



Ontology in Public Administration Includes Potential, Positivism and Rationalism Approaches

Antonio Daniguelo

Public Administration, University of Minho, Portugal

Corresponding Author: Antonio Daniguelo



Article Info

Article history:

Received 4 November 2020
Received in revised form 15
November 2020
Accepted 27 November 2020

Keywords:

Public Administration
Ontology
Approach

Abstract

This paper discusses Public Administration Ontology departing from the fundamental understanding of administrative ontology, which is a thought based on the nature and meaning contained in administration itself as a branch of administrative science. The ontology basis of scientific development of public administration in the context of the philosophy of administrative science is the essence of what is studied from the aspect of how the public administration process is managed properly to regulate, serve and protect the public interest. So here the government bureaucracy and also non-governmental organizations that play a role in carrying out government functions, both in the implementation of public services and economic, social and other development fields collectively. Substantially the area of study for managers' work has a variety of interests from governance and public matters, from defense and security to social welfare and environmental quality, from road and bridge design and construction to space exploration and from tax and financial administration to management issues. human Resources. This paper also discusses the Administrative Ontology Approach, Positivism and Rationalism in Administration.

Introduction

Departing from the substantial and historical aspects of ontology is a fundamental part of philosophy, because the birth or existence of ontology cannot be separated from the role of philosophy. Conversely, the development of ontology also strengthens the existence of philosophy. Ontology is related to the theory of existence, existence, or reality. For those who accept the basic premises of modern Western culture, it may be hard to imagine why public administration theorists even talk about things like this. Aren't all rational people agree on the bottom line? If not, surely these problems are questions for philosophy, religion, or physics. Public administration scholars should focus on the theoretical questions of the scientific method and alternative ways of knowing as the basis of our theory and practice. Indeed, our field invests a great deal of attention in these epistemological issues in shaping administrative studies (Adams 1992; Box 1992; Houston and Delevan 1990, Raadschelders, 1999; White, 1990).

The thinking in the ontology of administrative science starts from the existence of evidence, or an in-depth investigation to the core of the problem that can be treated at any time. Ontological thinking in administration, of course, begins with proof, or in other words, a conscious and deep investigation to the real root of the problem and can be applied anytime and anywhere and is relatively fundamental in its true content. Public administration science in its application is carried out with an approach that must be prioritized. To achieve progress in various aspects of life and modern life, it must prioritize the guidance and development of science.

Basic Administrative Ontology

The discussion of the basis of administrative ontology is the basis of the development of thoughts on the justification and truth contained by the science of administration itself. On the basis of the ontology that the scientific development of public administration in the context of the philosophy of administrative science, is the essence of what is studied from the aspect of how the public administration process is properly managed to regulate, serve and protect the public interest. Administrative science ontology has a total character rather than things that are characterized by abstraction and concrete. Administrative science ontology which is characterized by abstractness because it is only in the human mind which is very unlimited and its reach can only be reached by the mind. Meanwhile, administrative ontology has concrete characteristics because it can be directly observed by the human senses and the results can be directly enjoyed.

Public administration wants how to focus better services for all human citizens with their new creativity. We have to think of the best way to work at all levels of government. We want and develop partnerships with non-profit institutions and non-governmental organizations (non-governmental organizations). We have to start with the Millennium approach pattern that has a degree of ignorance of a number of accounts and that is required to be presented to us as public administration officers.

The Nature of Public Administration

To answer questions in administrative ontology, a fast and precise method of thinking is needed. Thus, administrative ontology always asks something that is understood or known, because questions are part of reason as a product of human thought.

Historically, the development of administration and management as "art" is based on modern human knowledge about past events in certain cultures. Apart from being defined as administrative activity and cooperation, administration is also defined as a profession or expertise. And because administration is a profession, many cases occur due to administrative problems. And this can worsen the image of an organization in the eyes of the public / society. An organization can go forward or backward, live or die, move or remain silent, it will depend on the administration carried out by the people or members of the organization concerned. Therefore administration as a science must and can be studied, so that it can be utilized / used for the benefit of society in order to create welfare.

On the basis of the ontology that the scientific development of public administration in the context of the philosophy of administrative science, is the essence of what is studied from the aspect of how the public administration process is properly managed to regulate, serve and protect the public interest. So here the government bureaucracy and also non-governmental organizations that play a role in carrying out government functions, both in the implementation of public services and economic, social and other development fields collectively. Substantially the area of study for managers' work has a variety of interests from governance and public matters, from defense and security to social welfare and environmental quality, from road and bridge design and construction to space exploration and from tax and financial administration to management issues. human Resources.

Seeing this above, administration automatically falls into the category of applied social science. According to Robert Presthus (1958) State administration is said to be a science and an art when it designs and implements public policies. His opinion was supported by Dimock, who said that as a study of State administration, it discusses every aspect of government activities that are intended to implement law and give influence to public policy. Meanwhile, according to Waldo, State Administration is said to be the organization and management of people and

things in order to achieve government goals. State Administration is also said to be the art and science of management which is used to regulate State affairs.

Potential and Administrative Ontology Approaches

Administration exists because people need it, along with the increasingly complex needs of society that must be met immediately by an organization. In its implementation, administration is carried out by administrators, namely officers who are attached to the administration itself. So that there is no abuse in the implementation of administration, then administration must be studied through an education or training so that it becomes a profession. It can be said that the potential ontology of administrative science is human thinking about the contents of this world.

In essence, there is no obstacle or obstacle for administrative scientists anywhere and at any time to carry out actions and thoughts about the creation of that arrangement and order optimally. Any kind of bipolarity that requires the creation of order and order in the science of administration indicates the possibility, and even the desire for, maximum integrity. The obligation of administrative scientists in order to think, based on ontological thinking in transidential truth and empirical truth, lies in the structure of the reasoning of each administrative scientist. If there is a lack of harmony, a lack of truth, and goodness, then it does not arise from the nature of the ontology of administrative science, but is an event for some reason and reality always exists, as long as there is one there is.

Administrative roles as permanent social positions held by certain individuals will disappear entirely, replaced by functions that must be fulfilled in accordance with the needs of the situation. Affected groups of individuals will use a phenomenological form of collaborative decision-making in which intersubjective agreements are reached through communicative action in a flowing network. As such, all participants play a co-creator role in governance, i.e. through highly nested groups and linking affected individuals. Using an interpretive approach (White, 1992; White & Adams, 1994) to content analysis, this investigation reviews Follett's key writings to explain his ontological assumptions. It then explores the basic principles of process philosophy, as first articulated by White and later developed by contemporary process scholars, in the hope that this thinking can provide a coherent ontological basis for Follettian governance and the collaborative tradition of public administration theory, serving to strengthen and expand philosophical foundations and recipes for practice.

According to Sharma (1966) in Administration as a Field of Study a number of approaches in administration. The Operational Approach, namely administration as a work process starting from a logical analysis of human activities (administrators), which is then identified and organized and determining the sub-processes of the administrative process in order to achieve organizational or business goals, both in whole and in part. The difference with other administrative approaches is that this approach is purer in the administration (activities) carried out by humans (administrators) without looking at other supporting factors.

The Empirical Approach is an administrative approach that starts from the experiences of previous successful administrators or an observation of successful administrative practices in order to equip prospective administrators to effectively manage their future activities. Therefore this approach is known as an experiential approach because of its persistence in self-centering. on the study of experiences intended to understand and explain administrative phenomena. The difference with other administrative approaches is that this approach relies on the case study method and the method of comparing events between the past and the current one.

The Human Behavior Approach is an administrative approach which is basically humans as the main motor of administrative processes or the main elements of administration with the

argument that individual and group efforts in order to realize organizational goals will be achieved if the principles of psychology (the science of human behavior) are applied. The difference with other administrative approaches is that in this approach human behavior / psychology is the main element of administration.

The Social Systems approach is that administration as a social system in which biological, physical and social factors are very influential on humans and the environment, so this can be overcome by working together or administering. Important contributions from this approach include recognition of organizations as social organizations, awareness of the institutional underpinnings of administrative authority, the role of informal organizations in the realization of organizational goals, understanding of group behavior in social systems and a view of the social obligations of administration. The difference with other administrative approaches is that this approach seeks to identify social groups, find cultural relationships and integrate them into social systems.

The Mathematical Approach is a logical process so it can be expressed in terms of mathematical symbols, the desire is that the administrative function can determine processes and mathematical models that can be used to predict results. The benefits of this approach: demands to think regularly, determine problems precisely, ability to deal with complex problems and its success in reducing the subjective element in / from administration. The difference with other administrative approaches is that this approach uses mathematics as a basic administrative tool. The Decision Theory approach views decision making as a real function of administration where decision / theory is a rational method for / choosing an action based on possible alternatives. This approach is an administrative characteristic and vital function of / within any organization. This approach grew out of the economic sphere, demonstrating the impact of economic theories on development.

The difference with other administrative approaches is that this approach emphasizes decision factors such as the decision-making process, which affects decisions etc. as dominant in the implementation of an administration. Although many of these approaches show some differences in the meaning of public administration publicity, a closer look at this approach shows that there are only two principles used to separate public organizations from private organizations. The first of these principles is recognized in the economist's core approach and involves the production of goods. The second principle can be found in both a political approach and a normative perspective; it does not concern the production of goods but rather the way the organization influences the running of government and society. In other words, the principle that differentiates public and private organizations lies in the way these organizations influence the public interest.

The dimensional approach does not present a new principle for limiting public and private organizations, but combines the two principles that have been presented. The generic approach does not allow a description of the concept of publicity, not because the distinction between public and private organizations is refuted but because of methodological and empirical considerations. As such, it does not help in building a suitable conceptual understanding of public administration publicity.

From the two principles that differentiate public and private organizations, it can be concluded that there are two ways of conceptualizing public administration publicity. First, organizational publications related to the publication of goods; second, publicity related to publicity in the public interest. These two ways of conceptualizing public organization publicity are called conceptual versions of public administration publicity. This version can be characterized as (1) The economist's version links the publicity of public administration with the publicity of public

goods. (2) The political version links public administration publicity with publicity in the public interest. This division aims to find a consistent description of public administration publicity. The presence of two conceptual versions seems to contradict this aim. In order to find out whether the desired consistency can still be achieved, three possibilities must be explored.

Positivism and Rationalism in Administration

In the view of positivism, knowledge can never exceed facts. It is clear that in this way empirical science is appointed as a special example in the field of knowledge in general. The point of positivism has to do with what empiricism aspires to. Positivism also prioritizes experience (Bertens, 1991). Administrative rationalism is a method used to acquire knowledge in the field of administration. Rationalism assumes that the source of knowledge comes from the mind. In addition, the flow of rationalism does not deny the existence of experience, but that experience becomes a stimulant to the thought process. Descartes as a pioneer of the flow of rationalism, always tries to find a truth that cannot be doubted (Clarke, 1982).

Rationalism in administration includes 3 approaches, the first is administrative rationalism which includes the dominant government's response to environmental problems, by emphasizing the role of experts over citizens. The institutions identified in this approach are pollution control institutions that exist at the international, national and subnational levels. However, no global perspective has been identified, which means that expertise and research can be influenced or directed toward preferred perspectives or ideologies. Right-wing politicians have even claimed that scientific neutrality is effectively impossible (Dryzek, 2013).

The second approach is democratic pragmatism. Estimated as a response to the deficiencies that exist in administrative rationalism, this approach aims to make administration more responsive and flexible in accordance with existing conditions at a certain time period (Fiorino, 2004). To make it happen, it is necessary to democratize environmental administration; which can occur through public consultation, alternative dispute resolution, policy dialogue, public deliberations, public inquiries or right to know laws. Of course, either of these types implies - or intends to - broaden the scope of participating actors.

The third approach, economic rationalism, offers a way for market mechanisms to achieve the goals of the public interest. According to Dryzek (2013), the government must play a peripheral role. Their participation is linked to establishing basic market rules, with the potential implications of natural resource privatization. A growing market for environmental goods will provide a further path of action, which proponents perceive as environmental protection.

Conclusion

Thought in the ontology of administrative science starts from the existence of evidence, or an in-depth investigation to the core of the problems found. The main approaches are the scientific approach and the human approach to achieve progress in various aspects of life and modern life. The ontology basis of scientific development of public administration in the context of the philosophy of administrative science is the essence of what is studied from the aspect of how the public administration process is managed properly to regulate, serve and protect the public interest. In the view of positivism, knowledge can never exceed facts while administrative rationalism is a method used to acquire knowledge in the field of administration. Then rationalism assumes that the source of knowledge comes from the mind.

References

Adams, Guy B. (1992). Enthrallled with Modernity: Th e Historical Context of Knowledge and Th eory Development in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 52(4):

- Box, Richard C. (1992). An Examination of the Debate over Research in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 52(1): 62–69.
- Houston, David J., and Sybil M. Delevan. (1990). Public Administration Research: An Assessment of Journal Publications. *Public Administration Review* 50(6): 674–81.
- Raadschelders, Jos C. N. (1999). A Coherent Framework for the Study of Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(2): 281–303.
- White, Orion F. (1990). *Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate*. In *Refounding Public Administration*, edited by Gary L. Wamsley et al., 182–245. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- White, J.D. (1992). Taking language seriously: Toward a narrative theory of knowledge for administrative research. *American Review of Public Administration*, 22, 75–88.
- White, J.D., & Adams, G.B. (1994). Making sense with diversity: The context of research, theory, and knowledge development in public administration. In J.D. White & G.B. Adams (Eds.), *Research in public administration: Reflections on theory and practice* (pp. 1–22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sharma, C. L. (1966). Administration as a Field of Study. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 32(4), 287–300.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2013). *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. 3rd. Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fiorino, D. J. (2004). Flexibility. In: R. F. Durant, D. J. Fiorino and R. O’Leary (eds). *Environmental Governance Reconsidered: Challenges, Choices, and Opportunities* (pp. 393–425). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Clarke, D. M. (1982). *Descartes' philosophy of science*. Manchester University Press.
- Berten, A. (1991). Tradition démocratique et universalité. *Cahiers de philosophie politique et juridique de l'Université de Caen*, (20), 31–53.
- Presthus, R. V. (1958). Toward a theory of organizational behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48–72.