PUBLICNESS IN THE VIEWPOINT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

CHULASAK CHARNNARONG

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Science, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand
E-mail: brakmae@yahoo.com

Abstract - This research has 2 objectivities which were: 1) to study defining the word "Publicness" as shown in Public Administration Curriculum and 2) to study defining the word "Publicness" aligned with the perspective of Public Administration Academics. QualitativeResearch: the document analyzer andopen ended questionnaire was research tool. By using the content analysis. There were 24 key informants. The results of this research indicated that

1. Defining the word "Publicness" as shown in Public Administration Curriculum, it has been mostly found as an emphasis that Publicness aligned with the concept belief of Publicness regarded as "those who perform activities" (79.17%) and the concept belief of Publicness regarded as "the output with public target" (20.84%).

2. The defining the word "Publicness" in the perspective of Public Administration Academics, it has been most found that major data providers interpreted such word definition as being public or public matters.With the concept belief of Publicness regarded as "the output with public target" (87.50%) and the concept belief of Publicness regarded as "those who perform activities" (12.50%). Because this concept related with ultimate goal of Public Administration: well-being of people and public interest.

Keyword - Publicness; Public Administration

I. INTRODUCTION

Udo Pesch (2008) cited that every science particularly social science expected to be precise for study regarded as central concept. Nevertheless, Public Administration could be regarded as interdisciplinary research associated with critical state of distinctive aspect whereas central concept hardly found but central concept of Public Administration regarded as public issue. In regard to wording "Public", it has been explained in Dictionary of Royal Academy(Royal Academy, 2013) that this is for general people; e.g. public park, public phone, public well, etc. For instance, this road is not public, please do not dressdisgracefully. Summarized as above mentioned definition, public could be defined as anything which affects several things generally not specific and basically related to location could be commonly used by everyone without any specific owners. Though, in regard to academic study of political science and public administration, wording "Public" might be collapsed with other issues particularly such word related to the issue "Publicness" could be defined asthose who take action and action result in terms of public administration. When this word merged with public administration terminology and methodology, there is academic difference and complexity in several aspects as shown in several words; for instance, public service, public interest, public people, public policy, and public choice.

Therefore, wording "Public" might not be regarded as just general issue and affects general people not specifically as a group of lecturers; Political Sciences Study, Chulalongkorn University (Siriphan Noksuan and Ake Tangsubwattana: Editor, 2003) whereas Pitsanu Sangiampong mentioned definition of such word in terms of academic with the subject "Public Sphere" dependent on 3 perspectives. The first perspective, public sphere could be defined as public sector or government with bureaucratic divisions as mechanism to proceed for further public interest. Public sector got procedure objective and activities for government law enforcement as well as public service.The second perspective, public sphere could be defined as society by considering activity result issue; for instance, private sector activity result (or individual) got overall social impact summarized as public sphere representing broader perspective than the previous perspective. It could be summarized that all the activities got public impact. Therefore, public classification could be replacement divided into narrow or broad public sphere.The last perspective, public sphere could be defined as unity in society in terms of division or organization which is different from individual or pre-unity condition (Though, there is individual unity to proceed further particular activity or business; for instance, unity as business organization regarded as interest group). Furthermore, there is unity between individual organized as division which is not public sector division but proceed further activity as public interest. Therefore, it might be difficult to come to an agreement rather than unity issue like this characteristic whether it is public scope by considering from particular perspective in terms of which objective could be replacement as mentioned characteristic.

Defining the word "Public" could be regarded as the core of study or it might be called major analytical unit of public administration which could not yet be summarized or come to an agreement.

In reviewing literature as mentioned issue as shown in the study of Udo Pesch (2008) aligned with the concept fundamental from Rainey (1997), Scott and Falcone (1998), this issue has been summarized into

5 academic approaches having public sphere analysis comparing with private sectors as the following approaches: 1)The generic approach: as mentioned difference between public and private sphere, practically every organization should have private and public sphere so they are different in major issues. 2) The economist core approach: public and private sphere are different in major issues regarded public related to the state whereas private related to the market. 3) The political core approach: public and private sphere are different regarded the difference caused by political and policy factors. 4) The normative approach: the concept extended from the political core approach by not focusing on political factors but instead focusing on public and private targets which are different in terms of public interest. And 5) The dimensional approach: the hybrid of political and economic approach focusing on the difference of political and economic factors by regarding organization as integration of public and private sphere. It has been summarized that they are divided into 2 major academic approaches as below: (1) Economist version is related to public administration in terms of public goods issue focusing on "Publicness" from the issues of factor or manufacturer whether who performs public activity. And (2) Political version is related to public r administration with public interest issue focusing on "Publicness" from the issue of result or manufacturer whether the target is for public.

Therefore, the researcher regarded the study of defining definition "Publicness" will be consistent with resolution includes academic development of such issue by adopting the concept of "Publicness" study to be investigated whereas public administration got both responsibility and relation directly with important content significant content of such word by investigating from the content as shown in public administration study curriculum and from the perspective of public administration academics to apply such concept and perspective in creating further application approach for public sector administration. So,this research got 2 objectives as below:1) to study defining the word "Publicness" as shown in public administration curriculum. And 2) to study defining the word "Publicness" aligned with the perspective of public administration academics.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In conducting research to be aligned with such objective from major research data provider consistent with research objective as the first objective. The major research data analyzed from the document related to the issue using the word "Publicness" as shown in public administration study curriculum through explanation by each particular subject aligned with postgraduate course structure of public administration of each university opened for teaching in Thailand. The data excerpted from explanation by public administration fundamental subject and by other subjects in major compulsory subjects program of public administration study as follows (24 universities Altogether): 7 Public Universities,12 Rajabhat Universities and 5 Private Universities Aligned with the second objective whereas full-time public administration postgraduate program lecturers as major data provider teaching public sector administration fundamental subjects of several universities in Thailand by indicating major 24 data providers by each category of universities as well as the first objective.

In collecting data aligned with objectives and from the document commenced from definition of the word "Publicness" as shown in public administration curriculum through explanation by public administration fundamental subjects under public administration postgraduate program structure of several universities as opened for teaching in Thailand as well as collecting data from open-ended questionnaires from full-time public sector administration lecturers of several universities opened for teaching in Thailand as the sample group.

Data analysis could be regarded as qualitative research and aligned with 2 research objectives by using the same data analysis which is "content analysis".

III. RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research result could be divided into 2 parts as below:

1) Defining the word "Publicness" as shown in public administration curriculum, it has been mostly found as an emphasis that "Publicness" aligned with the concept belief of "Publicness" regarded as those who perform activities (79.17%) and the concept belief of "Publicness" regarded as the output with public target (20.84%)in Table 1.

Defining the word "Publicness"	**"those who perform activities"**	**"output with public target"**	**Total**
Frequency (Percent)	19 (79.17%)	5 (20.84%)	24 (100%)

Table 1 Represent the definition the word "Publicness" as shown in public administration curriculum (N=24)

2) Defining the word "Publicness" in the perspective of public administration academics in terms of major 2 issues as follows: (1) Regarding to the general definition issue of "Publicness", it has been most found those major data providers interpreted such word definition as being public or public matters (29.17%). And (2) "Publicness" has been interpreted as most people interest (20.82%) and capability to use something together or the privilege to use something together (12.50%)in Table 2.

The definition the word "Publicness"in general	(N=24)	
	Frequency	Percent
1. being public or public matters	7	29.17
2. most people interest	5	20.82
3. to use something together or the privilege to use something together	3	12.50
4.Every part of society	2	8.33
5.Opportunity to receive in equality	2	8.33
6.Peopleor Citizen	1	4.17
7. The activities of the gathering	1	4.17
8. Public participation	1	4.17
9. Public policy	1	4.17
10. Public service	1	4.17
Total	24	100

Table 2 Represent the definition the word "Publicness"in general (N=24)

Regarding to the perspective of public administration academics toward study of "Publicness", it has been mostly found that public administration academics thought that an emphasis on study of "Publicness" should focus on the concept belief that this could be regarded as the output with public target (87.50 %) and those who performs public activity (12.50%). in Table 3.

Defining the word "Publicness"	"those who perform activities"	"output with public target"	Total
Frequency (Percent)	3 (12.50%)	21 (87.50 %)	24 (100%)

Table 3 Represent the definition the word "Publicness" as shown in perspective of Public Administration Academics (N=24)

Therefore, public administration academics (as shown in public administration curriculum) thought there should be the study of "Publicness" aligned with the concept belief that "Publicness" could be regarded as those who perform activities with the reasons that public administration academics should maintain scope of major study in terms of public sector and public interest. In contrary, public administration academics thought "Publicness" should be studied aligned with the concept belief that it could be regarded as the output with public target with the reason related to the maximum target of public administration in terms of people happiness and public interest.

So, it is so interesting that there are something difference with the real situation: in public administration curriculum, it has been mostly found as an emphasis that "Publicness" aligned with the concept belief of "Publicness" regarded as "those who perform activities". This is about public servant; government. But when they teach or in lecturerstatus, they must highlight in contrast, they use the term "Publicness" with the concept belief that it could be regarded as the "output with public target". This is about public participation; public interest. The truth is different from what is done.So, we must review what should be done.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Science, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand. I am grateful to all of those with whom I have had the pleasure to work during this and other related projects. Each of the members of my research supporters has provided me extensive personal and professional guidance and taught me a great deal about both academic research idea and life in general. I would especially like to thank Associate Professor Dr.Cholavit Jearajit, Dean, Faculty of Social Science. As my teacher and mentor, he has taught me more than I could ever give him credit for here. He has shown me, by his example, what a good researcher (and person) should be. Nobody has been more important to me in the pursuit of this project than the members of my family. I would like to thank my parents, whose love and guidance are with me in whatever I pursue. They are the ultimate role models**.**

REFERENCES

(1) Book :

[1] Baldwin, J. N., & Farley, Q. A. (2001). Comparing the public and private sectors in the United States: A review of the empirical research. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), **Handbook of comparative and developmental public administration** (2nd ed., pp. 119-130). New York: Marcel Dekker.

[2] Bozeman, Barry. (1987). **All organizations are public: Bridging public and private organisational theories**. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

[3] Deway, John . (1954). **The Public and It Problems**. Chicago: Swallow Press.

[4] Frederickson, George H. (1997). **The spirit of Public administration**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

[5] Nigro, Felix A. and Lloyd G. Nigro.(1984). Modern Public Administration, Cambridge: Harper and Row.

[6] Noksuan, Siriphan and Tangsubwattana, Ake: Editor, (2003). **Words and Ideas in Contemporary Politics**. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

[7] Rainey, Hal G. (1997). **Understanding & managing public organizations**. second edition, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

[8] Royal Academy. (2013). **Dictionary of Royal Academy**. Bangkok:Nanmee Publications.

(2) The Article Research, Thesis and Journal:

[1] Anderson, Stuart. (2013) .the End of Publicness? Public and Private Healthcare organizations are alike in all Important respects in **International Journal of Public and Private Healthcare Management and Economics**, 3(3-4), 44-61, July-December 2013.

[2] Anderson, Stuart. (2013). Publicness Organisational Characteristics and performance: An Investigation of Public and Private Hospitals in England. International Journal of Public and Private Healthcare Management and Economics, 3 (1). pp. 33-50.

[3] **Andrews**, Rhys; Boyne, **George A.** and Walker, **Richard M.** (2011). Dimensions of Publicness and Organizational Performance: A Review of the Evidence**Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**, Volume 21 Issue supple 3, July.

[4] Antonsen, Marianne and Jørgensen, Torben Beck.(2002). The 'Publicness' of Public Organizations.Article. Public Administration 75(2):337 - 357 · December.

[5] Bozeman, B. and Moulton, Stephanie**.** (2011). Integrative Publicness: A Framework for Public Management Strategy and Performance**.** Research paper**. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**, Oxford University Press**.**

[6] Bozeman, B. and Rainey, H.G. (1998). Organisational Rules and the Bureaucratic Personality. **American Journal of Political Science**. Vol.42 No.1, pp.163-189.

[7] Goldstein, Susan Meyer; Naor, Michael (2005) Linking publicness to operations management practices: a study of quality management practices in hospitals **Journal of Operations Management** 23 (2005) 209–228.

[8] Mathews, David. (1984).The public in theory and practice. **Public Administration Review**. (Special issue on citizenship and public administration , H.G Frederickson and R.C. Chandler, eds.) , Mar.

[9] Moulton, Stephanie M., and Barry Bozeman. (2008). Public value failure and the subprime mortgage lending market: Implications for managing publicness. **Presented** at the Public Values Research Workshop Copenhagen, May 2008.

[10] Moulton, Stephanie M. (2007). More than intent: evaluating publicness in mortgage lending. **Presented** at the Public Management Research Association Conference, Tucson, AZ, October 26, 2009. Putting together the publicness puzzle: A framework for realized publicness. Public Administration Review 69:899–900.

[11] Pesch,Udo. (2008) .The publicness of public administration. **Administration and Society**. 40:170–93.

[12] Rainey, Hal, and Barry Bozeman. (2000). Comparing public and private organizations: Empirical research and the power of the a priori. **Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**. 10:447–70.

[13] Rainey, Hal, Robert W. Backoff, and Charles H. Levine. (1976). Comparing public and private organizations. **Public Administration Review** 36:233–246.

[14] Scott, P.G. and Falcone, S. (1998). Comparing Public and Private Organisations : An Exploratory Analysis of Three Frameworks. **American Review of Public Administration**, Vol.28 No.2, pp.126-145.

[15] Shaw, L.C., and Clark Jr., R.T. (1972). The Practical Differences between Public and Private Sector Collective Bargaining. **UCLA Law Review**, Vol.19 No.6.

[16] Solomon, E.E. (1986). Private and Public Sector Managers: An Empirical Investigation of Job Characteristics and Organisational Climate. **Journal of Applied Psychology**. Vol.71 No.2, pp.247-259.

★★★