

The Foundations of Public Administration Series is a collection of articles written by experts in 20 content areas, providing introductory essays and recommending top articles in those subjects.

An Overview of Organization Theory and Behavior

Dr. Robert Denhardt, Arizona State University

Margaretha Warnicke, Arizona State University

Ljubinka Andonoska, Arizona State University

This essay provides an overview of organizational theory and behavior in the public sector from the perspective of leading public administration scholars whose articles have been published in the *Public Administration Review*. There are three main components to this analysis: an overview to how theorists have approached knowledge acquisition; important topics including managerial techniques, the role of the individual, and leadership and organizational change; and finally, an exploration of the implications of organizational theory and behavior for the future of democratic governance.

Positivist Organization Theories

Early theoreticians in the field of public administration searched for underlying principles to explain how public organizations functioned. Heavily influenced by positivism, they turned to research methods imported from the natural sciences to do this. Positivist researchers believed that knowledge should be generated by the accumulation of facts, and that principles of administrative behavior would then be generalized from this empirical knowledge. Researchers considered values and facts to be logically distinct, and promised objectivity through the use of the scientific

method to empirically gather data, which involved: establishing a hypothesis that proposed a relationship between two variables, creating a research design, testing the relationship elaborated in the hypothesis, analyzing the results, and then drawing conclusions based on the observed data. Typically, positivist organizational theorists were concerned with efficiency, or how to economically maximize worker productivity (Denhardt, 2008; Simon, 1947a)

Robert B. Denhardt is an ASU Regents Professor, Lincoln Professor of Leadership and Ethics and Director of the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University. He is also a Distinguished Visiting Scholar at the University of Delaware.

rbd@asu.edu

Margaretha Warnicke is a doctoral student in the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University. She has a master's degree in history from the University of Delaware.

margaretha.warnicke@asu.edu

Ljubinka Andonoska is a doctoral student in the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University. She has a master's degree in public administration from Arizona State University.

ljubinka.andonoska@asu.edu

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

Both the research of Frederick Taylor and the Hawthorne studies provide examples of the scientific or “orthodox” approach to studying management, organizations and efficiency. Taylor, best known for his articles about scientific management, viewed humans as extensions of the machines with which they worked. Taylor’s research included observations of worker performance in factories so that he could design better ways to perform tasks and increase productivity. The researchers of the Hawthorne studies employed more active techniques by performing experiments on workers in a Chicago factory to determine if changes to environmental factors (such as lighting) could impact worker performance. While the conclusions that the Hawthorne researchers drew ultimately broke with scientific management theories, the initial design and research methodologies reflected the orthodox perspective (Denhardt, Denhardt, & Aristigueta, 2008). Taylor and the researchers of the Hawthorne studies adopted objective, empirical approaches to the study of organizations, and they assumed that the work environment was the most crucial aspect to understand in order to maximize worker efficiency (Burrell & Morgan, 2006).

Herbert A. Simon was one of the most active and well-known proponents of logical positivism in public administration. Simon’s (1946, 1947a) exchange with Robert A. Dahl (1947) in the *Public Administration Review* illustrated positivist administrative thought and the debate surrounding it. Simon (1946) broke with the orthodox tradition in his first article of the exchange by claiming that four well-known proverbs of administration – specialization, unity of command,

span of control, and organization by purpose, process, clientele, and place – were not good analytical tools for administrative researchers, but simply descriptors of an administrative system. These proverbs could easily be interpreted in conflicting or contradictory ways, and thus result in distinct system designs that might or might not be efficient. Simon proposed two alternative conditions that would produce successful research. First, the goals of the administrative system would have to be well defined to ensure easy assessment of results, and second, the system must be controllable during an experiment to ensure valid testing of the variables. Simon complained that few researchers designed studies that met these two criteria, and he hoped that his arguments would convince these researchers to switch to more scientific, empirical methods.

Dahl (1947), in contrast, identified two problems with these efforts to make public administration a more scientific discipline. First, he believed that it was impossible to exclude normative values from the study of public administration, and moreover, “science cannot construct a bridge across the great gap from ‘is’ to ‘ought’” (p. 1). While Simon perceived efficiency to be a value-free goal, Dahl believed efficiency to be a value, one that just happened to be preferred by researchers in the field whether or not they recognized their bias. The second problem for a scientific study of public administration involved the human element. Public administration scholars studied human behavior in governmental organizations, and Dahl rejected the idea that a study of human behavior could be designed as a true experiment that produced uniform

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

data, created independently verifiable data, or resulted in reliable “laws of public administration.” Dahl suggested that a true scientific study of public administration would only be possible if researchers clarified what normative values were at play, understood better the place of human behavior in public administration, and created more comparative studies.

In Simon’s (1947a) response to Dahl, he detailed a complicated argument for two approaches to public administration research: a pure science approach and an applied approach. Simon suggested that a pure approach could be values-free whereas an applied approach could not be, and that Dahl’s ideas were most appropriate for the applied approach. Simon also rejected the notion that efficiency was a value that the pure science approach venerated. This exchange between Simon and Dahl clearly demonstrates the tensions among researchers at the time in regards to positivism, arguments for greater scientific rigor, and the role of efficiency in public administration research. It is important to note that both Simon and Dahl believed that public administration could be subject to scientific study and that the field would benefit from such analysis. One additional, important contribution that Simon (1947b) made to the positivist study came from his book, *Administrative Behavior*, in which he borrowed and then modified rational choice theory from the field of economics. Simon described a (rational) administrative man who made “satisfactory” decisions that were constrained by his personal limitations and the available information to him. Simon contended that the concept of the administrative man removed normative values from the discussion, and

presented a model of people within an organization attempting to make optimal decisions under difficult circumstances. However, not all scholars agreed with the tenets of the administrative man.

Interpretive Organization Theories

Theories derived from the interpretivist paradigm reject the notion that the human world can be studied with scientific methods. Instead, interpretive theorists want to study organizations from the inside in order to understand how everything actually functions from the perspective of the workers themselves. Often defined most clearly when set up in opposition to functionalist theories, interpretive theories suggest that human values will inevitably intrude upon scientific theory and inquiry. The Hawthorne experiments, while initially designed in accordance with scientific methodologies, resulted in conclusions that focused on the importance of human interaction in the workplace and its impact on productivity ((Denhardt, 2008). The researchers involved in the Hawthorne experiments did not understand the impact of human values and interaction until they went into the organization and interacted with the workers. Through this interaction, the researchers came to understand how worker actions reflected their understanding of and interaction with their environment. Another exchange of articles involving Simon serves as an example of the dissatisfaction that many interpretive scholars felt with positivism, its scientific theories of public administration, and how these theories addressed the human element of organizations.

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

Chris Argyris (1973a) rejected Simon's emotionless, yet rational, administrative man. While Argyris accepted that people usually behave rationally, he criticized Simon's theory for not providing mechanisms for individual and organizational development. Argyris contended that rational organizations comprised of administrative men would exclude anyone who had self-actualized and make it difficult to excite change from the bottom-up because of the authoritative power structures dedicated to maintaining the *status quo*. According to Argyris, the positivist aversion to normative values was the true weakness of the scientific management theories. By rejecting normative values, these theories began to appear like orders awaiting enforcement, and enforcing these orders then created the data for the scientists to prove their theoretical generalizations and thus reinforce the *status quo*. Argyris believed that when scholars aimed for objectivity, they ended up championing their own normative values and ignoring the actual human element. The only solution Argyris perceived to this logical meltdown would be to focus less on creating an overall theory of organizations as they are. Instead, researchers should describe what organizations ought to be, thus including normative values at the onset of theory development.

Not too surprisingly, Argyris's critique provoked a response from Simon (1973). Simon criticized Argyris' understanding of bounded rationality and argued that individuals had a choice about whether or not to accept organizational authority. Simon acknowledged that the assumption of rational behavior within or-

ganizations assisted researchers in theory building, but insisted that this model neither excluded development nor emotion. A dedicated positivist, Simon wanted to uncover general laws that explained the process of decision-making in organizations. He believed that understanding these general laws could help develop alternatives to the existing models and even change the *status quo* (although he cautioned against it). However, if researchers included "ought" in theory development, then theory could not predict human behavior and provided little value. Unwilling to let Simon have the last word, Argyris (1973b) responded with an article that essentially attributed their disagreement to their different intellectual paradigms. Argyris accepted the value of descriptive theories, but concluded that social science research is normative no matter what theory researchers employ. Argyris's approach clearly demonstrated an interpretive theorist's preference to investigate organizations via studies of individual worker intentions, emotions, and perspectives.

Argyris was not alone in his distrust of how theorists of the scientific bent handled normative values and human behavior. Bayard L. Catron and Michael M. Harmon (1981) also rejected positivist claims to objectivity and expressed concern that theorists were perpetuating a conspiracy on practitioners by: disregarding the actualities of administrative life in favor of their own assumptions about how organizations worked; disguising normative judgments as facts or methodologically determined; and completely ignoring moral and ethical issues. Catron and Harmon believed that the quality of organizational and social theory could be improved if theoreticians and practi-

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

tioners engaged with one another more honestly. Theoreticians must acknowledge the gap between theory and practice, and then recognize that the uniqueness of organizations and individuals could help build better theory for practice, which should be the ultimate purpose of theory. Theorists and practitioners must also work together to ease the frustrations of clients, which meant that any workable theory must be both political and moral. Public administration scholars should first gather information from the front lines by observing actual human behavior and then build theory.

Critical Organization Theories

Critical organization theories generally derive from the radical humanist paradigm and take the interpretive concern for the human element a step further. Scholars who employ critical theories have been concerned with how workers perceive both themselves and their roles in organizations. Theoreticians have sought to unmask the human alienation within the organizational life and have placed a substantial emphasis on individual human values and attitudes that affect organizational management. Critical theorists criticize the classical management models and push to move beyond economic interest and positivist notions of rational decision-making because “the variability of human behavior from place to place and time to time limits the positive science pursuit of lawlike statements applicable to a wide range of human behavior” (Denhardt, 2008, p. 155). Critical theorists assume

that humanity can control its choices and environment, and they call for changes to improve the human condition within organizations and in society as a whole. Critical theorists have offered a number of alternative organizational theories and perceptions of the discipline of public administration, as demonstrated in this section.

William G. Scott (1969) and Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1972) each presented alternatives to the positivist and interpretivist visions of organizations. Scott combined industrial humanism (interpretive theories) and pluralism to create his theory. Pluralism, a concept employed by social responsibility theorists to analyze interorganizational activities, accounts for how multiple human interests affect the administrative decision-making process. According to pluralism, competition amongst these interest groups blocks the centralization of power and the creation of an administrative elite. Scott suggested that instead of allowing this elite to develop, democratic principles and governmental structures be extended within organizations; employees would be treated as citizens of the organization with the commensurate rights and protections provided to citizens of the United States. Scott doubted that his proposal would be adopted because high-level administrators would not cede power to employees and because an improbable coalition of managers and theoreticians were requisite. Ramos, on the other hand, felt optimistic about his alternative organizational theory because organizations had already begun shifting from bureaucratic structures to new designs. Ramos’ theory relied on the concept of the “parentetical man,” who was both a

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

reflection of and a reaction to the modernization of society. Ramos described the parenthetical man as one who could “step from the stream of everyday life to examine and assess it as a spectator” (p. 244). Specifically, the parenthetical man could develop a new perspective that would allow for the design and establishment of organizations without the traditional bureaucratic hierarchy. Both Scott and Ramos reflect the determination of critical organization theorists to push beyond traditional social arrangements to improve the human condition by changing organizational structure and raising workers’ consciousness.

Robert B. Denhardt (1981) echoed the calls of Scott and Ramos for a shared critical theory of public administration. Denhardt asserted that public administration as discipline was in the throes of an intellectual crisis. Rather than promoting one critical organization theory over another, he explained why critical organization was needed and how it would benefit the discipline. While positivist theories may have met administrators’ needs for administrative efficiency and control, such theories could not meet the requirements of an administrative system steeped in democracy. Public service in a democratic government should reflect democratic ideals, and bureaucratic hierarchies based on authority and control cannot foster democratic values. Denhardt contended that critical theories offered an alternative approach to knowledge accumulation by raising questions about power and alienation in organizational structures and identifying areas for improvement. Much like the interpretive theorists, Denhardt recommended that critical theorists investigate human interactions and communications directly.

Through this analysis, theorists would develop organizational structures where management could provide assistance to individual employees and clients without regard to organizational efficiency. By democratizing administrative structures, public administrators and scholars could foster democratic social and political action throughout society.

David C. Korten (1984) approached the need for a critical theory of organization from a global perspective of people and their needs. By first tracing the rise of industrial society and its spread to the developing world, Korten demonstrated how and why bureaucratic structures had dominated. However, he claimed that the needs of individuals had changed and that public and private organizational structures were beginning to adapt to meet these new requirements even if theorists had not fully recognized it. Moreover, the whole basis for the legitimacy of public institutions had been transformed. Constitutional political authority was no longer sufficient to justify the existence of a public entity because organizations must now serve a useful social function for the public. Unlike the positivist vision of a stable bureaucracy, the new strategic organization would have control mechanisms and flexible financial plans to guide managerial action. Like Denhardt, Korten envisioned public administration as being in a time of transition and transformation that could finally move past hierarchical bureaucracy and positivism.

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

Post-Modern Organization Theories

Post-modern organization theorists tend to evince skepticism about the primacy of rationalism and reason, and offer a variety of critiques both of the field and of organizational theory. Post-modern theories of organization as a whole lack a coherent vision or ideology that unifies them, but share an emphasis on language, perspective and discourse. Post-modern theorists assert that the common discourses need to be changed so that true understanding can be achieved and real change effected. Theory is built through an examination of the assumptions that are the basis for societal beliefs. Knowledge may be accumulated through textual analysis as well as traditional scientific methodologies, but different analytical tools may also be employed to improve understanding. Post-modern theorists typically believe that enhanced public dialogue and open discussion amongst the parties in organizations is critical.

Orion F. White, Jr. (1969) introduced a dialectical analysis to offer a different perspective on how an organization could meet the needs of its clients. White's analysis involved contrasting opposing models to current theory. He identified four dimensions to the dialectical analysis of organizations. The first dimension concerned client relations. Traditional organizational structures treat clients as subordinate to the administrator, so the opposite nonbureaucratic approach would encourage administrators to solve even the most challenging or daunting cases regardless of the impact on efficiency or bureaucratic fairness. In

the second dimension, White honed in on the homogeneity and conformity encouraged by hierarchical organization. His proposed alternative would distribute authority laterally instead of vertically, which he believed would encourage diversity in the organization. The third dimension tackled organizational ideology and the bureaucratic focus on self-preservation even at the expense of organizational goals. The opposing ideology suggested by White would elevate the achievement of the company's goals above all else. The fourth dimension focused on organizational mentality, or "antagonistic cooperation," where cooperation in bureaucracies is ensured by coercion. The nonbureaucratic alternative would elevate consensus through discussion and shared decision-making. White insisted that the dialectical model of organization could be applied not only to small agencies, but also to the political system even though he recognized that such an application would be unlikely.

Chris Argyris (1980) elaborated models of organizational learning that when implemented effectively would promote more honest organizational communication, a very post-modern objective. Argyris asserted that certain topics or organizational problems inhibit communication and cause workers to play games with one another. Argyris identified these as "undiscussable" problems and his goal was to make these issues more acceptable. Organizations typically learn in two different ways: single-loop learning (or thermostat learning), which occurs when workers attempt to smooth over communication issues without altering organizational policies or procedures; and double-loop organizational learning, when workers

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

attempt to understand why the miscommunication happened and then change policies to address the problem. In general, Argyris found that workers have two options when faced with “undiscussable” problems, either they can attempt to control others and withhold information to benefit their own self-interest, or they can learn how to deal with challenging situations that will give them the opportunity for open communication. Argyris believed that double-loop learning would help executives to recognize the difference between what people say and what they actually do, which should enhance skill development, facilitate more double-loop learning, encourage open communication, and ultimately help organizations overcome complex problems.

David J. Farmer and Patricia M. Patterson (2003) also focused on methods of communication, and more specifically on rhetoric. The authors recognized that public administration faced challenges with public communication, so they elaborated a three-step technique based on rhetoric to improve understanding between public administrators and their clients. First, the administrator should identify useful terms and their definitions. Then the administrator should consider these rhetorical terms carefully in light of public administrative texts. Finally, the administrator should analyze the usage of the selected terms in different academic or political contexts. After this technique has been applied, administrators then need to carefully consider their rhetorical signature – what their verbal style communicates about their thoughts and administrative manner. Individual rhetorical signatures often must be modified in order to mesh with the

group rhetoric of the larger organization, which can be frustrating. The discipline of public administration, for example, has relied on ‘efficiency’ in its rhetoric, which some scholars reject due to its limitations. Like the other examples of post-modern techniques, Farmer and Paterson analyze organizations, management, and administration from a different perspective than positivists, interpretivists, and critical theorists through their focus on language and communication.

Networks and Organizations

Public organizations deliver services to citizens in a complex manner by cooperation with other agencies. The commonplace nature of this new method for delivering public service means that the performance of public organizations can no longer be evaluated by analyzing the performance measures of one organization on its own. Networks consisting of multiple stakeholders have become the new reality, which means that evaluating the efficiency and performance of these networks is critical to understanding how public administration relates to those seeking public services.

Keith G. Provan and H. Brinton Milward (2001) proposed mechanisms for evaluating the efficiency of networks. The authors identified three levels of performance evaluation: community, network, and participant. When networks are analyzed at the community level, efficiency should be evaluated in terms of its total contribution for the community served. The major challenge for a network is negotiating the bal-

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

Topics in Organizational Theory

The Context

ance of power, especially when one organization in the network has more power than the others. The network administrative organization (NAO) must allocate resources so that members of the network can efficiently provide effective services to clients. Smaller organizations especially benefit from the shared resources and solutions that a network can facilitate. While efficiency at each level may be measured, the actual efficiency of the network must be integrated across the different levels of analysis, which can be challenging because effectiveness at one level does not always translate into effectiveness at the other levels.

Kenneth J. Meier and Laurence J. O'Toole (2003) evaluated the role of networks in policy execution. The authors specifically focused on the role public managers play in these networks and how public managers can impact program outcomes. Of particular interest to Meier and O'Toole was how managers navigated the complicated channels of power in networks, which do not resemble the traditional hierarchical structure of many public organizations. The authors established a model for evaluating managerial impact on program outcomes and then employed a regression analysis to test their theories about managers, networks, and policy implementation. Ultimately, the authors conclude that organizations with network-oriented managers performed better than those whose managers ignored network-based interaction.

Up until this point, we have primarily focused on the theoretical perspectives of organizational performance, organizational structure, and knowledge accumulation. In the following sections, we will discuss several important topics in organizational behavior and how these topics interact with or reflect various organizational theories. In this first section, we will explore the organizational context in more detail to develop an understanding of how theory can shed light on organizational problems and processes. Sometimes administrators must modify their theories when faced with the realities of organizational life and human behavior. Discussions of organizational context must include consideration of external factors as well as internal factors. For legislators and executives who interact with public organizations, understanding how a policy's design affects its outcome can be critical to implementation success. In the end, context always matters.

Robert T. Golembiewski's (1960) article exemplified the case management approach that became very popular in the mid-twentieth century among public administration researchers. Golembiewski's case study analyzed the performance of the Copy Pulling Section in the Patent Office at the U.S. Department of Commerce, which underwent organizational restructuring in 1946 and then again in 1948. The first restructuring had been based on an orthodox theory in the style of

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

Taylor's scientific management. The administrators hoped to increase productivity and efficiency in the organization by instituting a top-down management approach with very close supervision, dissolving pre-existing small workgroups, and designing a mechanized work routine. Golembiewski indicated that this approach caused management to overlook the impact of these changes on employee morale, and to focus too much on the technical aspects of efficiency. Even though this restructuring improved the efficiency of the section it adversely affected morale so that management pursued a second restructuring in 1948 to fix the enormous morale problems. In this second restructuring, workers were offered greater participation in establishing and implementing organizational goals, and smaller workgroups were reestablished. Efficiency and productivity increased even more after this second restructuring. Thus, Golembiewski concluded that by employing a theory that accounted better for the organizational context and needs of the individuals, management successfully created a more efficient and productive workforce.

Like Golembiewski, Martin Landau (1969) offered insights into the internal organizational context. Landau investigated redundancy and criticized rational theories of organization that characterized redundancy as a negative phenomenon. Landau explained that policy makers and researchers often focus on the excesses of redundant organizational processes, complaining that unnecessary duplication wastes public resources. However, Landau argued that overlapping functions in a public organization are not always negative, and that redundancy can provide value to public

organizations and their clients. He compared the context of a public organization to that of a machine, where engineers often design redundancy in order to improve reliability and performance in the event that an untoward accident or other unpredicted outcome occurs. Many public administration scholars of Landau's era ascribed to Herbert Simon's theory that an administrative system had a limited set of prescribed variables, which meant that redundancy was unnecessary because nothing unexpected should happen. Landau contended that in the actual context of most organizations, such certainty about the variables was rare. Indeed, the development of "parallel circuits" (according to his machine analogy) might be both vital and beneficial to an organization. His article suggested the importance of analyzing the actual function of an administrative element in the context of the organization before automatically eliminating it as unnecessary or redundant.

While Landau compared organizations to machinery, Herbert Kaufman (1973) suggested an organic analogy to explain the external contextual elements affecting the rate and capacity of organizations to change. Like biological organisms, public organizations require significant quantities of time for small evolutionary changes to take effect. Kaufman asserted that the existence and continued growth of large organizations was unavoidable despite a societal dislike for how they dehumanized workers, were challenging to control, and were too large to evolve quickly, thus perpetuating large inefficiencies. Kaufman suggested that even if governments were to adopt regulations to decentralize large organizations, the problems associated

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

with them would still exist. The vast resources of these organizations would no doubt stave off the implementation of whatever legislative policies local groups managed to pass attempting to force their disaggregation. Kaufman wanted public administration scholars to acknowledge the larger political context in which these large organizations operated in order to develop better ideas for their regulation. He concluded that “even if we understood the process better, we would for the foreseeable future still be bound by it; ignoring it, we have no hope at all of influencing its direction” (p. 307). Kaufman clarified that his assertion that change would come slowly, if at all, did not reflect support for the status quo, but rather an acknowledgement of the political context that large organizations inhabited.

Robert S. Montjoy and Laurence J. O’Toole (1979) concentrated on intra-organizational policy implementation, and how public organizations respond internally to external policy mandates. The authors identified two key criteria of any mandate – the specificity of the description and the provision of new resources dedicated to the implementation. Montjoy and O’Toole then identified four possible combinations of policies that organizations might be asked to implement based on those two criteria. Through their analysis of these four types, the authors discovered that when agencies were awarded new resources and wide discretion (type A), the implementation often resulted in paralysis because the agency was not always sure how to act with so little direction. On the other hand, mandates that included no new resources (types C and D) forced agencies to incorporate the

new mandates into existing routines. Without new resources, policies with vague definitions (type C) were often abandoned in favor of pre-existing processes although those with specific definitions (type D) were also occasionally reprioritized. According to Montjoy and O’Toole, based on the context of public organizations, those policies that included new resources and specific definitions (type B) had the best chance of complete implementation. Improving our understanding of the organizational context, then, can significantly impact whether or not a policy is successfully implemented as well as to help improve organizational performance.

The Individual Actor

Organizations, both public and private, are comprised of individual workers whose actions and beliefs affect the outcomes of organizational objectives. Consequently, the role of the individual has been discussed by a variety of public administration scholars throughout the years. Since organizational action depends on individuals, numerous theories have emerged about individual decision-making, psychological development, motivation, and responsiveness to management. Different intellectual paradigms have begat unique interpretations of the importance of the individual worker. More scientifically based theories focus on the organizational processes and how the individual’s contribution can be streamlined. Theories with a stronger psychological basis have tended to focus on individual maturity and motivation, and particularly on how management interactions with or un-

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

derstanding of workers can make a substantial difference on organizational performance.

Herbert A. Simon (1965) contributed to public administration scholars' understanding of individual decision-making and the possible supportive role that technology could play. Simon focused on individual decision-making because he felt that rational choice theory had not fully accounted for the messiness of administrative decisions. Administrators often lack complete information and viable alternatives, but Simon believed that theory development and new technologies could simplify the administrative decision-making process because if decision-making were more efficient, an organization could be more productive. He contended that recent technological advancements had allowed for the development of new tools to assist with the decision-making process via three channels: operations and management research; real-world experiments in administrative decision-making; and theoretical development. Simon believed that public administration scholars needed to continue improving scientific understanding of and investigation into administrative decision-making. According to his perspective, statistics and technology were the most critical components to making daily administrative decision-making more efficient and improving an organization's overall performance. However, Simon also advocated additional theory development to improve both normative and quantitative tools.

Where Simon wanted to make administrative decision-making more technical and systematic, Richard L. Schott (1986) focused on how public organizations

could improve efficiency by understanding the different stages of adult psychological development. Schott wanted public organizations to learn from the example of private organizations, which had been very proactive about acknowledging the relationship between individual psychology and organizational performance. According to psychological research, individual motives and goals change according to a specific sequence from early adulthood to middle adulthood to late adulthood. Schott contended that by understanding these psychological stages, managers could better structure hiring and recruiting initiatives. For example, when hiring for leadership positions, administrators should consider the maturity level of the individual because an individual in early adulthood may not possess the requisite psychological strength for effective managerial performance. Additionally, psychological research had uncovered strong connections between maturational development and job satisfaction. As a consequence, Schott suggested designing organizational structures to support workers appropriately as they move through the maturational phases because it would improve overall organizational effectiveness and reduce employee alienation. Schott argued that an individual's maturational stage could be directly linked to the productivity of the organization.

James L. Perry and Lois Recascino Wise (1990) also analyzed an individual's psychology, but from the perspective of what motivated people to want to work in public organizations. Perry and Wise identified three categories of motivation that caused individuals to seek public sector employment: rational,

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

norm-based, and affective. Rational theories of motivation proposed that an individual attained utility maximization from working for the public sector because the individual felt excited to be a part of the policy development process, had a personal investment in a policy outcome, or wanted to lobby on behalf of a special interest. An individual driven by norm-based motivations had an interest in serving the public, a strong determination to fulfill his or her civic responsibility, or a desire to participate in public resource allocation to underserved communities. Affective motivations best described individuals who were driven by a commitment to a specific program, or who believed that public service best expressed their patriotic duty and love for their fellow citizens. Perry and Wise asserted that these motivations translated into important implications for employee behavior in public sector organizations. An individual who sought employment in a public organization tended to be one who was most motivated by the idea of public service. Moreover, individual motivation was positively correlated to individual performance, which meant that utilitarian methods for motivation commonly employed by private organizations, such as monetary bonuses, were not as important to the motivation of public sector employees. Perry and Wise suggested that additional research into public sector employees was needed to better understand motivation, and consequently employee recruitment and retention.

Robert D. Behn's (1998) article highlighted the role of public managers in organizations, which contrasts with the approach of the previous authors who focused on the characteristics of the individual worker

from the managerial perspective. Behn firmly believed that public managers, although not a part of the government as specified by the Constitution, played an important role in public management and could in fact correct some of the systemic failures of the American governmental system. He elaborated the major failures that occur in both public organizations and government, including: organizational, analytical, executive, legislative, political, civic, and judicial failures. According to Behn, public managers could and should work to reduce the severity and likelihood of these failures. He recognized that some public managers might use their power in improper ways, but he felt that human error is an inevitable consequence of human governmental systems, which was why a system of checks and balances had been created. Behn ultimately recommended that public organizations make it "an explicit part of the public manager's job to exercise leadership" (p. 221), so that public managers could correct the deleterious effects of human failures. One individual then, according to the authors in this section, can make an enormous impact on public government and organizational performance.

Leadership and Organizational Change

So far, we have looked at the context of an organization and how scholars have understood the role and impact of individual actors. The authors in this section explore one specific type of individual actor – the leader. Each author contributes to our understanding of leadership and organizational change, and also how organizational theory has affected our understanding

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

of these two themes. Topics covered include the sources of administrative power, how that power is legitimated, what constitutes power in an information-based organization, how our understanding of leaders and leadership have changed over time, and how leaders can help an organization not only survive but thrive when faced with substantive change.

Norton E. Long (1949) explored the sources of administrative power, which he described as the “lifeblood of administration” (p. 257). Long’s arguments countered those of orthodox public administration theorists such as Frank Goodnow (2003) and Woodrow Wilson (1887) who disapproved of how the Constitution had balanced power between the branches of government. Long argued that the politics-administration dichotomy, of which Goodnow and Wilson had each theorized versions, could not work properly in the American state due to the absence of a centralized power and the failure of political parties to follow through on policy issues after an election. Long criticized contemporary theorists of administration for not investigating the sources of administrative power more fully and exploring how power did not percolate downwards, but sideways or even upwards from the center. Long asserted that in his present-day system, administrators spent a lot of time lining up political and ‘customer’ support in order to launch programs and policies, which contradicted Herbert Simon’s (1947b) theory of rational administrative behavior. In actual fact, the search for power often united an administrative organization more than the unifying purpose of everyone’s individual rational self-interest. Long concluded with the

suggestion that until the political parties fulfilled their responsibilities, theories based on the politics-administration dichotomy or rational administrative behavior would not work. Instead of focusing on what could be, Long encouraged scholars to develop new theories based on the actual state of administration.

Unlike Long, Robert V. Presthus (1960) was less concerned about the source of administrative power and more intrigued by how organizations channeled power and how individuals conferred legitimacy on authority in an organization. He defined authority as transactional – the organization and individuals negotiate concessions and thus forge a reciprocal relationship. Presthus highlighted the need for additional research into the process by which authority was legitimated because he believed that it varied depending on the circumstances in the organization. Presthus suggested that four bases legitimated authority: expertise or technical skill, formal delegation of authority through job title and status symbols, rapport or personal interaction with subordinates, and people’s general willingness to defer to authority. These four bases often co-exist as a manager may have both specific technical skills and strong interpersonal skills that makes subordinates want to respect his or her authority as legitimate. Leadership, according to this point of view, can be awarded through hierarchical structures, but still requires the acquiescence of the individual.

Harlan Cleveland (1985) also focused on organizational hierarchy, but he explored the development of the modern informatics society and how that might

provoke changes in organizational power and authority. In an informatics society, the key item produced is information, which Cleveland claimed had unique characteristics when compared to other products. Information is easy to produce, requires few inputs, is cheap, and is easy to trade. Due to these unique properties, he concluded that information would erode the traditional hierarchies of control, secrecy, ownership, structural unfairness, and location. While knowledge itself provides power to the person who acquires it, that power is ephemeral and easily lost because information tends to leak, which diffuses power and control and can even obliterate secrecy. Thus, Cleveland envisioned a new geography in an informatics society, one where organizations would be comprised of communities of people instead of tied to a specific location. Cleveland projected that the primacy of information would have serious implications that public organizations must consider in order to prepare for the unfamiliar terrain of the future.

Montgomery Van Wart's (2003) article touched on several themes already mentioned, but also provided a thorough review of leadership theory. Van Wart asserted that society has developed a greater appreciation of leadership in recent years, but that this appreciation has been accompanied by rising expectations for public leaders. He credited both of these trends to the greater access media has to leaders and the easier flow of information through the Internet, one proven repercussion of the changes caused by an informatics society as described by Cleveland (1985). In contrast to the rapid technological changes, Van Wart noted that the academic study of leadership, and in particu-

lar public sector leadership, had been somewhat stagnant. Theories of leadership in public organizations had been strongly affected by the popular organizational theories, which affected the type of research produced. For example, when scientific management theories predominated, scholars sought the specific traits or characteristics that made a good leader, which had mixed results in terms of predictive power. Herbert Simon's call for more scientific studies of public administration resulted in many empirical studies of small groups and the development of the transactional theories of leadership such as Prethuis (1960) discussed. Van Wart identified four key recurrent themes that scholars had not yet resolved: what the focus of leadership studies should be; if a leader actually makes a difference in an organization; if leadership traits are genetic or if they can be taught; and whether there is a best style of leadership. Van Wart concluded that much research still needed to be done, and he hoped that a comprehensive model of leadership that could be subjected to empirical analysis would be created.

Sergio Fernandez and Hal G. Rainey (2006) also reviewed existing literature, but unlike Van Wart, they focused on organizational change and the role of leaders in managing change. Fernandez and Rainey suggested that eight factors influence whether or not an organization successfully navigates change, and that many leaders often remain unaware of or underestimate the impact of these factors. First, a manager must verify that change is actually needed, and if confirmed, the manager must then develop a clear plan of action. Once the plan has been established, the leader

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

needs to rally internal support and defuse any objections to the plan; the support of higher-level executives is especially critical. After any internal issues have been resolved, the leader must negotiate the needs or requirements of external agencies or stakeholders. Next, the leader must coordinate and secure the provision of resources. Only then can the leader begin implementing the plan, making sure to institutionalize the changes comprehensively into organizational culture and business processes to ensure the longevity of the reforms. Fernandez and Rainey intended these suggestions to serve as guidance for practitioners who find themselves charged with leading an organization through significant changes. However, the authors, like Van Wart, called for additional theoretical and empirical research into these issues.

Managerial Techniques

The successful implementation of organizational change in public organizations has frequently been attributed to the skills of managers or the systems that they implement. Many of the most used and most effective management systems have been brought over from the private sector. Some techniques have been more successful than others, and many have required modifications in order to accommodate the characteristics of the public sector that differ markedly from the private. The authors in this section discuss several of the most popular of these systems, including organizational development (OD), management by objectives (MBO), cutback management, total

quality management (TQM) and strategic planning. As the authors indicate, there are advantages and disadvantages to each of these systems that public administrators should recognize before any of them are implemented.

Robert T. Golembiewski (1969) explained that organizations in the private sector had successfully been utilizing organizational development (OD) programs as a managerial technique to facilitate the implementation of change. Organizations employ OD programs to implement change in stages: first in employee attitudes, then in employee behavior, and finally in organization policies and structures. He then noted that OD programs had often been imported directly from the private sector and thus could not account for the unique characteristics of public organizations. Golembiewski asserted that if OD programs were to be successfully implemented in the public sector, that OD teams must include trained public administrators who understand the unusual challenges that public organizations face.

Several years later, Larry Kirkhart and Orion White (1974) identified 'technicism', or the tendency to focus on mechanistic processes and systematization as the major threat to the future development of OD. Kirkhart and White then detailed the two major paradigms for OD implementation. Situational/Emergent (S/E) OD has focused on different techniques and interventions to effect total system change that may vary depending on context, and grid OD, which developed in the wake of behavioral science and offered a series of defined processes for an organization to

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

follow irrespective of context. Despite the differing perspectives offered by each paradigm, the authors claimed that the paradigms shared a common weakness – neither proffered solutions for organizational design/structure or organizational/environmental relationships. Regardless Kirkhart and White argued that future developments of S/E OD offered the most opportunities for combating the technicist threat of rational organizational processes.

Frank Sherwood and William J. Page, Jr. (1976) presented another common managerial technique that some have tried to transport from private to public organizations, Management by Objectives (MBO). MBO requires managers to define feasible and measurable short-term organizational goals. The authors contend that private organizations often employ MBO effectively and efficiently, but that public service organizations struggle with establishing strict goals. Public organizations face challenges with MBO because they are often saddled with projects that private organizations are unwilling or incapable of delivering, the publicly identified goal is not the actual goal of the project, or no standards of measurement exist to determine a project's success. Additionally, some managers in public organizations cannot disconnect their activities from external factors such as Congressional authority, which means that MBO would not be effective as a managerial technique in that setting. Yet the authors predict that MBO will increasingly be used in public organizations because of the greater focus on accountability and performance measurements. This prediction has come true to a certain extent as exemplified by the government's

reliance on performance budgets, which are often used to measure the effectiveness of public organizations.

Charles H. Levine (1978) focused on how public organizations react to economic crisis and organizational decline. He explained that the causes of organizational decline include both external and internal political or economic factors, which result in four typical scenarios: political vulnerability, problem depletion, organizational atrophy, and environmental atrophy. Organizations typically respond in one of two ways – they either resist the decline or they try to smooth the decline. In some cases, higher-level management may adopt one strategy even as middle-level managers in the same organization pursue another. Levine next described the most commonly used cutback measures utilized by public organizations, which included among others: hiring freezes, terminating junior employees, even-percentage-cuts-across-the-board, eliminating low-productive units, and zero-base budgeting. Managers often must juggle efficiency, efficacy, and employee seniority issues when faced with cutback management, and many of those tactics do not account for the importance of the services provided by that organization to the public. Levine hoped that public managers would adopt a more long-range perspective when navigating through a crisis because short-term solutions often do not address the larger problems of the organization, thus making future crises inevitable. A manager's vision can substantively influence the long-term survival of a public organization.

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

James E. Swiss (1992), like several of the authors in this section, supported the public sector's adoption of a management practice used in private business; however, he demanded that several important modifications to the practice be made first. Total Quality Management (TQM) has five central tenets: the customer makes the final decision about quality; quality should be built into the product from the beginning; products should not vary in quality; employees need to work together instead of as individuals; and quality requires constant effort and attention to process improvement. One of the primary challenges to implementing a vanilla version of TQM in public organizations is that governments often provide services not products, which makes measuring outputs and process quite challenging. It is also often unclear who the customer is, especially when an organization serves the public at-large. TQM works best when management has low turnover and a clear focus, and those two prospects are often untenable or at the very least unlikely in government organizations due to changing political climates. Swiss suggested that when public organizations implement TQM that they request client feedback, report on specific performance measures, encourage continuous improvement of procedures and processes, and empower workers. In this modified form, Swiss contended that TQM could be a valuable public management tool.

Frances Stokes Berry (1994) expressed concern about how and when state agencies adopted another management innovation brought over from the private sector called strategic planning. Berry defined strategic planning as having four parts: a mission statement

that clearly states organizational goals; identification of those who the agency either serves or is responsible to; a 3 to 5 year plan that specifies the agency's long-term goals; and an explanation of the methods by which the agency plans to attain its goals. Berry found that public organizations were more likely to adopt strategic planning when their fiscal health was either very good or very poor. Additionally, larger agencies were the most likely to invest the time and resources into strategic planning. Gubernatorial politics also played a role in when an organization would decide to implement strategic planning; the first year of a governor's term (whether brand new or recently re-elected) proved to be the most popular time for this management innovation. The private sector also affected the probability of an agency's adoption of strategic planning. The more interactions that an agency has with the private sector, the more likely it would be to invest in strategic planning. Berry noted that public managers who wanted to push strategic planning in their organizations ought to pay attention to these factors in order to ensure their success.

Implications of Organization Theory and Behavior for Democratic Governance

Framing the Issue

As we have seen, organization theory has changed dramatically over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Theoretical perspectives have affected administrators' understanding and opinions on the multitude of topics, including organizational

context, the role of individuals, leadership, organizational change, and management techniques. In this final section, we explore the connections between organization theory and democratic governance as well as contemporary debates within the field. Before we focus on present-day discussions, we will first examine how scholars have framed organization theory and behavior. Some scholars have honed in on the potential negative consequences of organizational theory, while others have discussed its broader context in both politics and daily administrative life.

Some theorists worried that contemporary organization theory could cause harm to both theory and practice. David M. Levitan (1943) offered a critique of the then dominant “institutional” approach that was rooted in both Woodrow Wilson (1887) and Frank Goodnow’s (2003) works. Levitan feared that the institutional approach with the politics-administration dichotomy could easily be taken to an extreme and undemocratic end. He asserted that politics and administration were actually organically connected, and that administrative procedures should serve as tools for political ideologies because “Democratic government means democracy in administration, as well as in the original legislation” (p. 357). Levitan suggested that administrative processes regularly be reexamined to confirm that they accomplish political ends in accordance with the values of the governmental system.

Robert T. Golembiewski (1962) worried about the negative influences of organizational theory as it developed after Herbert Simon’s pivotal work in the late 1940s. In particular, Golembiewski criticized how or-

ganizational theory was goal-based, empirical, and focused on organizational function, while ignoring the moral consequences of organizational action. He offered an alternative values-based approach rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition that centered around five conditions aimed at increasing productivity: a psychologically acceptable and non-threatening work environment; management openness to workers developing to their full capabilities; some worker control over his or her individual day-to-day responsibilities; opportunities for workers to control and influence their larger work environment; and shared decision-making between workers and managers. Regardless of whether his calls for change were acknowledged, Golembiewski wanted to communicate to scholars and administrators alike that “organization is a moral problem” (p. 58).

Dwight Waldo (1968) raised the issue of public administration’s responsibility for and involvement in larger contemporary changes, specifically revolutions of thought, art, commerce, politics, and technology. According to Waldo, public administration participates in revolutionary activities every day from regulating agricultural technologies to motor vehicles to its use of computers. In addition to this passive or daily involvement, Waldo recommended that public administrators become more self-conscious and take action by responding to these revolutions in a calm and collected manner. He perceived a great deal of risk for public administration with recent political changes and the general distrust of government that contemporary society expressed. He feared that public administration might become focused exclusively on

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

operations, their economy, and efficiency. Waldo recommended that public administration foster a new interest in experimentation in organizational structure, procedures, and theory in order to keep pace with the revolutionary times.

Herbert Kaufman (1969) also perceived rampant change in public administration's past and present-day circumstances, and like Waldo, Kaufman identified larger societal forces at work that public administrators could only respond to and not truly alter. Kaufman suggested that three basic human values have governed the nature of administrative structures since America's birth: representation, leadership, and a neutral, competent public service. At any given time, one of these values typically dominates over the other two, and when Kaufman authored this article, citizens were calling for the elimination of bureaucratic structures through decentralization in order to increase political representation. He intimated that although decentralization seemed like the best solution to current issues, that the resulting changes would eventually serve as the basis for future calls for reform. Kaufman (1981) further developed these ideas in a later essay where he discussed the ever-present societal fear of bureaucracy. The calls for decentralization and elimination of the bureaucracy had continued and were now being made by people of all echelons of society. Kaufman credited the widespread fear to the American need to identify who was to blame for current societal ills, and that bureaucracy was the just the most convenient and "most recent devil" (p. 7). Rather than assign blame, the author recommended that researchers investigate larger societal trends and even

the possibility of employing an evolutionary model to explain the human condition.

David H. Rosenbloom (1983) agreed with Kaufman that societal values conflict with one another and spark change. However, Rosenbloom identified the source of these values as the three functions of the government, which constituted his main theoretical approaches to the discipline of public administration. The managerial approach advocates hierarchical organizational structures, an impersonal view of the individual, and the core principles of efficiency, effectiveness, and economy, whereas the political approach centers on accountability, responsiveness, and representation. These two approaches often clash due to their opposing viewpoints on organizational structure and individuals. They also typically dominate the legal approach, which has its ideological origins in the Constitution and thus emphasizes due process, individual rights, and equity. Rosenbloom doubted that a unifying theory of public administration could ever be synthesized from these three approaches due to their sometimes-contradictory natures and values, but argued that this did not undermine their legitimacy. Rosenbloom also asserted that the administrative branch of government applied each approach in varying degrees depending upon the purpose of the agency. He concluded that researchers should observe how administrators integrate the three approaches in their daily practice.

Charles T. Goodsell (1992) also offered a discussion of public administration's values, and just as Rosenbloom suggested, his ideas derived from daily admin-

istrative practice. Goodsell prescribed a normative theory of public administration that promoted the use of aesthetic values in an administrator's day-to-day tasks. He deliberately concentrated on identifying the values specific to an administrator's daily routine, which he felt had been overlooked in the more macro-level discussions of values such as efficiency, economy, equity, and even social justice. An artisan public administrator would embody the normative ideas derived from aesthetic theory: craftsmanship, style, form, respect for materials, and creativity. The author was not suggesting that administrators abandon the values derived from prior discussions, but rather that if macro-level frameworks were supplemented with his "microcosmic" vision, administrators could attain a greater sense of pride in their work developed through mastery of their craft.

Louis C. Gawthrop (1997) also lamented the influence of macro-level trends in public administration, and explored the relationship between democracy and bureaucracy. Gawthrop rather eloquently and pessimistically noted that "it seems to me that the predominant characteristic of the fusion of democracy and bureaucracy – that which, in turn, defines our deeply ingrained paradigm of policy and administration in a democratic society – is hypocrisy" (p. 206). He challenged the notion that administrative neutrality served a useful purpose. While prevalent theories called for neutrality to ensure that administrators heeded the guidance of politicians and the voice of the people, Gawthrop suggested that the focus on neutrality caused public servants to demote democratic values in their daily practice. Thus, administrators had on nu-

merous occasions divorced themselves from the responsibility for public policy mishaps. Bureaucracy had been designed to deliver services efficiently and effectively, not necessarily humanely, and for this reason, Gawthrop concluded that hypocrisy would continue to be rife in American public administration.

Contemporary Debates

Contemporary discussions of public administration and organization theory and behavior have been dominated by the topics of economics, democracy, governance, and the role of scholars in shaping the field. The most recent trends include the rise of New Public Management (NPM), New Public Service, and network governance. Scholars have responded to each of these trends in a variety of ways. Yet overall discussions have focused on the importance of increasing democratic governance and how to best foster citizen involvement in the public institutions of the modern American state.

Linda Kaboolian (1998) presented a summary of NPM. According to Kaboolian, NPM treats citizens as customers by applying an individualistic approach and private sector managerial techniques honed to enhance effectiveness. Public managers thus have the authority to decide what services public agencies will provide to their 'customers.' Kaboolian's article appeared as part of a symposium about NPM that included articles from five scholars, including Larry D. Terry, Rita Mae Kelly, Robert Behn, Brian J. Cook, and Laurence E. Lynn. Each of these scholars ad-

PAR

Foundations of Public Administration

Organization Theory and Behavior

Robert Denhardt, Margaretha Warnicke and Ljubinka Andonoska

dressed the consequences of NPM on public administration and public managers, and all spoke to how NPM affected the tension between politics and administration. Several scholars expressed concerns that decentralized government and business-driven endeavors would create an exclusionary state because NPM emphasized market mechanisms and to some degree ignored the democratic principles of representation, participation, and citizenship. Other scholars noted that governmental failures under previous systems had problems that would most likely continue to exist under NPM and encouraged public managers to engage in resolving these problems.. Another unifying theme was the call for accountability for public managers, although no general consensus emerged as to what an accountability system would look like. Overall, Kaboolian concluded that the five scholars made the case for additional research, both in the United States and around the world.

Donald F. Kettl (2000) explored the hot topic of governance, a successor to NPM, and the challenges that globalization and devolution pose to both federal and local governments. Kettl discussed the blurring relationships among public, for-profit (private), and not-for profit organizations that has been further complicated by the involvement of communities, multinational companies, and international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank. Many local and national governments from all over the world have contracted with private companies to deliver public services, and public administrators have found themselves managing contracts and

extended networks rather than providing services to the public directly. One challenge that Kettl identified for governments was that while most bureaucracies have been structured vertically with a top-down hierarchy, and this structure did not always mesh well with the horizontal networks that have developed. Additionally, delegation has caused problems for the traditional forms of accountability that relied on administrative hierarchies and chains of command. A third challenge related to the size of government and the scale of services that must be provided, which had grown beyond the capabilities of governmental systems. Kettl concluded that the gradual changes in public policy over the last two decades had completely transformed government and governance.

Robert B. Denhardt and Janet Vinzant Denhardt (2000) offered a new alternative for managing the public sector called New Public Service, which was deeply enmeshed in democratic theory rather than the economic-based theories that Kaboolian and Kettl presented. According to their argument, public servants and public managers should facilitate dialogue among different stakeholders to build a collective public interest out of the voices of individuals. Denhardt and Denhardt also suggested that public servants plan the implementation of the collective vision carefully, and make sure to encourage citizen involvement. In contrast with adherents to NPM, the authors portrayed the public as citizens, not customers, and argued that public servants must attend to the needs of citizens and recognize that it is the citizenry to whom they are accountable for their actions. Denhardt and Denhardt wanted to shift the focus of dis-

cussions from achieving productivity and efficiency to valuing the contributions and impact of people, both citizens and public servants.

John J. Kirlin (2001), like Denhardt and Denhardt, addressed the role of public administration in society, but he focused on academics rather than practitioners. Kirlin suggested that the academic concentration on daily operations limited scholarly understanding of how public administration affects the society-at-large. Kirlin identified several recent articles by well-known scholars who had researched how public administration and administrative operations had been impacted by societal forces, but never reversed the question. Not only did this lack of self-awareness limit the scope and number of “big questions” posed, but it could also heighten anti-democratic tendencies by not investigating how American public administration affects American democracy. Kirlin noted that few scholars or public organizations provided good evidence of the larger societal impact of their efforts, and he challenged his peers to do so. Ultimately, Kirlin stated that “We should take our role in society very seriously—the big questions of public administration must address how we make society better or worse for citizens” (p. 142).

Harry C. Boyte (2005) also highlighted the large role that public administration researchers and scholars played in implementing the new ideas behind governance. Boyte, like Denhardt and Denhardt, described the active role that citizens must have in both policy creation and in the process of democratic governance, rather than simply being consumers of public servic-

es. Boyte emphasized the importance of civic organizations and public spaces to citizen engagement and democracy in American history, but noted that many of these organizations and spaces have disappeared in modern society, which could have detrimental effects on democratic governance. In order to reinvigorate citizen activity and reduce the impact of the state-centered policies which have gained prominence in recent years, Boyte encouraged public administrators as public workers to foster the development of new citizen organizations.

Donald F. Kettl (2006) identified the chief problem of modern-day public administration and governance as the inconsistencies between existing administrative systems and the problems that public administration must resolve. Historically, American public administration drew boundaries to guide organizational design and ensure the preservation of values such as efficiency and democracy, and these boundaries have required trade-offs. For example, establishing a bureaucracy required sacrificing some democratic elements in order for the administrative systems to be most effective. Typically, five boundaries have shaped public administration in the United States: mission, resources, capacity, responsibility, and accountability. However, the prevailing trend of network governance has wrecked havoc on the stability of these boundaries. Network reporting structures tend to be horizontal rather than vertical, which has undermined traditional hierarchies, made co-ordination more challenging and accountability difficult to ensure. Kettl challenged public administration scholars and practitioners to find an alternative solution to the drawing of

boundaries, and instead elaborate strategies that will foster collaboration without making democratic public management impossible.

Amber Wichowsky and Donald P. Moynihan (2008) discussed public sector performance management and how it can threaten democratic governance by ignoring citizenship outcomes. Wichowsky and Moynihan demonstrated how one such tool, the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) employed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), assessed outcomes without regard to the civic implications of its community development programs. The authors contended that program evaluation tools ought to take into account citizenship outcomes because policy affects citizenship regardless of one's preference for a large or small government, managers need to keep long-term goals in mind when making short-term decisions, ignoring these outcomes has already had unintended consequences, and because even agencies with limited resources should be able to incorporate performance measures that relate back to their larger missions. Wichowsky and Moynihan suggested that government must be held accountable for the consequences of its programs whether intentional or not. Network governance has only heightened this need because many third-party organizations now provide public services, which has weakened the relationship between a government and its citizenry. The authors concluded that public agencies and government networks in a democratic state are responsible to their citizenry, and thus must measure how their programs affect democratic governance.

Conclusion

This overview has been primarily limited to the scholars and topics that have appeared in the pages of the *Public Administration Review*. Everything that we have discussed here has been treated in other venues, but it is clear that the *Public Administration Review* offers a selection of articles that has significantly contributed to our understanding and the development of theory and behavior in organizations. Many avenues for future research are still open and new ones continue to emerge, which will require the innovation of both academics and practitioners. The world of public service is one of ambiguity and uncertainty, and traditional management formulas are less likely to deliver results than the development of creative solutions.

References

- Argyris, C. (1973a). Some limits of rational man organizational theory. *Public Administration Review*, 33 (3), 253-267.
- Argyris, C. (1973b). Organization man: rational and self-actualizing. *Public Administration Review*, 33 (4), 354-357.
- Argyris, C. (1980). Making the undiscussable and its undiscussability discussable. *Public Administration Review*, 40 (3), 205-213.
- Behn, R. D. (1998). What right do public managers have to lead? *Public Administration Review*, 58 (3), 209-224.
- Berry, F. S. (1994). Innovation in public management: the adoption of strategic planning. *Public Administration Review*, 54 (4), 322-330.
- Boyte, H. C. (2005). Reframing Democracy: Governance, Civic Agency, and Politics. *Public Administration Review*, 65 (5), 536-546.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (2006). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis : elements of the sociology of corporate life*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Catron, B. L., & Harmon, M. M. (1981). Action theory in practice: toward theory without conspiracy. *Public Administration Review*, 41 (5), 535-541.
- Cleveland, H. (1985). The twilight of hierarchy: speculations on the global information society. *Public Administration Review*, 45 (1), 185-195.
- Dahl, R. A. (1947). The science of public administration: three problems. *Public Administration Review*, 7 (1), 1-11.
- Denhardt, R. B. (1981). Toward a critical theory of public organization. *Public Administration Review*, 41 (6), 628-635.
- Denhardt, R. B. (2008). *Theories of public organization* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60 (6), 549-559.
- Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Aristigueta, M. P. (2008). *Managing human behavior in public and non-profit organizations* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Farmer, D. J., & Patterson, P. M. (2003). The reflective practitioner and the uses of rhetoric. *Public Administration Review*, 63 (1), 105-111.

- Gawthrop, L. C. (1997). Democracy, bureaucracy, and hypocrisy redux: a search for sympathy and compassion. *Public Administration Review*, 57 (3), 205-210.
- Golembiewski, R. T. (1960). O & m and the small group. *Public Administration Review*, 20 (4), 205-212.
- Golembiewski, R. T. (1962). Organization as a moral problem. *Public Administration Review*, 22 (2), 51-58.
- Golembiewski, R. T. (1969). Organization development in public agencies: perspectives on theory and practice. *Public Administration Review*, 29 (4), 367-377.
- Goodnow, F. J. (2003). *Politics and administration : a study in government*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Goodsell, C. T. (1992). The public administrator as artisan. *Public Administration Review*, 52 (3), 246-253.
- Kaboolian, L. (1998). The new public management: challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate. *Public Administration Review*, 58 (3), 189-193.
- Kaufman, H. (1969). Administrative decentralization and political power. *Public Administration Review*, 29 (1), 3-15.
- Kaufman, H. (1973). The direction of organizational evolution. *Public Administration Review*, 33 (4), 300-307.
- Kaufman, H. (1981). Fear of bureaucracy: a raging pandemic. *Public Administration Review*, 41 (1), 1-9.
- Kettl, D. F. (2000). The transformation of governance: globalization, devolution, and the role of government. *Public Administration Review*, 60 (6), 488-497.
- Kettl, D. F. (2006). Managing boundaries in american administration: the collaboration imperative. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (s1), 10-19.
- Kirkhart, L., & Orion F. White, Jr. (1974). The future of organization development. *Public Administration Review*, 34 (2), 129-140.
- Kirlin, J. J. (2001). Big questions for a significant public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61 (2), 140-143.
- Korten, D. C. (1984). Strategic organization for people-centered development. *Public Administration Review*, 44 (4), 341-352.
- Landau, M. (1969). Redundancy, rationality, and the problem of duplication and overlap. *Public Administration Review*, 29 (4), 346-358.
- Levine, C. H. (1978). Organizational decline and cutback management. *Public Administration Review*, 38 (4), 316-325.
- Levitan, D. M. (1943). Political ends and administrative means. *Public Administration Review*, 3 (4), 353-359.

- Meier, K. J., & O'Toole Jr., L. J. (2003). Public management and educational performance: the impact of managerial networking. *Public Administration Review*, 63 (6), 689-699.
- Montgomery Van, W. (2003). Public-sector leadership theory: an assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 63 (2), 214-228.
- Montjoy, R. S., & O'Toole, L. J., Jr. (1979). Toward a theory of policy implementation: an organizational perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 39 (5), 465-476.
- Norton, E. L. (1949). Power and administration. *Public Administration Review*, 9 (4), 257-264.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review*, 50 (3), 367-373.
- Presthus, R. V. (1960). Authority in organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 20 (2), 86-91.
- Provan, K. G., & Milward, H. B. (2001). Do networks really work? a framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61 (4), 414-423.
- Ramos, A. G. (1972). Models of man and administrative theory. *Public Administration Review*, 32 (3), 241-246.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (1983). Public administrative theory and the separation of powers. *Public Administration Review*, 43 (3), 219-227.
- Schott, R. L. (1986). The psychological development of adults: implications for public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 46 (6), 657-667.
- Scott, W. G. (1969). Organization government: the prospects for a truly participative system. *Public Administration Review*, 29 (1), 43-53.
- Sergio Fernandez, H. G. R. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (2), 168-176.
- Sherwood, F. P., & Page, W. J., Jr. (1976). MBO and public management. *Public Administration Review*, 36 (1), 5-12.
- Simon, H. A. (1946). The proverbs of administration. *Public Administration Review*, 6 (1), 53-67.
- Simon, H. A. (1947a). A comment on "the science of public administration". *Public Administration Review*, 7 (3), 200-203.
- Simon, H. A. (1947b). *Administrative behavior*. New York,: Macmillan Co.
- Simon, H. A. (1965). Administrative decision making. *Public Administration Review*, 25 (1), 31-37.
- Simon, H. A. (1973). Organization man: rational or self-actualizing? *Public Administration Review*, 33 (4), 346-353.

- Swiss, J. E. (1992). Adapting total quality management (tqm) to government. *Public Administration Review*, 52 (4), 356-362.
- Waldo, D. (1968). Public administration in a time of revolutions. *Public Administration Review*, 28 (4), 362-368.
- White, O. F. (1969). The dialectical organization: an alternative to bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, 29 (1), 32-42.
- Wichowsky, A., & Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Measuring how administration shapes citizenship: a policy feedback perspective on performance management. *Public Administration Review*, 68 (5), 908-920.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.