



Public Administration and the Field of Public Policy Studies in the USA and Brazil

Marta Ferreira Santos Farah

To cite this article: Marta Ferreira Santos Farah (2014) Public Administration and the Field of Public Policy Studies in the USA and Brazil, Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 16:1, 45-61, DOI: [10.1080/13876988.2013.787694](https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2013.787694)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2013.787694>



Published online: 30 Jul 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 156



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Public Administration and the Field of Public Policy Studies in the USA and Brazil

MARTA FERREIRA SANTOS FARAH

Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo da Fundação Getúlio Vargas – FGV-EAESP, São Paulo – SP, Brazil

ABSTRACT *This paper discusses the presence of public policy as a subject of the public administration discipline in Brazil and the USA. The US experience is included due not only to the role the USA played in founding the discipline, but also to the influence it exerted on the establishment of the field of public policy studies in Brazil. Emphasis is given to turning points within public administration discipline, which resulted in the inclusion of public policy as its subject. It also discusses the impact of changes in the political regime on the Brazilian development of the field of public policy.*

Introduction

In the past several decades, public policy has gained a renewed academic interest, especially in developing countries. The reasons for the relevance of the field vary from country to country, as does the way the field develops in each place, including aspects such as the institutional locus of policy studies, education, and the relationship with other academic disciplines and government activities.

In Brazil, this new centrality has its roots in the democratization of the 1980s and in the fiscal adjustments of the 1990s (Souza 2006; Hochman *et al.* 2008). More recently the centrality of public policy studies has been strengthened under the influence of government incentives, giving birth to an embryonic “public policy movement”, which engaged different disciplines in a process of “bringing public policy back in”. In this context, a seminar on the contribution of distinct disciplines to the study of public policy was held in 2010 during a meeting of the Brazilian Association of Political Science (Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP). This paper is a revised version of my contribution to that forum.¹ It attempts to answer the following question: what was the contribution of public administration to the constitution and development of the field of public policy? Due to the centrality of the USA to the constitution of the field of public policy as well as to public administration as an academic discipline, and given the influence the USA exerted on the development of the

Marta Ferreira Santos Farah is Professor of Public Policy in the Department of Public Management, at Fundação Getúlio Vargas, São Paulo, Brazil. She specializes in public policy studies, local government policies and innovation. She is also the Associate Dean for the Graduate Programme in Public Administration and Government at FGV-SP and the editor of *Cadernos Gestão Pública e Cidadania*, a Brazilian journal with focus on public management, public policy and citizenship. She has published several articles on local policies and innovation, on dissemination of local policies and on gender and public policy.

Correspondence Address: Marta Ferreira Santos Farah, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo da Fundação Getúlio Vargas – FGV-EAESP: Coordenadoria do Curso de Mestrado e Doutorado em Administração Pública e Governo, Av. 9 de julho, 2029, 3º andar, 01313-902, São Paulo – SP, Brazil. Email: Marta.Farah@fgv.br

discipline in Brazil and on the public policy field, the paper includes a discussion of both countries.²

The analysis of the contribution of public administration to the field of public policy required examination of the constitution and development of the discipline in both countries. In Brazil, the literature on public administration had discussed the influence of the USA, but did not consider the public policy subfield. There is also a gap in the literature on comparative public administration and on comparative policy analysis. It does not include a discussion about the development of these fields comparing Brazil and the USA. This paper tries to contribute to filling the gap found in these different “bodies” of academic literature.

The paper shows how the dissociation between administration and politics affected the foundation of the discipline of public administration in both countries, as the main commitment of those engaged in this process was to contribute to the rupture with patrimonialism. Due to this dissociation, until the middle of the twentieth century, public policy was not a focus of the discipline.

The paper also shows that, in the 1960s, there was a reaction against this insulation of administrators in the realm of an exclusively scientific, technical and “neutral” knowledge. The public policy movement in the USA was responsible for the recognition that public servants and public administrators “make” policies and could no longer deal only with the execution of policies established by politicians. At this moment, the public administration discipline included public policy as one of its main foci in the USA.

The inclusion of public policy as a subject within the public administration discipline also occurred in Brazil at this time, due to the strong influence exerted on the development of the discipline in this country by American institutions, mainly by American universities, since the 1950s.

But the development of public administration and policy studies, as the paper shows, followed different paths in Brazil and in the USA after the interruption of the democratic regime in Brazil in 1964. Only in recent decades, after the redemocratization of Brazil in the 1980s, did public policy reassume relevance in academia. The American influence during this recent period has been exerted mainly through the theories of the field. To develop the argument, I present first the USA case and then the Brazilian development of public administration and public policy studies. The first three sections of the paper are dedicated to the analysis of the USA. First, I discuss the origins of the discipline with emphasis on the influence of the dissociation between administration and politics to the exclusion of public policy as a subject; then I analyse how and why public policy became a focus of teaching and research in public administration in the USA; and the impact of the changes in the frontiers of the state on the discipline. The next three sections are devoted to the case of Brazil: I present an analysis of the establishment of a modern public administration in Brazil, which occurred also under the influence of the paradigm which opposes politics and administration; then I reconstruct the process of inclusion of public policy as a subject of the discipline, under direct influence of the USA, showing also the specificities of the field in this country; and I discuss the recent development of the discipline of public administration and the prominence of public policy studies since democratization. In the concluding section, I present a synthesis of the argument about the evolution of relations between public administration and the field of public policy, showing that the discipline developed through very distinct paths in the USA and in Brazil.

The Public Administration Discipline and the Administration–Politics Dichotomy

The public administration discipline emerged more than a century ago in the USA as an area of training and field of study which aimed to prepare public servants for modern public administration. The article “The study of administration” by Woodrow Wilson, published in the journal *Political Science Quarterly* in 1887 (Wilson 1887), and the book *Politics and Administration*, written by Frank Goodnow in 1900 (Goodnow 1900 *apud* Henry 1975), were the founding pillars of the discipline. The new discipline established differentiation between public administration and politics, with a view to overcoming practices of patronage and patrimonialism, which had hitherto characterized public administration in the USA (Ozlak 1982).

The academic discipline has its origins in scientific tradition, one of the public administration traditions which consolidated from the turn of the nineteenth century onwards.³ The science of administration envisaged public administration as a sphere of the execution of policies defined within the field of politics by the executive (Henry 1975). The discipline focused on training government bureaucrats responsible for the execution or implementation of public policies.

According to this tradition, bureaucrats should act in an apolitical and impartial manner, based on solid professional training. They should be oriented by “scientific principles of administration” and follow general procedural rules (Henry 1975; Hood 1995).

The new discipline was affiliated to political science:

Political science, as a report issued in 1914 by the Committee on Instruction on Government of the American Political Science Association, was concerned with training for citizenship, professional preparations such as law, and training “experts and to prepare specialists to governmental positions”. *Public administration, therefore, was a clear and significant subfield of political science, and political science departments in universities were perceived as the logical place in which to train public administrators.* (Henry 1975, p. 379; emphasis added)

The prevalence of the paradigm based on the separation between administration and politics meant that public policy was not the subject of analysis within the discipline until the 1950s: “the study of public policy making and related matters was left to the political scientists” (Henry 1975, p. 379).⁴

The disassociation between administration and politics gave rise to a search for valid comprehensive principles for the administration of all kinds of organization, regardless of whether they were public or private. The weakening of the public aspect of administration – hitherto clearly modelled as the locus of government – led to a crisis of identity within the discipline in the middle of the last century (Henry 1995).

In subsequent decades, the discipline divided into two paths. The first saw a strengthening of the political sphere and a rapprochement between public administration and political science. This rapprochement resulted in the discipline losing its distinct identity. Between 1950 and 1970, public administration practically disappeared as a subfield of political science (Henry 1975; Frederickson 1999). The second path saw the consolidation of the science of administration, which included organization and management theory. This path resulted in a loss of reference to the public component of public administration, hitherto understood as governmental (Henry 1975).

In short, in the foundation and initial development of the discipline of public administration in the USA there was no place for the study of public policy, due to the prevalence of the opposition between administration and politics. Nevertheless, from the middle of the last century this scenario began to change and public policy was included as an element of the discipline's "core".

Public Policy as a Focus of Teaching and Research by Public Administration Discipline

Despite having developed initially as a result of the contrast between administration and politics, from the middle of the last century onwards, the study of public policy was incorporated into public administration initially by the path close to political science. In a book from 1960, McCamy gives prominence to the incorporation of public policy as a focus of analysis:

All disciplines have their turning points ... The study of public administration has just passed a turning point. Its first stage dealt with efficiency, organization, and management. The second stage, upon which we have entered, is concerned most of all with policy-making in administration. ...

All who work in administration, or study those who work, know that *administrators make policy*. (McCamy 1960, pp. 1–2; emphasis added)

In the 1960s and the 1970s, there was an expansion of graduate courses with the founding of independent public administration programmes (Henry 1975, 1995). This was followed by a decline in the number of courses linked to political science departments and business schools.⁵

The creation of public policy schools occurred partly as direct opposites of traditional public administration schools. The public policy analysis movement (Engelbert 1977; Lynn Jr. 1999) sought to prepare public policy analysts. According to Altshuler, this movement emerged as a result of collaboration between a group of elite universities and employees of the Ford Foundation and the Sloan Foundation (Altshuler 1990 *apud* Ospina Bozzi 1998). The Ford Foundation made its first donations to universities in 1973, with the purpose of improving preparation for the civil service, by means of "a better blend of social science education for the *analysis and management of complex problems*" (Engelbert 1977, p. 230; emphasis added).

The most significant repositioning of the field of study was therefore related to the shift of focus to the analysis of substantive problems, to produce public servants capable of analysing relevant social problems and designing public policies.

As public policy analysis schools and courses emerged as a movement distinct from public administration, we might have expected a schism between them. However, quite the opposite occurred: a process of reciprocal influence took place (Engelbert 1977; Ospina Bozzi 1998).

The influence of traditional public administration training on public policy analysis courses occurred by means of the incorporation of administration as a subject of study. However, in an attempt to emphasize the move away from the traditional approach of public administration, new courses adopted the term "public management as a way of indicating its dynamic and action oriented nature" (Ospina Bozzi 1998, pp. 5–6; free translation).

Traditional public administration courses also changed, including public policy courses as a core requirement for the students (Engelbert 1977). Evidence of the inclusion of public policy analysis as part of public administration training can be found in a guide for schools and programmes linked to the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), from the start of the 1970s (Henry 1995).⁶

The emphasis on public policy in public administration courses resulted in the inclusion of this new focus on the discipline's research agenda in the early 1960s (McCamy 1960). From the 1970s onwards, analysis of public policy arguably became an element of public administration.

In 1977, in a study on higher education focusing on public policy analysis at graduate level, Engelbert states that despite their diverse institutional locations, public policy analysis courses shared common elements, in terms of both the content and pedagogical approach (Engelbert 1977).

The relevance of the public policy field since the 1960s was felt also in other disciplines, especially in political science. The traditional American Political Science Association (APSA) established a section on public policy for the first time in 1970 (Kdhor 2005). In 1972, APSA founded the Policy Studies Organization and give birth to the *Policy Studies Journal*.⁷

So, in less than a decade the denial of public policy as a concern of public administration was no longer the rule. Under the influence of the public policy movement and the concern with public problems, the public administration discipline included public policy as one of its main subjects.

Changes in the Frontiers of the State and the Public

When the public administration discipline emerged, public administration meant *government* administration.

However, in recent decades the “public” in public administration was redefined, and extended its reach beyond the state. It began to include non-governmental organizations, private sector and community entities. This change affected the discipline and the study of public policy (Frederickson 1999; Rabell 2000; Pacheco 2003).

The discipline was also affected by the impact of the New Public Management, in both teaching and research, introducing a renewed debate on effectiveness, accountability, quality of public services, and giving a central role to management (Lynn 1998; Ventriss 2000).

The shift in the meaning of public to “beyond the state”, the blurring of the boundaries between the public and the private, and the consideration of public problems as multi-jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional (Frederickson 1999) increased the complexity of public policy. These factors as well as the pressure exerted by state reform driven by the paradigm of the New Public Management affected particularly policy implementation, with inter-organizational coordination problems assuming greater prominence (Rabell 2000).

The public administration discipline therefore needed to reposition itself in order to digest this new complexity, which also required a review of the analytical approach to public policy (Frederickson 1999; Rabell 2000).

In Frederickson's optimistic reading: “It is the public administration field in political science that is responding to the modern challenges of high fragmentation and the

disarticulation of the state” (Frederickson 1999, p. 710). In his opinion, public administration at the time ceased to be colonized by theories from other disciplines, and began to construct its own body of theory. Theories of cooperation, network, governance, and institutionalism were developed to cope with the new challenge (Frederickson 1999).

The inclusion of public policy as a focus of study in public administration was partially a result of criticism by the policy analysis movement of the discipline’s traditional approach, which established a separation between administration and politics. However, according to critics of the *mainstream* approach to public policy analysis, this (re) introduced a separation between politics and administration at the very heart of public policy analysis itself. According to these critics (Durning 1999; Lynn Jr. 1999), the dominant perspective in the field was linked to the positivist dream of objectivity and rationality. This perspective assumed that the objective fact is likely to be appropriated by the analyst using neutral scientific methods and that the knowledge generated from these methods (quantitative) will be useful to the decision (a political one) taken by decision makers and policy makers.

In recent decades, proposals for alternative approaches emerged based on this criticism, and recommendations were made for the adoption of qualitative methodologies (Fischer 1993 *apud* Lynn Jr. 1999), which take into account subjectivity and seek to bring an end to the separation between policy analysts and actors involved with public policy. Some postpositivists reject what they see as a technocratic and economic perspective and propose the study of public policy based on a participatory strategy (Torgerson 1986 *apud* Lynn Jr. 1999; Roberts 2004; Wagle 2000) and the treatment of the facts as social constructions: “facts are social constructions, not objective features of the material world awaiting discovery” (Lynn Jr. 1999, p. 419).

In short, at the end of the twentieth century, some of the premises of the study of public policy by public administration discipline have been profoundly revised, such as the boundaries of the “public” and the *scientific* (quantitative and positivist) approach, opening new venues for the understanding and study of public policy.

The Development of the Public Administration Discipline in Brazil

The establishment of the public administration discipline in Brazil, just as in the United States, was linked to the training of public servants for modern public administration. In Brazil, the birth of the discipline can be traced back to the 1930s. Public administration had until then been based on administrative law or, in the words of Muñoz, on “legal rules, limiting its problem to the drafting of laws and implementation of regulations” (Muñoz 1958 *apud* Keinert 1994, p. 42). This law-oriented tradition (Hood 1995) left a legacy, still felt in Brazil. This means that the efforts towards a “modern” administration had to deal with institutions and practices affected by the emphasis on legal rules – as a legacy which was at the same time cultural and normative.

While the formal tradition was law oriented, in practice public administration was also influenced by patrimonialism and clientelism (Nunes 1997; Andrews and Bariani 2010). According to Nunes (1997), the effort to consolidate a modern public administration in Brazil in the thirties was oriented against this *political grammar*, which was characterized by the appropriation of the public by the private. The administrative reform of the New State (Estado Novo⁸) sought to establish a public service along the lines of Weberian bureaucracy, which was based on principles of merit and impersonality. This modern

administration was part of a broader project for the country, a national developmental project, in which the state would assume a central role, promoting development. It was a centralized project which fought against the regional oligarchies.

The Constitution of 1937, linked to the authoritarian regime, established that a department should be created, linked to the Presidency, with the purpose of implementing the reform of Brazilian public administration. In 1938, the Administrative Department of Public Service (DASP – Departamento Administrativo do Serviço Público) was founded with this purpose. With the same purpose the *Public Service Journal (Revista do Serviço Público – RAP)* was created in 1937, publication of which was taken on by the DASP after its foundation.

The objective of the journal was to spread the ideas and guiding principles for modernizing administration (Silva 1968). The DASP promoted the basic restructuring of the administrative apparatus of the Brazilian state with a view to adapt it to the new state's role. Strict admission criteria were implemented; public examinations were introduced and meritocratic evaluation criteria established (Couto 1993; Bariani 2010).

The implementation of administrative reform was grounded in the training of public servants to take up new duties in the *new* state. At first, the DASP undertook the challenge of providing this training (Fischer 1984). The department absorbed an elite of public servants (Fischer 1984) responsible for promoting training in areas such as public administration, personnel management, applying statistics to social assistance, personnel selection, taxation and material resources, either undertaking the courses themselves, or bringing in professors from other institutions (Rabello 2011). According to Fischer, in less than a year the courses had more than 8000 inscriptions (Fischer 1984, p. 281).

The founding of the DASP and the creation of the *Public Service Journal* reflect the influence of “concepts, principles and practices emanating from other countries” (Fischer 1984, p. 281). The Weberian concept of bureaucracy was important, as well as the influence of authors such as Francisco Campos, Henri Fayol, Luther Halsey Gulick, Frederick Winslow Taylor and William F. Willoughby (Warlich 1983 *apud* Bariani 2010). Paradigms prevailing in the public administration discipline in the USA also exerted an influence at this time. The search for a model of public administration explains the creation of an exchange programme which sent public servants abroad, mainly to the USA (Rabello 2011). One of the DASP technicians responsible for the promotion of this initiative (Fischer 1984) wrote about the search for inspiration in the USA. His words are illustrative of the expectations about what could be learned from the USA experience:

What we intend to demonstrate is the convenience for Brazil to train ... chosen elements from its public service through the direct contact with an administrative mechanism which supports, controls and propels the *greatest national civilization of the present time*. (Silva 1938, p. 15; free translation from Portuguese⁹)

An analysis of the paradigms of public administration in Brazil between 1900 and 1992 conducted by Keinert (1994) and a study by that author and Vaz, published in the *Public Service Journal* (Keinert and Vaz 1994), show how the perspective of rationalization and the principle of an administration's neutrality were present in the articles published in the *Public Service Journal* between 1937 and 1946. Under the influence of these paradigms, public policy was not the focus of attention of this proto-discipline.

In fact, in Brazil, the dissociation between administration and politics was deeper than in the USA. It went beyond the limits of public administration itself. If, in the USA, public administration was conceived as a realm to be preserved from politics; in Brazil, from 1937 to 1945, the political decision-making process was also seen as something to be insulated from and not affected by politics (Bariani 2010).

As a result of increased efforts to implement modern and efficient public administration, the idea to set up a centre for public administration studies emerged at the beginning of the 1940s. For this purpose, the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV) was created in 1944 with initial support from the United Nations (UN) (Fischer 1984). The founding of the FGV occurred at the same time as the decline in importance of the DASP in 1945, after the end of the New State (Estado Novo). However, it was not by chance that the former director of the DASP, Luiz Simões Lopes, held the chair of FGV. There was continuity between the two institutions in terms of perspectives concerning public administration. The idea for the new institution actually came from within the DASP itself.

In 1948, the new Foundation requested support from the United Nations for the creation of a National School of Public Administration, inspired by the *École Nationale de Administration* (ENA). The French institution had been established by De Gaulle immediately after the war, to professionalize the public service. The demand from the UN nevertheless evolved in another direction, that is, towards the consolidation of the links already established with the USA. That country was at this moment interested in strengthening its influence in developing countries, especially in Latin America. The foundation of the new school, under the auspices of the UN, occurred by means of formal support from the USA. In 1952, the Brazilian School of Public Administration (EBAP – *Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública*) was founded following two meetings, one in the USA and one in Brazil, “with the participation of Brazilian technicians from FGV e from the federal government, a representative of UN and American professors” (Fischer 1984, p. 282). The new school (EBAP) was structured as a teaching, research, and technical assistance institution, as a result of the close cooperation between the new school and North American universities and professors.

In 1959, a Public Administration and Business Teaching Programme agreement was signed between Brazil and the USA (Fischer 1984). Its objective was to develop training in the area of public administration and business, strengthening the courses already in existence (at the FGV),¹⁰ and to give support to the creation of new courses, such as those at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA) and the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Professors from these institutions went to the USA to get their PhDs – most of them to the University of South California, one of the best public administration schools in the USA (Fischer 1984; Keinert 1994). The influence of the North American schools was also felt when North American professors came to Brazil to “monitor the EBAP, UFRGS and UFBA long enough to set up [and consolidate] the programmes” (Fischer 1984, p. 282).

These institutions were pioneers in the teaching of public administration in Brazil and created undergraduate, graduate (Masters) and continuing education courses. In 1967, there were 28 public administration teaching institutions in Brazil, 16 of which had undergraduate courses and six had graduate courses (Masters) (Wahrlich 1967).¹¹

The Ford Foundation in Brazil also played a significant role at this time. The Brazilian office of the Foundation opened in Brazil in 1962 to contribute towards Brazil becoming a “true nation”.¹² In 1964, the Foundation gave two donations to public administration

programmes (UFBA and FGV). This was consistent with the Ford Foundation's support for the establishment of public policy courses in the USA, which focused on relevant public problems. The decision to support training in public administration in Brazil arose from the "desire to offer Brazilians the instruments to help them *resolve uniquely Brazilian problems*" (Station and Welna 2002, p. 170; emphasis added).

In Brazil, the foundation and the first decades of development of public administration training were – as in the USA – strongly affected by the paradigm that opposed administration and politics. But as this development evolved as an academic discipline, linked to academic institutions, the ties with the USA became the main source of influence in the discipline. Under this influence, the design of academic programmes of public administration included public policy as a subject at the same time as this occurred in the USA.

The Incorporation of Public Policy within the Public Administration Discipline in Brazil

The incorporation of the study of public policy by public administration discipline in Brazil took place at almost the same time as it happened in the United States. At first, this took the form of a research project outlined by the EBAP, entitled "Studies on Government Policies", the aim of which was to institutionalize in that School: "an essential area of public administration studies, designated specifically as *Policy Analysis*, one of the most important areas in the teaching of administration" (ESCOLA 1969, p. 164).

The project also identifies some of the general characteristics of the intended thematic and methodological profile. Emphasis was to be placed on sectorial studies, in an approach that would initially be descriptive and include the identification of policy objectives, the actors involved, the decision-making processes and the beneficiaries, as well as disputes over the government's agenda.

Apparently, from what can be ascertained from subsequent issues of *Revista de Administração Pública (RAP)*, the project did not develop sufficiently to generate articles on public policy for the journal. This suggests there was no systematic support for this area of research. Between 1967 and 1974, there were very few significant articles on public or governmental policies. In contrast to the scarcity of papers on public policy, a document from 1973 on the Masters in Public Administration at EBAP shows that public policy analysis had been integrated into the course curriculum as a core element:

The fundamental purpose of the Master's Course is to provide high level training in public administration ... Public administration is viewed, in this sense, as the area of expertise focused on the analysis, diagnosis, research, evaluation and addressing of the issues of public and governmental policy. (CURSO 1973, p. 85).

The central position of public policy within public administration training reflects the proximity between Brazilian programmes and Masters programmes in the USA and the influence of the North American policy analysis movement. The structure of the Masters course has similarities with North American programmes. Of the three modules comprising the theoretical training and basic methodology, one consisted of quantitative methods in organization and public policy. One of the sets of disciplines contained the perceived

target areas: *public and governmental policy* modules. Students were required to select disciplines related to a sector (CURSO 1973).

While the influence of public administration training in the USA is evident, the development of the field in Brazil is also a reflection of the specific challenges facing Brazil and the context in which public administration training occurred. Firstly, the guiding principle behind the reference to public problems was the development of the country:

The core objective of the area [of public and governmental policy (target areas)] is to offer the student the opportunity to evaluate the requirements, alternatives and possibilities of action in *areas of substantive importance for national development* ... and conducting analysis of the courses of action adopted or possible ones in view of the theoretical models and other relevant factors. (CURSO 1973, p. 90; emphasis added)¹³

A second element of the context is the authoritarian regime established in Brazil in 1964. The central administration was based on a techno-bureaucracy (Pereira 1972), which strengthened the value attributed to planning as an instrument of development and public problem solving. Government planning was one of the theoretical and methodological modules of the course at EBAP (CURSO 1973).

Thirdly, in the aftermath of its founding, there was no real support for the consolidation and expansion of research and teaching in public administration and in public policy. The context of the dictatorship contributed significantly to this, affecting the sources of funding and the development of the discipline of public administration and the area of public policy. This context also affected the support given by the Ford Foundation. When this institution opened its office in Brazil, it chose public administration training as one of its priority areas. However, the policy for granting support was redefined following the 1964 coup d'état, resulting in a reduction in the funding for research and training in public administration and reallocation of the funding to social science programmes:

The first attempt by the Brazilian office to finance public administration programmes coincided unfortunately with the military coup d'état of 1964. ... Events ... forced a rethinking of strategy. In 1966, the adviser ... Peter Bell lamented the “nepotism, favouritism and clientelism” which governed the appointments to public service and the excessively “technical and legal” view of the public policy formulation regime ...

... [A]s the dictatorship ... progressively limited political and civil society participation in public decisions and the drawing up of policies, the Brazilian Office preferred to “take a chance with social sciences” as it was a haven for intellectuals and ideas...”. (Station and Welna 2002, pp. 170–172)

The interruption of the embryonic field of public policy in Brazil affected the academic production oriented to the explanation of public policy processes, that is, the path of policy studies oriented to the study *of* public policy (Dobuzinskis *et al.* 2007). On the other hand, it aborted the possibility of the constitution of a clearly established policy analysis subfield (the study *for* public policy) oriented to prepare public servants to participate in the formulation of public policies. This does not however mean that a

process of analysis of public policy did not exist and that the preparation of “policy analysts” did not occur. In fact it continued by another path: through education in different areas, such as the economy, engineering and others (Vaitsman *et al.* to be published). The authoritarian regime aimed to be grounded on technical competence and on planning, which demanded solid academic preparation, while preserving the separation between administration, technical knowledge and planning on one side, and politics on the other. The technical approach was also seen as a means to eliminate the risk of communism in the international context of the Cold War (Dreifuss 1981).

There was also a weakening of the role played by public administration training, at the end of a cycle which emphasized administrative reform and the training of public servants as a requirement for development (Fischer 1984). According to a study by Keinert (1994) on the paradigms of the public administration field of knowledge in Brazil, in the period from the creation of the RAP - *Revista de Administração Pública* (1967) to the end of the 1970s, the paradigm of “public administration as a science of administration” prevailed. The prevalence of this paradigm and of an authoritarian regime of public policy explains the secondary position the public policy theme occupied in academic production. This occurred despite attempts to attribute a central position to this field of studies in research and teaching institutions.

From 1974 until the end of the 1980s, three kinds of article on public policy were published in the RAP – the only academic journal in the field at the time.¹⁴ The first, produced by members of the state bureaucracy, took the form of a defence of proposals for public policies, based on technical diagnostics and the evaluation of alternative policies.¹⁵ The second kind consists of theoretical articles produced by political scientists from distinct institutions.¹⁶ The third kind consists of analyses of sectorial public policies, based on public policy theories, mainly from the United States, dealing with topics such as implementation and evaluation.¹⁷ In the 1980s, this third type included new topics such as social movements, participation, legitimacy, impact of policies, funding of public policies, popular control and innovation.¹⁸

The analysis of RAP’s articles confirms Keinert’s analysis, which suggests that between 1980 and 1989 political science prevailed as the main source of theoretical reference for public administration research (Keinert 1994). However, this author identifies a trend towards the construction of the field’s own identity in Brazil in the 1990s and believes that during this decade “public administration as public administration” began to appear, a trend mentioned by Henry in the USA in the 1970s (Henry 1975) and reaffirmed by Frederickson in the 1990s (Frederickson 1999).

Public policy became a focus of the public administration discipline in Brazil at the same time as this occurred in the USA. Nevertheless, the dictatorship affected the continuity of studies on public policy and the field lost relevance (and resources) in the country for many years.

Public Administration Identity and Public Policy Studies in Brazil: The Impact of Democratization

Development of the discipline in Brazil is distinct from the evolution of the field in the USA. In Brazil, with the exception of the EBAP and very few courses, such as those at UNESP (Universidade Estadual Paulista) and the Fundação João Pinheiro,¹⁹ training in public administration at undergraduate and graduate level took place in business schools,

which housed business administration and training in public administration in a single institution, generally under the hegemony of training in business administration.

The importance of the institutional location of public administration training was mentioned by Henry in his analysis of the evolution and identity of the field in the United States. According to this author, “what public administration is” depends, to a large extent, on the department or school in which the training occurs (Henry 1975, p. 384). In the USA, the institutional location resulted from the initial influence of the political science departments and developed into autonomy for the public administration courses and “policy oriented” schools. This meant a certain amount of diversity was maintained within the field.

When discussing training in public policy in the USA, Engelbert demonstrates the existence of a diversity of trajectories resulting from the location of training programmes in different educational units at the end of the 1970s: departments of political science, business and law schools, public administration schools or departments and “policy oriented” schools, as well as schools of public affairs and schools of government. This author highlights the importance of the institutional location for the academic approach to public policy training: “As might be expected, the academic approach and content of public policy educational study programs varies considerably among the different categories of educational units” (Engelbert 1977, p. 230).

In Brazil, public administration training developed in institutions devoted to the teaching of administration, and from the very outset there was a tendency to deprive public administration training of its own specific identity, with emphasis placed on “the science of administration” as a shared characteristic. This trend was described for the first time at the II National Public Administration Conference, at EBAP in 1967. As the document containing the conference conclusions states:

The trend in Brazil is clearly in favour of the integrated curriculum... This trend has been encouraged by the Federal Education Council through its rules on the minimum curriculum for “administration” and not for “Public and Business Administration”. (CONFERÊNCIA 1967, p. 256)

State regulations on administration training consolidated the association between public administration education and business administration training. This contributed to the destruction of the identity of public administration training.

While the institutional location conditions the characteristics of training and research in public administration and public policy, as stated by Henry and Engelbert, in Brazil the positioning of public administration courses had an influence on the academic production of public policy within this field. Teaching and research in public policy had to fight for a place under the hegemony of the science of administration paradigm.

In the late 1980s and in the 1990s there was nevertheless a turning point both in the discipline and in the field of public policy. The recognition of politics was stimulated by the challenges following democratization and by issues arising from the transformation of the state and the *public* in Brazil (Keinert 1994; Farah 2001; Hochman *et al.* 2008). Studies on public policy respond to a demand for designing new policies as well as for analysis of the “new public policies” at the federal level, but also increasingly at the local level (Farah and Spink 2008). There was also a growth in the relevance of public administration due to the New Public Management. Besides the external influence, state

reform promoted during the 1990s, under the leadership of Bresser Pereira, helped to put this theme on the national agenda (Pereira and Spink 1998).

Within this context, the public administration discipline and the study of public policy gained impetus. Between 1998 and 2008, the number of studies registered within the area of public administration at the Administration Meetings (ENANPAD – Meeting of the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Administration) increased more than 300 per cent, about twice that recorded for the whole area of administration. This growth led to the creation of an independent biannual meeting, which is already in its sixth series – the ENAPG (Public Administration and Government Meeting). The growth of the area of public administration was accompanied by the consolidation and growth of the subfield of public policy. This can be seen in 2006 when there was a section with that focus at the meeting.

However, this growth did not result in autonomy for the graduate public administration programmes and courses, as had occurred in the USA from the 1970s onwards. Currently, across Brazil there is only one Doctorate of Public Administration course, which is at the Business School at São Paulo from the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV-EAESP – Fundação Getulio Vargas–Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo), and there are only five Masters programmes.²⁰ The impact on academic production in public administration within this context has yet to be evaluated.

Currently in Brazil there is a “boom” in new undergraduate courses focusing on public policy studies, such as public policy, management of public policies, management and public policies, management of social policies, as well as others related to the field, such as social management. The locus of studies and research on public policy is no longer confined to its roots in public administration and traditional disciplines such as political science. These courses are emerging at the very moment when public policies are gaining an important *status* on the government agenda in Brazil.

These courses begin as multidisciplinary, as occurred in the USA in the 1970s. They tend to contribute to a redefinition of the discipline of public administration and to the overcoming of some of the challenges present in public policy studies in public administration, as happened in the USA. The creation of Masters and Doctorate courses in the coming years will strengthen the redefinition of the field in Brazil.

The public administration discipline and the public policy field had a very different pattern of development compared with that in the USA. The academic programmes on public administration were located mainly in business schools, with an impact on the identity of the courses. The public policy field, immediately after its foundation in EBAP, lost relevance and went into a decline. In recent decades, the consolidation of democracy had an impact on both the public administration discipline and the public policy field within this discipline. But this strengthening of the public policy field is clearly a multi-disciplinary process, as has been the public policy movement in the USA.

Concluding Remarks

The analysis of the development of the public administration and public policy fields in the United States and in Brazil shows the influence of the USA in the founding of public administration as a discipline in Brazil as well as in the process of incorporation of public policy as a field of studies by this discipline.

On the other hand, differences of context – political, socio-economic and institutional – lead to very distinct paths of development for the discipline of public administration and the field of public policy.

In the USA, since the 1970s the public administration discipline has had public policy as one of its core subjects. On the other hand, autonomous schools on public policy emerged as an “evolution” of the previous public administration field.

In Brazil, the birth of the discipline had strong links with the North American institutions and paradigms in both public administration and public policy. The incorporation of public policy within the discipline of public administration occurred at the same time as in the USA, under the influence of American universities and institutions.

But the development of the public administration discipline in Brazil and in the USA, from this first moment onwards, followed very distinct trajectories. In the United States there was a boom of public policy programmes, which spread all over the country. In Brazil, the separation between administration and politics remained as a paradigm until a few decades ago, due to factors related to the authoritarian regime which lasted from 1964 to 1988 and to the institutional location of programmes of public administration. Only in recent years has the public administration discipline begun to be recognized as an area distinct from business education and the teaching and research on public policy has assumed a central role in the discipline.

Under the influence of the democratization of the country, public policy returned to the governmental and academic agendas. In this new scenario, public administration is not alone in the effort to “bring public policy back in”. The new programmes have a multi-disciplinary profile, expressing a movement towards autonomy, differentiating themselves from both public administration and political science. They emerge in a social and political context which emphasizes the need for contributions to the resolution of significant public problems.

Notes

1. The research was presented later at the International Workshop on Public Policy in Brazil and South America: Advances and Challenges held in São Paulo, Brazil, 18–19 November 2011 organized by the ICPA-Forum and Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo. A previous version of this research was published in a Brazilian journal (Farah 2011), with a focus on the Brazilian audience in the field of public administration.
2. The discussion is based upon a review of the literature on the development of the public administration discipline in the USA and in Brazil; the identification of the themes covered by the main journals on public administration in the USA and in Brazil (*Public Administration Review* in the USA and *Revista de Administração Pública* in Brazil) and an examination of the contents of the main programmes on public administration and on public policy in both countries.
3. Other traditions are: administrative law (law oriented), which characterized continental Europe; pragmatism, which prevailed in England; and a specific path followed by the communist countries (Hood 1995).
4. One of the pioneering political scientists in the study of public policy was Lasswell (1951). The public administration course created at Harvard in 1936 included public policy on its curriculum (Engelbert 1977), but this was an exception at that time.
5. In 1974–1975 there were 138 graduate courses in PA in the USA, and records of 121 doctorate programmes (Henry 1995).
6. The policy analysis movement emerged from a segment of the programmes in public administration: the elite universities (Altshuler 1990 *apud* Ospina Bozzi 1998). When policy analysis spread from the PP schools to the more traditional programmes on PA this also occurred mainly in the graduate programmes of universities. Another segment of public administration schools is that linked to community colleges. In the

1960s, there was an expansion of this segment of education, which was intended to provide introductory-level education in public affairs/administration. A recent study on this segment nevertheless showed that “less than two percent of America’s community colleges offer associate degree programs in public affairs/administration”. This suggests that community colleges are not the locus of policy analysis, at least not in the path linked to the public administration field, the main focus of this paper (Klay and Maxwell 2009, p. 177).

7. The subsequent evolution of the public policy field as a whole and the relationship between the different “paths”, such as the one which emerged from public administration and the one that evolved from political science, cannot be addressed within the limits of this article, the focus of which is the contribution of the public administration discipline to public policy studies.
8. Between 1937 and 1945, Getulio Vargas governed Brazil under an authoritarian regime. This period is usually referred to as the “Estado Novo”. Some of the pillars of the National Developmental State in Brazil were built during this period.
9. A free translation was made of every citation in Portuguese.
10. The EBAP (Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública), in Rio de Janeiro, founded in 1952, and EAESP (Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo) founded in 1954 for training in business administration.
11. In 1959–1960, in the USA, there were already 100 institutions offering some kind of graduate course in public administration. The first survey conducted by NASPAA in 1970–1971 identified 125 graduate programmes (Henry 1995, p. 4).
12. According to the consultants’ report (Station and Welna 2002, p. 169).
13. The developmental ideology during the government of President Juscelino Kubitschek had affinities with the development aid strategy for poor countries, which characterized the USA’s foreign policy during the Kennedy era.
14. Analysis conducted based on research into all the issues of the RAP from 1974 to 1988.
15. Examples Pantoja (1969) and articles published in a special issue on Scientific and Technological Policy (*Revista de Administração Pública*, 1973, 7 (2)).
16. A special issue from 1976 had this focus, bringing together, among others, authors such as Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos, James Malloy and Fabio Reis (Malloy 1976; Reis 1976; Lima Júnior and Santos 1976).
17. An example is the article by Oscar Oszlak on public policy and political regimes with an emphasis on the analysis of the implementation process (Oslak 1982).
18. Examples: Oliveira (1984); Azeredo (1988); Fleury (1996); Farah (2001). This new trend also affects the researchers of the administration field and new journals. Some examples are: Arretche (2004) and Spink (2006). Sobre a produção recente em Administração Pública, ver também (Pacheco 2003).
19. State University of São Paulo (Universidade Estadual Paulista), is linked to the government of the State of São Paulo and João Pinheiro Foundation, which is linked to the government of the State of Minas Gerais.
20. The first school of Public Administration, the National School of Public Administration (EBAP – Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública) turned itself into a “public and business” administration school in 2011.

References

- Altshuler, A., 1990, Teaching leadership. Annual Meeting of APPAM. San Francisco, October, 1990.
- Andrews, C. W. and Bariani, E. (Eds), 2010, *Administração Pública No Brasil: Breve História Política* (São Paulo: Editora Unifesp).
- Arretche, M., 2004, Federalismo e políticas sociais no Brasil: Problemas de coordenação e autonomia. *São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 18(2), pp. 17–26.
- Azeredo, B., 1988, O financiamento dos programas sociais: Impasses e perspectivas. *RAP. Revista de Administração Pública*, 20(1), pp. 3–13.
- Bariani, E., 2010, DASP: Entre a norma e o fato, in: C. W. Andrews and E. Bariani (Eds) *Administração Pública No Brasil: Breve História Política* (São Paulo: Editora Unifesp), pp. 39–62.
- Conferência Nacional de Administração Pública, 1967, *Revista de Administração Pública*, 1(2), pp. 233–237.
- Couto, C. G., 1993, Modernização, in: R. de Castro Andrade and L. Jaccoud (Eds) *Estrutura e Organização Do Poder Executivo* (Brasília: ENAP), vol. 1, pp. 109–202.
- Curso de Mestrado em Administração Pública, 1973, *Revista de Administração Pública*, 7(3), pp. 85–104.

- Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M. and Laycock, D., 2007, *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of Art* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- Dreifuss, R. A., 1981, 1964, *A Conquista Do Estado: Ação Política, Poder E Golpe De Classe* (Rio de Janeiro: Vozes).
- Durning, D., 1999, The transition from traditional to postpositivist policy analysis: A role for Q-Methodology. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, **18**(3), pp. 389–410.
- Engelbert, E. A., 1977, University education for public policy analysis. *Public Administration Review*, **37**(3), pp. 228–236.
- Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública, 1969, Plano de Trabalho para 1969. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **3**(1), pp. 147–170.
- Farah, M. F. S., 2001, Parcerias, novos arranjos institucionais e políticas públicas no nível local de governo. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **35**(1), pp. 119–145.
- Farah, M. F. S., 2011, Administração Pública e Política Pública. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **45**, pp. 813–836.
- Farah, M. F. S. and Spink, P., 2008, Subnational government innovation in a comparative perspective: Brazil, in: S. Borins (Ed) *Innovations in Government: Research, Recognition, and Replication* (Cambridge/Washington, DC: Harvard/Brookings Institution Press), v.1, pp. 71–92.
- Fischer, T., 1984, Administração Pública como área de conhecimento e ensino: A trajetória brasileira. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, **24**(4), pp. 278–288.
- Fischer, F., 1993, Citizen participation and the democratization of policy expertise; From a theoretical inquiry to practical cases. *Policy Sciences*, **26**, pp. 165–187.
- Fleury, S., 1996, Saúde e qualidade de vida: Combate à desigualdade e à exclusão. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **30**, pp. 165–176.
- Frederickson, H. G., 1999, John Gaus lecture – the repositioning of American public administration. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, pp. 701–711.
- Goodnow, F., 1900, *Politics and Administration* (New York: Macmillan).
- Henry, N., 1975, Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, **35**(4), pp. 378–386.
- Henry, L. L., 1995, NASPAA history. A summary report from the NASPAA Historical Project, prepared for NASPAA's 25th Anniversary Conference, Austin, TX, October 18–21, 1995. Available at <http://www.naspaa.org> (accessed on 20 May 2010).
- Hochman, G., Arretche, M. and Marques, E., 2008, *Políticas Públicas No Brasil (Ed.)* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fiocruz).
- Hood, C., 1995, Emerging issues in public administration. *Public Administration*, **73**(1), pp. 165–183.
- Keinert, T. M. M., 1994, Os paradigmas da Administração Pública no Brasil (1900–92). *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, **34**(3), pp. 41–48.
- Keinert, T. M. M. and Vaz, J. C., 1994, Histórico da RSP: A Revista do Serviço Público no Pensamento Administrativo Brasileiro (1937–1989). *Revista do Serviço Público*, **118**(45), pp. 9–42.
- Khodr, H., 2005, *Public Administration and Political Science: an historical analysis of the relation between the two academic disciplines*. Dissertation submitted to the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy. The Florida State University, College of Social Sciences.
- Klay, W. E. and Maxwell, S. R., 2009, Public Administration Programs in America's Community Colleges: The implications of their surprising scarcity. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, **15**(2), pp. 177–183.
- Lasswell, H. D., 1951, The policy orientation, in: D. Lerner and H. D. Lasswell (Eds) *The Policy Sciences* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- Lima Júnior, O. B. and Santos, W. G., 1976, Esquema geral para a análise de políticas públicas: uma proposta preliminar. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **10**(2), pp. 241–256.
- Lynn, L. E. Jr., 1998, The new public management: How to transform a theme into a legacy. *Public Administration Review*, **58**(3), pp. 231–237.
- Lynn, L. E. Jr., 1999, A place at the table: Policy analysis, its postpositivist critics, and the future of practice. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, **18**(3), pp. 411–424.
- Malloy, J., 1976, Política de bem-estar social no Brasil: Histórico, conceitos, problemas. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **10**(2).
- McCamy, J. L., 1960, *Science and Public Administration* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press).
- Muñoz, A. P., 1958, *Introdução À Administração Pública* (Rio de Janeiro: FGV).
- Nunes, E., 1997, *A Gramática Política Do Brasil: Clientelismo E Insulamento Burocrático* (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editores/Brasília: ENAP).

- Oliveira, J. A., 1984, Política social, acumulação e legitimidade. *RAP. Revista de Administração Pública*, **18**(2), pp. 110–116.
- Oslak, O., 1982, Políticas públicas e regimes políticos: Reflexões a partir de algumas experiências latino-americanas. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **16**(1), pp. 17–60.
- Ospina Bozzi, S. M., 1998, La Administración Pública como Comunidad Discursiva: Algunas lecciones del caso estadounidense para América Latina. *Reforma y Democracia*, **10**, pp. 85–112.
- Pacheco, R. S., 2003, Administração Pública nas revistas especializadas – Brasil, 1995–2002. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, **43**(4), pp. 63–71.
- Pantoja, W., 1969, Relatório situação da saúde e Plano Nacional de Saúde. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **3**(1), pp. 149–156.
- Pereira, L. C. B., 1972, *Tecnoburocracia E Contestação* (Rio de Janeiro: Vozes).
- Pereira, L. C. B. and Spink, P. (Eds), 1998, *Reforma do Estado e Administração Pública Gerencial* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundação Getulio Vargas).
- Rabell, L. S., 2000, Tendencias curriculares en la enseñanza de la Administración Pública en los Estados Unidos. *Reforma y Democracia*, **17**, pp. 235–264.
- Rabello, F. L., 2011, O DASP e o combate à ineficiência nos serviços públicos: A atuação de uma elite técnica na formação do funcionalismo público no Estado Novo (1937–1945). *Revista Brasileira de História & Ciências Sociais*, **3**(6), pp. 132–142.
- Reis, F., 1976, Política e políticas. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **10**(2), pp. 52–63.
- Roberts, N., 2004, Public deliberation in a age of direct citizen participation. *The American Review of Public Administration*, **34**(4), pp. 315–353.
- Silva, B., 1938, Treinamento de funcionários nos Estados Unidos. *Revista do Serviço Público*. Ano 1, [v.1], pp. 10–18.
- Silva, B., 1968, O DASP como propulsor do *managerialismo* no Brasil. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **4**, pp. 222–234.
- Souza, C., 2006, Políticas públicas: Uma revisão da literatura. *Sociologias*, **8**(16), pp. 20–45.
- Spink, P. K., 2006, Learning from innovation: Educational policies seen through the Public Management and Citizenship Program. *Cadernos Gestão Pública e Cidadania*, **11**, pp. 109–128.
- Station, E. and Welna, C. J., 2002, Da Administração Pública à participação democrática, in: N. Brooke and M. Witoshynsky (Eds) *Os 40 Anos Da Fundação Ford* (São Paulo: EDUSP/Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Ford), pp. 167–200.
- Torgerson, D., 1986, Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences*, **19**, pp. 33–59.
- Vaitsman, J., Ribeiro, J. M. and Lobato, L., 2013, *Policy Analysis in Brazil - the State of the Art* (Policy Press (Bristol University: Bristol, UK)).
- Ventriss, C., 2000, New public management: An examination of its influence on contemporary public affairs and its impact on shaping the intellectual agenda of the field. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, **22**(3), pp. 500–518.
- Wagle, U., 2000, The policy science of democracy: The issues of methodology and citizen participation. *Policy Sciences*, **33**, pp. 207–222.
- Währlich, B., 1967, Formação em Administração Pública e de Empresas: programas específicos ou integrados numa sociedade em desenvolvimento. *Revista de Administração Pública*, **1**(2), pp. 239–265.
- Währlich, B., 1983, *A Reforma Administrativa Na Era De Vargas* (Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getulio Vargas).
- Wilson, W., 1887, The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, **2**(2), pp. 197–222. reprinted Nov. 56, December 1941.