? The Need for a Continuous Emphasis on How to Actualize the Public Interest. *Public Administration Review* 69(1): 166–67.

Van Slyke, David M. 2003. The Mythology of Privatization in Contracting for Social Services. *Public Administration Review* 63(3): 296–315.

Van Wart, Montgomery, and N. Joseph Cayer. 1990. Comparative Public Administration: Defunct, Dispersed, or Redefined? *Public Administration Review* 50(2): 238–48.

Vigoda, Eran. 2002. From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens, and the Next Generation of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 62(5): 527–40.

Vocino, Thomas, and Robert H. Elliott. 1982. Journal Prestige in Public Administration: A Research Note. *Administration & Society* 14(1): 5–14.

———. 1984. Public Administration Journal Prestige: A Time Series Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 29(1): 43–51.

Waldo, Dwight. 1974. Editorial: About the Review. *Public Administration Review* 34(2): 95–96.

———. 1984. *The Administrative State: A study of the political theory of American Public Administration.* 2nd ed. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Walker, Thomas C. 2010. The Perils of Paradigm Mentalities: Revisiting Kuhn, Lakatos, and Popper. *Perspectives on Politics* 8(2): 433–51.

Walters, Lawrence C., James Aydelotte, and Jessica Miller. 2000. Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review* 60(4): 349–59.

Wamsley, Gary L. 1996. A Public Philosophy and Ontological Disclosure as the Basis for Normatively Grounded Theorizing in Public Administration. In *Refounding Democratic Public Administration: Modern Paradoxes, Postmodern Challenges,* edited by Gary L. Wamsley and James F. Wolf, 351–401. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wellford, Harrison. 2008. Preparing to Be President on Day One. *Public Administration Review* 68(4): 618–23.

Wettenhall, Roger. 1997. Reflections on *AJPA* and Other Public Administration Journals. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 56(1): 189–98.

Whitley, Richard. 1974. Cognitive and Social Institutionalization of Scientific Specialties and Research Areas. In *Social Processes of Scientific Development,* edited by Richard Whitley, 69–95. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Williams, Daniel W. 2000. Reinventing the Proverbs of Government. *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 522–34.

Wise, Charles R. 2001. Election Administration in Crisis: An Early Look at Lessons from Bush versus Gore. *Public Administration Review* 61(2): 131–39.

———. 2002. Organizing for Homeland Security. *Public Administration Review* 62(2): 131–44.

———. 2006. Organizing for Homeland Security after Katrina: Is Adaptive Management What's Missing? *Public Administration Review* 66(3): 302–18.

Wright, Bradley. 2011. Public Administration as an Interdisciplinary Field: A Research Note Assessing Its Relationship with Other Fields of Law, Management, and Political Science. *Public Administration Review* 71(1).

Yang, Kaifeng, Jun Yi Hsieh, and Tzung Shiun Li. 2009. Contracting Capacity and Perceived Contracting Performance: Nonlinear Effects and the Role of Time. *Public Administration Review* 69(4): 681–96.