

WILEY



Paradigms of Public Administration

Author(s): Nicholas Henry

Source: *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 1975), pp. 378-386

Published by: [Wiley](#) on behalf of the [American Society for Public Administration](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/974540>

Accessed: 07/09/2014 05:21

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wiley and American Society for Public Administration are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Public Administration Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Paradigms of Public Administration

Nicholas Henry, *University of Georgia*

Public administration again is examining itself.¹ Given the history of the field, this exercise probably is a sign of health. While self-scrutiny can be overdone—the late mathematician, John von Neumann, once described the state of a discipline that had become far too involved with self-study by coining the term “baroquism”—a reexamination by public administrationists of where the field has been and where it is going appears worthwhile. As an intellectual enterprise, public administration has reached a point of radical departure from its own past.

It is my purpose in this article to: (1) sketch the development of the field by describing four broad paradigms of American public administration, (2) speculate on what the emerging paradigm of public administration may turn out to be, and (3) attempt to justify why it is mandatory that public administration “come into its own” as an identifiable, unique, and institutionally independent field of instruction, research, and practice.

“Paradigm” no doubt is an overworked word.² Nevertheless, it is a useful one because there is no other term that conveys the concept of a field’s self-identity and the changing dynamics of that identity. Paradigmatic questions are of especial significance in public administration. With approximately 90 per cent of all advanced degree graduates in public administration going into government employment,³ with roughly one-in-six members of the American labor force working for one government or another, and with administrative-profession-technical personnel the major growth factor in public service hiring practices, it follows that the way in which public administration defines itself will determine to a profound degree the manner in which government works. It

The author wishes to express his thanks to Professors Robert T. Golembiewski and Frank Thompson, both of the University of Georgia, for their helpful critiques of this article. Final responsibility is, of course, the author’s.

■ Five paradigms of public administration are sketched in an effort to indicate that the notion of public administration as a unique, synthesizing field is relatively new. The discipline is conceived as an amalgam of organization theory, management science, and the concept of the public interest. It is suggested that it is time for public administration to establish itself as an institutionally autonomous enterprise in colleges and universities in order to retain its social relevance and worth.

is with these reasons in mind that we should turn to a reconsideration of the trite yet worthy question of “What is public administration?”

Public Administration’s Eighty Years in a Quandary

Public administration’s development as an academic field may be conceived as a succession of four overlapping paradigms. As Robert T. Golembiewski has noted in a perceptive essay on the evolution of the field,⁴ each phase may be characterized according to whether it has “locus” or “focus.” *Locus* is the institutional “where” of the field. A recurring locus of public administration is the government bureaucracy, but this has not always been the case and often this traditional locus has been blurred. *Focus* is the specialized “what” of the field. One focus of public administration has been the study of certain “principles of administration,” but, again, the foci of the discipline have altered with the changing paradigms of public administration. As Golembiewski observes, the paradigms of public administration may be understood in terms of locus or focus; when one has been relatively sharply defined, the other has been relatively ignored in academic circles and vice-versa. We shall use the notion of loci and foci in reviewing the intellectual development of public administration.

JULY/AUGUST 1975

Paradigm 1: The Politics/Administration Dichotomy, 1900-1926

Our benchmark dates for the Paradigm 1 period correspond to the publication of books written by Frank J. Goodnow and Leonard D. White; they are, as are the years chosen as marking the later periods of the field, only rough indicators. In *Politics and Administration* (1900), Goodnow contended that there were “two distinct functions of government,” which he identified with the title of his book. Politics, said Goodnow, “has to do with policies or expressions of the state will,” while administration “has to do with the execution of these policies.”⁵ Separation of powers provided the basis of the distinction; the legislative branch, aided by the interpretive abilities of the judicial branch, expressed the will of the state and formed policy, while the executive branch administered those policies impartially and apolitically.

The emphasis of Paradigm 1 was on locus—where public administration should be. Clearly, in the view of Goodnow and his fellow public administrationists, public administration should center in the government’s bureaucracy. The initial conceptual legitimation of this locus-centered definition of the field, and one that would wax increasingly problematic for academics and practitioners alike, became known as the politics/administration dichotomy.

Public administration received its first serious attention from scholars during this period largely as a result of the “public service movement” that was taking place in American universities in the early part of this century. Political science, as a report issued in 1914 by the Committee on Instruction in Government of the American Political Science Association stated, was concerned with training for citizenship, professional preparations such as law, and training “experts and to prepare specialists for governmental positions.”⁶ 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.

Public administration began picking up academic legitimacy in the 1920s; notable in this regard was the publication of Leonard D. White’s *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* in 1926, the first textbook devoted *in toto* to the field. As Dwight Waldo has pointed out,⁷

White’s text was quintessentially American Progressive in character and, in its quintessence, reflected the general thrust of the field: Politics should not intrude on administration; management lends itself to scientific study; public administration is capable of becoming a “value-free” science in its own right; the mission of administration is economy and efficiency, period.

The net result of Paradigm 1 was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy. Thus, everything that public administrationists scrutinized in the executive branch was imbued with the colorings and legitimacy of being somehow “factual” and “scientific,” while the study of public policy making and related matters was left to the political scientists. The carving up of analytical territory between public administrationists and political scientists during this locus-oriented stage can be seen today in political science departments: it is the public administrationists who teach organization theory, budgeting, and personnel, while political scientists teach virtually everything else.

Paradigm 2: The Principles of Administration, 1927-1937

In 1927 F. W. Willoughby’s book, *Principles of Public Administration*, was published as the second fully fledged text in the field. While Willoughby’s *Principles* was as fully American Progressive in tone as White’s *Introduction*, its title alone indicated the new thrust of public administration: that certain scientific principles of administration were “there,” that they could be discovered, and that administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these principles.

Public administrationists were in high demand during the 1930s and early 1940s for their managerial knowledge, courted by industry and government alike. Thus the focus of the field—its essential expertise in the form of administrative principles—waxed, while no one thought too seriously about its locus. Indeed, the locus of public administration was everywhere, since principles were principles, and administration was administration, at least according to the perceptions of Paradigm 2. Furthermore, because public administrationists had contributed as much if not more to the formulation of “administrative principles” as had researchers in any other field in inquiry, it also

followed that public administrationists should lead the academic pack in applying them to “real-world” organizations, public or otherwise.⁸

The “high noon of orthodoxy,” as it often has been called, of public administration was marked by the publication in 1937 of Luther H. Gulick and Lyndall Urwick’s *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Principles were important to Gulick and Urwick, but where those principles were applied was not; focus was favored over locus, and no bones were made about it. As Urwick said in the *Papers*,

It is the general thesis of this paper that there are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human organization which should govern arrangements for human association of any kind. These principles can be studied as a technical question, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise, the personnel comprising it, or any constitutional, political or social theory underlying its creation.⁹

That was public administration in 1937.

The Challenge, 1938-1950

In the following year, mainstream, top-of-the-heap public administration received its first real hint of conceptual challenge. In 1938, Chester I. Barnard’s *The Functions of the Executive* appeared. Its impact on public administration was not overwhelming at the time, but it later had considerable influence on Herbert A. Simon when he was writing his devastating critique of the field, *Administrative Behavior*.

Dissent from mainstream public administration accelerated in the 1940s and took two mutually reinforcing directions. One was the objection that politics and administration could never be separated in any remotely sensible fashion. The other was that the principles of administration were logically inconsistent.

Although inklings of dissent began in the 1930s, a book of readings in the field, *Elements of Public Administration*, edited in 1946 by Fritz Morstein Marx, was one of the first major volumes which questioned the assumption that politics and administration could be dichotomized. Perhaps the most succinct statement articulating this new awareness was expressed by John Merriman Gaus in 1950: “A theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also.”¹⁰

Arising simultaneously with the challenge to the traditional politics/administration dichotomy of the field was an even more basic contention:

that there could be no such thing as a “principle” of administration. In 1946 and 1947, a spate of articles and books by Robert A. Dahl, Simon, Waldo, and others appeared that addressed the validity of the principles concept from a variety of perspectives.¹¹ The most formidable dissection of the principles notion appeared in 1947: Simon’s *Administrative Behavior*. Simon effectively demonstrated that for every “principle” of administration advocated in the literature there was a counter-principle, thus rendering the very idea of principles moot.

By mid-century, the two defining pillars of public administration—the politics/administration dichotomy and the principles of administration—had been toppled and abandoned by creative intellects in the field. This abandonment left public administration bereft of a distinct epistemological identity. Some would argue that an identity has yet to be found.

The Reaction to the Challenge, 1947-1950

In the same year that Simon razed the traditional foundations of public administration in *Administrative Behavior*, he offered an alternative to the old paradigms in a little-noted essay entitled “A Comment on ‘The Science of Public Administration,’” published in the *Public Administration Review*. For Simon, a new paradigm for public administration meant that there ought to be two kinds of public administrationists working in harmony and reciprocal intellectual stimulation: those scholars concerned with developing “a pure science of administration” based on “a thorough grounding in social psychology,” and a larger group concerned with “prescribing for public policy,” and which would resurrect the then-unstylish field of political economy. Both a “pure science of administration” and “prescribing for public policy” would be mutually reinforcing components: “there does not appear to be any reason why these two developments in the field of public administration should not go on side by side, for they in no way conflict or contradict.”¹²

Despite a proposal that was both rigorous and normative in its emphasis, Simon’s call for a “pure science” put off many scholars in public administration and political science alike. First, Simon’s urging that social psychology provided the basis for understanding administrative behavior struck many public administrationists as foreign and discomfiting; most of them had no training in

social psychology. Second, since science was perceived as being “value-free,” it followed that a “science of administration” logically would ban public administrationists from what many of them perceived as their richest sources of inquiry: normative political theory, the concept of the public interest, and the entire spectrum of human values. In sum, then, public administrationists faced the worrisome prospect of retooling only to become a technically oriented “pure science” that might lose touch with political and social realities in an effort to cultivate an engineering mentality for public administration.

There was also a more positive rationale for scholars in public administration to retain their linkages with political science; *i.e.*, the logical conceptual connection between public administration and political science: that is, the public policy-making process. Public administration considered the “black box” of that process: the formulation of public policies within public bureaucracies and their delivery to the polity. Political science was perceived as considering the “inputs and outputs” of the process: the pressures in the polity generating political and social change. Hence, there was a carrot as well as a stick inducing public administrationists to stay within the homey confines of the mother discipline.

Political scientists, for their part, had begun to resist the growing independence of public administrationists and to question the field’s action orientation as early as the mid-1930s. Political scientists, rather than advocating a public service and executive preparatory program as they had in 1914, began calling for, in the words of Lynton K. Caldwell, “intellectualized understanding” of the executive branch, rather than “knowledgeable action” on the part of public administrators.¹³ In 1952 an article appeared in the *American Political Science Review* advocating the “continuing domination of political science over public administration.”¹⁴

By the post-World War II era, political scientists could ill afford the breakaway of the subfield which still provided their greatest drawing card for student enrollments and government grants. The discipline was in the throes of being shaken conceptually by the “behavioral revolution” that had occurred in other social sciences. Political scientists were aware that not only public administrationists had threatened secession in the past, but now other subfields, such as international relations, were restive. And, in terms of science

and social science both, it was increasingly evident that political science was held in low esteem by scholars in other fields. The formation of the National Science Foundation in 1950 brought the message to all who cared to listen that the chief federal science agency considered political science to be the distinctly junior member of the social sciences, and in 1953 David Easton confronted this lack of status directly in his influential book, *The Political System*.¹⁵

Paradigm 3: Public Administration as Political Science, 1950-1970

In any event, as a result of these concerns public administrationists remained in political science departments. The result was a renewed definition of locus—the governmental bureaucracy—but a corresponding loss of focus. Should the mechanics of budgets and personnel procedures be studied exclusively? Or should public administrationists consider the grand philosophic schemata of the “administrative Platonists,” as one political scientist called them, such as Paul Appleby?¹⁶ Or should they explore quite new fields of inquiry, as urged by Simon, as they related to the analysis of organizations and decision making? In brief, this third phase of definition was largely an exercise in reestablishing the linkages between public administration and political science. But the consequences of this exercise was to “define away” the field, at least in terms of its analytical focus, its essential “expertise.” Thus, writings on public administration in the 1950s spoke of the field as an “emphasis,” an “area of interest,” or even as a “synonym” of political science.¹⁷ Public administration, as an identifiable field of study, began a long, downhill spiral.

Things got relatively nasty by the end of the decade and, for that matter, well into the 1960s. In 1962, public administration was not included as a subfield of political science in the report of the Committee on Political Science as a Discipline of the American Political Science Association. In 1964 a major survey of political scientists indicated that the *Public Administration Review* was slipping in prestige among political scientists relative to other journals, and signalled a decline of faculty interest in public administration generally.¹⁸ In 1967, public administration disappeared as an organizing category in the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Waldo wrote in 1968 that, “The truth

is that the attitude of political scientists . . . is at best one of indifference and is often one of undisguised contempt or hostility. We are now hardly welcome in the house of our youth."¹⁹ A survey conducted in 1972 of the five major political science journals of a non-specialized nature indicated that only four per cent of all the articles published between 1960 and 1970 could be included in the category of "bureaucratic politics," which was the only category of the 15 possible that related directly to public administration.²⁰

Paradigm 4: Public Administration as Administrative Science, 1956-1970

Partly because of the "undisguised contempt" being displayed in a number of political science departments, some public administrationists began searching for an alternative. Although Paradigm 4 occurred roughly concurrently with Paradigm 3 in time and never has received the broadly based favor that political science has garnered from public administrationists as a paradigm (although its appeal is growing), the administrative science option (a phrase inclusive of organization theory and management science) nonetheless is a viable alternative for a significant number of scholars in public administration. But in both the political science and administrative science paradigms, the essential thrust was one of public administration losing its identity and its uniqueness within the confines of some "larger" concept. As a paradigm, administrative science provides a focus but not a locus. It offers techniques that require expertise and specialization, but in what institutional setting that expertise should be applied is undefined. As in Paradigm 2, administration is administration wherever it is found; focus is favored over locus.

A number of developments, often stemming from the country's business schools, fostered the alternative paradigm of administrative science. In 1956, the important journal, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, was founded by a public administrationist on the premise that public, business, and institutional administration were false distinctions, that administration was administration. Public Administrationist Keith M. Henderson, among others, argued in the mid-1960s that organization theory was, or should be, the overarching focus of public administration.²¹ Also in the 1960s, "organization development" began its rapid rise as a specialty of administrative science. Because of its

involvement in social psychology, its concern with the "opening up" of organizations, and the "self-actualization" of their members, organization development was seen by many younger public administrationists as offering a very tempting alternative for conducting research on public bureaucracies but within the framework of administrative science: democratic values could be considered, normative concerns could be broached, and intellectual rigor and scientific methodologies could be employed.²²

But there was a problem in the administrative science route, and a real one. If it were selected as the sole focus of public administration, could one continue to speak of *public* administration? After all, administrative science, while not advocating universal principles, nevertheless did and does contend that all organizations and managerial methodologies have certain characteristics, patterns, and pathologies in common. If only administrative science defined the field's paradigm, then public administration would exchange, at best, being an "emphasis" in political science departments for being, at best, a subfield in schools of administrative science. This often would mean in practice that schools of business administration would absorb the field of public administration; whether profit-conscious "B-school types" could adequately appreciate the vital value of the public interest as an aspect of administrative science was a question of genuine importance to public administrationists, and one for which the probable answers were less than comforting.

Part of this conceptual dilemma, but only part, lay in the traditional distinction between the "public" and "private" spheres of American society. What is *public* administration, what is everything else (i.e., "private" administration), and what is the dividing line between the two types has been a painful dilemma for a number of years.

As most of us know, "real world" phenomena are making the public/private distinction an increasingly difficult one to define empirically, irrespective of academic disputations. The research and development contract, the "military-industrial complex," the roles of the regulatory agencies and their relations with industry, and the growing expertise of government agencies in originating and developing advanced managerial techniques that were and are influencing the "private sector" in every aspect of American society, all have conspired to make *public* administration an elusive entity in terms of determining its proper paradigm.

This dilemma is not yet fully resolved, and confusion about the *public* variety of the field of administration seems at least understandable; one scholar, in fact, has argued that we should begin talking about “public administration,” since all kinds of managerial organizations increasingly find themselves relating to public, governmental, and political concerns due to the growing interrelatedness of technological societies.^{2,3}

The principal dilemma in defining the “public” in public administration appears to have been one of dimension.^{2,4} Traditionally, the basis of definition for the term has been an institutional dimension. For example, the Department of Defense has been perceived by scholars as the legitimate locus of study for public administration, while the Lockheed Corporation was seen as beyond the field’s proper locus of concern. These were institutional distinctions. Recently, however, this institutional dimension seems to be waning among scholars as a definitional base, while a growing philosophic and ethical dimension appears to be waxing. Hence, we are witnessing the rise of such concerns for the field as “the public interest” and “public affairs.” As concepts, these terms tend implicitly to ignore institutional arrangements and concentrate instead on highly normative issues as they relate to the polity. Thus, rather than analyzing the Department of Defense as its legitimate locus of study, public administration finds itself scrutinizing the Department’s relationships with Lockheed and other private contractors as these relationships affect the interests and affairs of the public. The normative dimension supplants the institutional dimension as a defining base for the locus of public administration.

As a paradigm, administrative science cannot comprehend the supralocus of the public interest. Without a sense of the public interest, administrative science can be used for *any* purpose, no matter how antithetical to democratic values that purpose may be. The concept of determining and implementing the public interest constitutes a defining pillar of public administration and a locus of the field that receives little if any attention within the context of administrative science, just as the focus of organization theory/management science garners scant support in political science. It would seem, therefore, that public administration should, and perhaps must, find a new paradigm that encourages both a focus and a locus for the field.

The Emerging Paradigm 5: Public Administration As Public Administration, 1970?

Despite continuing intellectual turmoil, Simon’s 1947 proposal for a duality of scholarship in public administration has been gaining a renewed validity. There is not yet a focus for the field in the form of a “pure science of administration,” but at least organization theory primarily has concerned itself in the last two and a half decades with how and why organizations work, how and why people in them behave, and how and why decisions are made. Additionally, considerable progress has been made in refining the applied techniques of management science, as well as developing new techniques, that often reflect what has been learned in the more theoretical realms of organizational analysis.

There has been less progress in delineating a locus for the field, or what public affairs and “prescribing for public policy” should encompass in terms relevant to public administrationists. Nevertheless, the field does appear to be zeroing in on certain fundamental social factors unique to fully developed countries as its proper locus. The choice of these phenomena may be somewhat arbitrary on the part of public administrationists, but they do share commonalities in that they have engendered cross-disciplinary interest in universities, require synthesizing intellectual capacities, and lean toward themes that reflect urban life, administrative relations among organizations, and the interface between technology and human values—in short, public affairs. The traditional and rigid distinction of the field between the “public sphere” and the “private sphere” appears to be waning as public administration’s new and flexibly defined locus waxes. Furthermore, public administrationists have been increasingly concerned with the inextricably related areas of policy science, political economy, the public policy-making process and its analysis, and the measurement of policy outputs. These latter aspects can be viewed, in some ways, as a linkage between public administration’s evolving focus and locus.

Institutionalizing Paradigm 5: Toward Curricular Autonomy

With a paradigmatic focus of organization theory and management science, and a paradigmatic locus of the public interest as it relates to

public affairs, public administration at last is intellectually prepared for the building of an institutionally autonomous educational curriculum that can develop the epistemological uniqueness of the field. What that curriculum will be is open to speculation, but some trends seem to be emerging. One is that the field is burgeoning. Between 1970 and 1971 alone, undergraduate enrollments in public administration increased 36 per cent, and between 1971 and 1972 graduate enrollments went up 50 per cent.²⁵

A second trend is institutional. Public administration programs normally still are lodged in political science departments, although this arrangement clearly is declining. In a period of one academic year (1971-72 to 1972-73), graduate public administration programs that were a part of political science departments sank precipitously from 48 to 36 per cent, and those programs connected with business schools (only 13 per cent in 1971) appeared to be declining as well. On the clear upswing were those programs that functioned as autonomous units within the university. During the same period, the percentage of separate schools of public administration or public affairs more than doubled, from 12 per cent in 1971 to 25 per cent in 1972; separate departments of public administration (as opposed to separate schools) accounted for 23 per cent of the 101 graduate programs surveyed in 1972-73.²⁶

How public administration is situated in universities determines to a significant extent what public administration is. With a plurality of public administration programs still being conducted in political science departments, we can infer that political science currently dominates the field intellectually as well as institutionally; in brief, the arrangement represents the fulfillment of Gaus' statement on a theory of public administration being simply a theory of politics. Unfortunately, locating public administration programs in political science departments has its costs. As Eugene P. Dvorin and Robert H. Simmons observe, "any desire for extensive experimentation" by public administrationists "may depend upon the assent of departmental colleagues" in political science

who are unreceptive and insensitive to the administrative phenomenon in the emerging bureaucratic order. Under such conditions their power of decision making exceeds their responsibility for the program. . . . Under such conditions, the problems of public administration are compounded by the traditional disposition of political science to itself assume an orthodox stance of value-free scholarship. It would be difficult, therefore, to expect one

branch of political science to radically depart in its central assumptions from those comprising the body of its host discipline.²⁷

Similarly, those public administration programs that are a part of business schools—the administrative science approach—are limited in their potentiality for development. Administrative science is reflective of the earlier paradigm of public administration which was founded upon the notion of certain immutable administrative principles, in that both paradigms represent essentially technical definitions of the field. Politics, values, normative theory, and the role of the public interest are not salient concerns in the administrative science paradigm, yet it is precisely these concerns that must be critical in any intelligent definition of public administration.

Hence, public administration must borrow and redefine in its own terms the concept of the public interest from political science, and synthesize this concept with the methodologies and bureaucratic focus extant in administrative science. For all practical purposes, this unique, synthesizing combination can be accomplished only in institutionally autonomous academic units, free of the intellectual baggage that burdens the field in political science departments and administrative science schools alike.

Fortunately, the institutional trend in public administration appears to be heading in the direction of establishing separate schools of public affairs and separate departments of public administration. The MPA and DPA degrees are gaining in student popularity, and those academic journals concerned with public policy, public affairs, and the public bureaucracy are flourishing and proliferating. A major sign of public administration's growing independence is the dramatic growth of institutes of government, public administration, and urban affairs, and various kinds of public policy centers in universities. In an 18-month period between 1970 and 1972, the number of such units more than doubled to approximately 300.²⁸

It is time for public administration to come into its own. Substantial progress has been in this direction intellectually. For perhaps the first time in public administration's 80 years in a quandary, a tentative paradigm has been formulated for the field that defines the discipline's "specialized what" and its "institutional where." This intellectual ripening must not be allowed to wither in institutional settings that are unsympathetic—

perhaps antithetical—to public administration's new and vital paradigm. The use of the field to society seems obvious, and, in an age in which higher education generally is suffering from declining enrollments, public administration programs are turning away highly qualified applicants. In short, the social, economic, intellectual, and political reasons for public administration to assert its identity and autonomy are there. It remains to be done.

Notes

1. There are a number of recent writings addressing the old question of "What is public administration?" from a new perspective. Representative published works of quality include: James C. Charlesworth (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, October 1968); Frank Marini (ed.), *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective* (Scranton: Chandler, 1971); Richard J. Stillman, II, "Woodrow Wilson and the Study of Administration: A New Look at an Old Essay," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 67 (June 1973), pp. 582-588; Vincent Ostrom, *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1973); Dwight Waldo, "Developments in Public Administration," in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 404 (November 1972), pp. 217-245; and Howard E. McCurdy, "The Development of Public Administration: A Map," *Public Administration: A Bibliography*, Howard E. McCurdy (ed.) (Washington, D.C.: College of Public Affairs, American University, 1972), pp. 9-28. I should state here that I am not considering the sub-field of comparative public administration in this article on the grounds that it has developed somewhat independently of its parent field.
2. And I likely am using it inappropriately in this article. Nevertheless, "paradigm" conveys to most people what I want it to convey; to wit: How mainstream public administrationists have perceived their enterprise during the last 80 or so years.
3. National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), *Public Affairs and Administration Programs: 1971-72 Survey Report* (Washington, D.C.: NASPAA, 1972), p. 1.
4. Robert T. Golembiewski, "Public Administration As A Field: Four Developmental Phases," *Georgia Political Science Association Journal*, Vol. 2 (Spring 1974), pp. 24-25.
5. Frank Goodnow, *Politics and Administration* (New York: Macmillan, 1900), pp. 10-11.
6. "Report of the Committee on Instruction in Government," *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association, 1913-14* (Washington, D.C.: APSA, 1914), p. 264.
7. Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration," *Political Science: Advance of the Discipline*, Marian D. Irish (ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), pp. 153-189.
8. The high status of public administration relative to other kinds of studies in the administrative sciences during this period is reflected in Robert Aaron Gordon and James E. Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), notably pp. 379-393.
9. Lyndall Urwick, "Organization as a Technical Problem," *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.) (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937), p. 49.
10. John Merriman Gaus, "Trends in the Theory of Public Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 10 (Summer 1950), p. 168.
11. For example: Robert A. Dahl, "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 7 (Winter 1947), pp. 1-11; Herbert A. Simon, "The Proverbs of Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 6 (Winter 1946), pp. 53-67, and *Administrative Behavior* (New York: Free Press, 1947); and Dwight Waldo, *The Administrative State* (New York: Ronald, 1948).
12. Herbert A. Simon, "A Comment on 'The Science of Public Administration,'" *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 7 (Summer 1947), p. 202.
13. Lynton K. Caldwell, "Public Administration and the Universities: A Half-Century of Development," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 25 (March 1965), p. 57.
14. Roscoe Martin, "Political Science and Public Administration—A Note on the State of the Union," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 46 (September 1952), p. 665.
15. David Easton, *The Political System* (New York: Knopf, 1953). Easton pulled no punches in his appraisal of the status of political science. As he noted (pp. 38-40), "with the exception of public administration, formal education in political science has not achieved the recognition in government circles accorded, say, economics or psychology." Or, "However much students of political life may seek to escape the taint, if they were to eavesdrop on the whisperings of their fellow social scientists, they would find that they are almost generally stigmatized as the least advanced."
16. Glendon A. Schubert, Jr., "'The Public Interest' in Administrative Decision-Making," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 51 (June 1957), pp. 346-368.
17. Martin Landau reviews this aspect of the field's development cogently in his "The Concept of Decision-Making in the 'Field' of Public Administration," *Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior*, Sidney Mailick and Edward H. Van Ness (eds.) (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962), pp. 1-29. Landau writes (p. 9), "public administration is neither a subfield of political science, nor does it comprehend it; it simply becomes a synonym."
18. Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *American Political Science: A Profile of a Discipline* (New York: Atherton, 1964), especially pp. 49-62 and

- 86-98.
19. Dwight Waldo, "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration," in Charlesworth, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
 20. Contrast this figure with the percentage of articles in other categories published during the 1960-1970 period: "political parties," 13 per cent; "public opinion," 12 per cent; "legislatures," 12 per cent; and "elections/voting," 11 per cent. Even those categories dealing peripherally with "bureaucratic politics" and public administration evidently received short shrift among the editors of the major political science journals. "Region/federal government" received four per cent, "chief executives" won three per cent, and "urban/metropolitan government" comprised two per cent. As the author of the study notes, "The conclusion is inescapable that political scientists in recent years have not paid much attention to the vast new public bureaucracies emerging at all levels of the American and other Western political systems. . . . in practice, if not in theory, our discipline still seems to operate as if the bureaucracies . . . were someone else's business." The quotations and percentages are in Jack L. Walker, "Brother, Can You Paradigm?" *PS*, Vol. 5 (Fall 1972), pp. 419-422. The journals surveyed were *American Political Science Review*, *Journal of Politics*, *Western Political Quarterly*, *Midwest Political Science Journal*, and *Polity*.
 21. Keith M. Henderson, *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966).
 22. The growing impact of organization development (and the entire administrative science paradigm) on public administration is aptly indicated by the recent symposium on the topic conducted by the *Public Administration Review*. Of the six contributors to the symposium, only two were associated with political science departments, and only one with a public administration unit. The remaining contributors were in administrative science, education, and psychology. See: Larry Kirkhart and Neely Gardner (co-eds.), "Symposium on Organization Development," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 34 (March/April 1974), pp. 97-140.
 23. Lynton K. Caldwell, "Methodology in the Theory of Public Administration," in Charlesworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-212.
 24. Public administrationists, in an effort to distinguish their field from "private administration," have taken a number of differing directions. Marshall Edward Dimmock and Gladys Ogden Dimmock's *Public Administration* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 4th edition, 1969) perhaps come closest to a philosophic dimension in defining the "public" in public administration by their discussion of an "appreciation of the public" and the concept of "the common man" (pp. 585-591). Most textbooks in the field, however, either rely on an institutionally formulated distinction between "public" and "private," or avoid the issue by relating public administration to political science and the public policy-making process. An example of the former is Felix A. Nigro and Lloyd G. Nigro's *Modern Public Administration* (New York: Harper and Row, 3rd edition, 1973). The authors define "public" in terms of their "goldfish bowl" thesis. As they state (p. 15): ". . . no public organization can ever be exactly the same as a private one. . . . As has often been said, the public official operates in a goldfish bowl. . . . Although the officials of a private company also have important public contacts, they are not operating in a goldfish bowl." John M. Pfiffner and Robert Presthus, in their *Public Administration* (New York: Ronald, 5th edition, 1960), also rely on institutionally based thinking when they distinguish "public" from "private" administration on the grounds that public administration "is mainly concerned with the means for implementing political values." its unique "highly legal framework," its "susceptibility to public criticism," and its inability to "evaluate its activities in terms of profits." Both texts are operating on variants of Paradigm 1 in that there is a clear locus (or "public") for the field which is perceived in institutional terms. By contrast, John Rehfuss's *Public Administration as Political Process* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973); James W. Davis, Jr.'s, *An Introduction to Public Administration: Politics, Policy, and Bureaucracy* (New York: Free Press, 1974); and Ira Sharkansky's *Public Administration: Policy-Making in Government Agencies* (Chicago: Markham, 2nd edition, 1972) all reflect a Paradigm 3 perception in that public administration is seen as political science. Hence, "public" in contrast to "private" is either ignored as a distinction or its legitimacy as a distinction is denied. Davis at least confronts this stance directly (p. 4) by stating that, while the field is broadly interdisciplinary, it nonetheless is "patent that this book represents only the political-science part of public administration, not the part that would be written by the economist or someone from a business school." Similarly, Sharkansky observes (p. 3) that his book "concentrates on those components that appear to be the most relevant to the political process and that have received the most attention from political scientists." Rehfuss tends to toss in the towel by noting (pp. 220-221) that, "Until the relationship between public and private administration is clarified (if, indeed, it ever can be), there is unlikely to be agreement on the type of graduate training."
 25. As calculated from figures in NASPAA, *op. cit.* (1971-72), pp. 1-2, and NASPAA, *Graduate School Programs in Public Affairs and Public Administration, 1974* (Washington, D.C.: NASPAA 1974), p. 2.
 26. NASPAA, *op. cit.* (1971-72), Table 1, p. 105, and NASPAA, *op. cit.* (1974), p. 2.
 27. Eugene P. Dvorin and Robert H. Simmons, *From Amoral to Humane Bureaucracy* (San Francisco: Canfield, 1972), pp. 52-53.
 28. Grace M. Taher (ed.), *University Urban Research Centers, 1971-1972* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 2nd edition, 1971), p. i.