

Public Administration Dictionary
Compiled by: Thomas R. Martinez, Ph.D.
(Updated: 1-6-10)

Unless otherwise indicated, the majority of terms below come from Chandler, Ralph C. and Plano, Jack D., The Public Administration Dictionary, 2nd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, 1988.

Others, as cited, are from other disciplinary references including:

Ammer, Christine and Dean S. Ammer, Dictionary of Business and Economics, The Free Press, Inc., New York, 1977.

Gould, Julius and William L. Kolb, A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY;

Poister, Theodore H., Public Program Analysis: Applied Research Methods, University Park Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1978.

Shafritz, Jay M., The Dorsey Dictionary of American Government and Politics, The Dorsey Press, 1988; or,

Theodorson, George A. and Achilles G. Theodorson, A Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Harper & Row, NY.

Others are excerpts from various books and journal articles.

Authority

The right to invoke compliance by subordinates on the basis of formal position and control over rewards and sanctions. Authority is institutionalized power. A power relationship is based on the ability to coerce compliant behavior if necessary. Without authority, power relationships develop according to status, knowledge, and informal characteristics. Authority, however, is based on legitimate foundations that formally establish structure and position within an organization. As social groups are formed, superior-subordinate relationships form. These power structures are perpetuated by tradition and eventually legitimized by law, statute, or formal rules. German sociologist Max Weber identified three types of authority. *Charismatic authority* depends on the personal characteristics of the authority figure. *Traditional authority* is the stabilization of informal roles over time. *Rational-legal authority* is formally legitimized as when a state grants institutional rights to a corporation. This type of authority, like others, is delegated through hierarchical patterns and depends on effective flow of direction from top to bottom if it is to succeed.

Significance Authority has a “zone of acceptance” according to organization theorist Herbert A. Simon. Unless a directive falls within this zone, it will not be effective, since it will be rejected by subordinates. Thus formal authority is limited. More and more in modern organizations, workers are questioning formal authority. If a synthesis of Weber’s three types of authority were used, the “zone of acceptance” would widen and the authority should become more effective. In the typical hierarchical organization, formal authority is located at the top. Often, however, this top position is dependent on people in lower positions possessing special knowledge or skills, in order to develop plans and give proper direction. Often these persons are advisors not in line positions of authority. Thus various staff positions might acquire “functional authority.” Persons in these staff positions have little formal authority, but the top decision makers depend on them for advice or information. Authority is necessary to get the job done. The extremes of authority—*anarchy* and *authoritarianism*—can, however, become dangerous. The ideal would be an organization with enough authority at the top and among the managers to ensure cooperation and achievement of goals, while allowing enough freedom for creativity. *Anarchy* leads to chaos, but it is often individuals struggling against authority who bring about change and progress.

Barnard, Chester I. (1886-1961)

American executive and administrative theorist who broke away from the legal-rational approach to organization theory in the late 1930s, arguing that authority is not imposed from above but is granted to supervisors by employees. Barnard had a rich and varied career as a chief executive. From 1927 to 1948, he was president of New Jersey Bell Telephone, a large public utility; during World War II he headed the USO, a nonprofit organization; and from 1952 to 1954, he was president of the Rockefeller Foundation, a large philanthropic organization. Barnard was the first major administrative theorist to develop the concept of the decision-making process. Decision making, in Barnard’s view, involves searching for strategic factors that meet the organization’s purposes. Barnard said that

coordination was the chief function of the executive. He said that discussions of administrative coordination led most managers to talk about issuing orders, preparing budgets, and staffing the organization. Barnard took a different approach. He emphasized the idea of organizational purpose. Every organization possessed some unifying purpose, just as New Jersey Bell's purpose was to provide telephone service. The individual employees, by themselves, without an organization, could not accomplish that purpose. The organization came into being when individuals who were in a position to communicate with one another decided to contribute their actions to a common purpose. Barnard did for organizations what John Locke did for constitutions. He set the source of organizations' power in the people who comprised them. From this principle came the idea that the exercise of authority is a two-way street. Top administrators could employ their formal authority to influence subordinates, but at some point subordinates had to be willing to be influenced. Barnard wrote of a *zone of indifference*, which Herbert Simon later renamed a *zone of acceptance*, to suggest that managers would be well-advised to limit their orders to what they were sure subordinates would accept. From this hypothesis followed the observation that only those orders that would be obeyed should be issued. See also ORGANIZATION THEORY, CLASSICAL; ORGANIZATION THEORY: HUMANISM; ORGANIZATION THEORY, NEO CLASSICAL.

Significance Chester Barnard stood directly opposite Henri Fayol. Barnard said simply that *all organizational authority flows from the bottom up*; from the worker to the foreman, from the client to the bureaucrat, from the child to the parent. The conclusions of the *Functions of the Executive* were controversial when Barnard published them in 1938, and they are controversial today. F. J. Roethlisberger thought it remarkable that the Bell System tolerated such deviant behavior on the part of one of its chief executives. Barnard's views are in stark contrast to the orthodox belief that executives acquire official authority from a specific grant of power from a higher office, relevant to their responsibilities, to which obedience is assured through the forces of command and discipline. Barnard insisted that formal authority of this sort existed only in the abstract. In real organizations, he said, authority is always attached to a communiqué to do this or not do that. If the communication channels are snarled, and the order never received, then authority does not exist. Subordinates ignore communiqués for a number of reasons: because they are physically unable to carry them out; because the orders conflict with their own personal interests; or because they believe that the orders are inconsistent with their own perception of the true purposes of the organization. In an organization where purpose is legitimized through the cooperation of its members, authority depends entirely on an effective system of communication. Barnard, made the executive the trustee of the organizational purpose, and this idea is his chief contribution to organization theory. *Persistence of cooperation*, he said, depends on the ability of the executive to preserve the purpose of the organization. A good executive promotes persistence of cooperation---Barnard's primary administrative value---by fusing the organizational purpose to the personal needs of the employees. The executive must make certain that organizational rewards contain noneconomic incentives, such as affection and a sense of belonging, and, most important, the executive must maintain among the members of the organization a willingness to communicate. Only by keeping communication channels open can the executive transmit the purpose of the organization and learn the needs of the employees. Chester Barnard was a brilliant contributor to the effort to transform public administration into a behavioral science. He was one of the few highly successful practitioners in U.S. administrative history to put his thoughts about administration "on paper."

Benefit-Cost Analysis

Beyond the question of a program's effectiveness is the larger issue of whether its positive impacts outweigh the costs, both direct and indirect, of producing them. **Benefit-cost** analysis is intended to address this issue. It is an economist's tool for assessing the net worth of public programs or projects or comparing the net benefits produced by alternative programs or projects. It is an analytical approach founded on the theory of welfare economics and developed to address the issue of whether resources should be withdrawn from the private sector of the economy and invested in public programs. The approach involves the systematic comparison of alternatives in order to maximize benefits derived by the society as a whole (McKean, 1958; Burkhead and Miner, 1971, chapter 7; Layard, 1972; Mishan, 1973, 1975; Prest and Turvey, 1975).

Benefit-cost analysis is directed toward resource allocation decisions on a global scale. It is used to address the question of whether a public program or project should be undertaken and at what level such programs and projects should be supported; it is a tool designed to evaluate the feasibility of specific projects, to select preferred projects from a range of possible projects, and to justify projects in the budgetary process. Formal benefit-cost models are most typically used in preinvestment analysis based on before-the-fact estimates of costs and benefits. Benefit-cost analysis differs from the other forms of evaluation research discussed in this text in that it is designed to provide an appraisal of proposed programs and projects, not an ex post facto evaluation of impacts. Nevertheless, benefit-cost analysis should not be viewed as an alternative to program impact evaluation. Rather, it is best used as a complement to ex post facto evaluation, a planning tool designed to project the total outcome of undertaking a program in terms of both costs and impacts.

Budget

A proposed action plan for government, defined in financial terms, that gives direction to the execution of policies and programs. A public budget is (1) a fiscal statement describing the revenues and expenditures of all governmental units; (2) a mechanism for controlling, managing, planning, and evaluating the activities of each governmental unit. A budget is political in content. It represents government's ranking of many activities. It reflects the relative strengths of competing groups and the nature of the compromises reached among competing values. A budget announces the direction in which government intends to go in the near future, usually in the next fiscal year. Political scientist Allen Schick has identified three distinct purposes for which budgets have been used: control, management, and planning. These purposes correspond to three historical periods in this century during which certain types of budgets were dominant. The United States is currently in a fourth period, with budgets now used for evaluation purposes. Although a dominant type is found within each of the four periods, some previous budget techniques were used in each succeeding period. The control function the first of the primary budgetary functions, was emphasized from about 1900 through the middle 1930s. The line-item budget was widely used in this period. The control period was featured by the establishment of central budgeting offices. At the federal level, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 created the Bureau of the Budget (BOB), which in 1970 became the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Prior to 1921, each agency presented its budget requests to Congress, whereas after 1921, in the new "executive budget," requests from executive agencies were funneled into the Budget Bureau, which functioned as a central clearinghouse. This system facilitated control by the president and by the Congress over requests for money and for expenditures once the requests had been approved. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 made the president responsible for formulating the national budget, with the Budget Bureau functioning as the chief staff agency to help him accomplish the task. The *management function* was emphasized from the middle 1930s until the late 1950s. *Performance budgets*, also called *program budgets*, largely replaced line-item budgets in this period. They were designed to answer the question of how well—that is, how efficiently—programs were being administered. This was the first use of the budget as an evaluation device. The *planning function* was emphasized from the late 1950s through the late 1960s in a budget process known as planning, programming, budgeting systems (PPBS). The overall purpose of PPBS (also called PPB) was to create greater rationality in the budgeting process by requiring administrators to plan long-range organizational goals, to establish programs to attain those goals, and to budget specific projects within those programs to make them effective. The *evaluation function* emerged during the 1970s and is represented by zero-based budgeting (ZBB). This system requires all spending for each program and agency to be justified anew each year. ZBB questions the need for a program at any funding level, and it rejects the incrementalist principle by which new budgets are constructed on the basis of last year's funding level.

Significance A budget was once considered to be little more than a document showing sums of money to be spent for particular purposes in a given period of time. Budgeting, or the process of creating the budget, was treated as an isolated, routine, administrative duty. The relationship between budgeting and other managerial functions was thought to be minimal. The primary concern and purpose of budgets was to ensure that money was spent only for what had been approved. This accounting approach to budgets has yielded today to a much broader role for the budget maker. A budget has come to be the single most important managerial tool available to the manager. It is a work plan and an evaluation instrument that gives direction to the execution of public policies.

Budget and Accounting Act of 1921

The basic legislation that established a rational budget-formation process in the executive branch of the federal government. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was a major reform of the process by which national spending programs are formulated, authorized, executed, and audited. For much of U.S. history prior to the act, agencies' requests for funds were simply "packaged" by the Treasury Department and transmitted to Congress without change. There was no unified executive budget. Agencies put together their asking figures, went to legislative committees of jurisdiction, and wangled what appropriations they could get. From 1885 to 1920, the appropriation requests for almost half the federal budget were distributed in the House of Representatives among seven substantive committees, rather than being considered by the Appropriations Committee. In 1920, the House restored full jurisdiction to the Appropriations Committee, but a more sweeping reform of the budgetary process was prevented by President Woodrow Wilson's veto of the bill, which a year later became the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. President Wilson opposed the independence of the legislative auditor that the law would, and finally did, create. The act created a new bureau in the Treasury Department, the United States Bureau of the Budget (after 1970 the Office of Management and Budget), to receive agency estimates and prepare the president's budget. It

established the General Accounting Office (GAO) in the legislative branch as the independent auditor of executive accounts. The president appointed its head, the Comptroller General of the United States, for a fifteen-year term. The Comptroller General could be removed only by a joint resolution of Congress or by impeachment. He could not be reappointed. A major feature of the Budget and Accounting Act was that it did not limit the GAO to post auditing. It gave the GAO the power to “prescribe the forms, systems, and procedure for administrative appropriation and fund accounting in the several departments and establishments, for the administrative examination of fiscal officers’ accounts and claims against the United States.” The act specified that control of agency accounting systems and the preaudit were also responsibilities of the General Accounting Office.

Significance The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was the product of reformist pressures to establish a consolidated executive budget. The act’s sponsors believed that financial corruption in government could be eliminated by the establishment of public financial bureaus under the chief executive. With the executive budget came additional innovations such as competitive bidding for contracts, centralized purchasing, standardized accounting procedures, and expenditure audits. Each of these innovations related directly to the idea that the budget was a useful device for controlling public administration and ensuring morality in government. The line-item budget was identified with the reform movement as well. The first director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charles G. Dawes, was a typical spokesperson for the reform position. In 1923 he wrote, “The Bureau of the Budget is concerned only with the humbler and routine business of government . . . it is concerned with no question of policy, save that of economy and efficiency.” The “economy and efficiency” theme went back to the origin of the movement that had resulted in the Budget and Accounting Act. This was the report of the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency, whose 1913 report had called for an executive budget that would include functional categories beyond the traditional listing of personal services and things to be bought. The line-item budget was made to order. It emphasized skilled accountancy, the objects needed to run an office or program and their costs, incremental policy making throughout government, dispersed responsibility for management and planning, and a fiduciary role for the budget agency. Public Administrationist Nicholas Henry points out the following item as an example of the technical definitions stressed in line-item budgeting: “pencils, 112, with 1/2 inch erasers, wood, No. 2 grade lead, 6”x1/4”.” Following passage of the Budget and Accounting Act such phrases as “watchdog of the treasury” and “balanced budget” were common, indicating the prevalent mentality of control and tight management. The control turned out to be too tight and too inflexible. The General Accounting Office (GAO), for example, assumed powers more appropriately lodged in the executive branch than in an agency of the legislative branch. Given the fact that an agency’s spending officers were personally liable for expenditures that GAO could later disapprove, these officers often asked the GAO for advance opinions. The GAO thus increasingly preaudited expenditures before they were made. As a result, the GAO only delayed actions but became less an auditor; that is, it forsook the function of an evaluator after the fact and became more a participant in the very transactions it was supposed to audit later. This situation was corrected in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

Bureaucracy

A system of authority relations defined by rationally developed rules. Bureaucracy as a term was first used in 1745 by Vincent de Gournay, a French physiocrat, to describe the Prussian government in which power resided with officials. It thus represented an addition to Aristotle’s three forms of perverted government: tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy, which were the dark sides of kingly rule, aristocracy, and constitutional government. Bureaucracy was developed by the German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920) as an “ideal type” of social system. For Weber, bureaucracy is typified by a rational and effective organization that operates on the basis of (1) rules by which tasks are organized; (2) a division of labor which produces specialization; (3) hierarchy, meaning superior-subordinate relationships; (4) decisions by technical and legal standards; (5) administration based on filing systems and institutional memory; and (6) administration as a vocation.

Significance Bureaucracy in the contemporary world refers primarily to government agencies that are characterized by day-to-day policy implementation, routine, complex procedures, specialization of duties, rights of authority and status, and resistance to change. Bureaucratic behavior is often objectionable to citizens because it denotes delay, red tape, pettiness, ritualistic attachment to rules, and concentration of power in persons neither elected by nor responsible directly to the people. The pathological aspects of bureaucracy, however, are largely the personal behavior patterns of individual bureaucrats and do not refer necessarily to bureaucracy as a form of social organization. Administrative units are necessary for governance. Civil servants who carry out the legally prescribed missions of government agencies are instructed to do so with maximum efficiency and minimum use of coercion. Yet a bureaucracy’s legislative mandate is frequently worded in such a general way that bureaucrats also have a considerable amount of discretionary power. This is true whether the society is capitalist or socialist, democratic or authoritarian. In U.S. democracy a premium is placed on guarding against the development of an irresponsible bureaucracy by means of congressional oversight, presidential direction, the power of the purse, and judicial review.

Conflict

A. Conflict may be defined as ‘a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals’ (L.A. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956, p.8).

B. An analysis of the literature reveals that the term conflict is defined with a number of different emphases. According to one school of thought, which might be said to stem from the work of G. Simmel (*Conflict and The Web of Group Affiliations*, trans. By K. H. Wolff & R. Bendix, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955, by R. E. Park and his co-workers, conflict is seen as one of the central forms of interaction. Simmel writes, ‘If every interaction among men is a sociation, conflict...must certainly be considered as sociation. ...Conflict is...designed to resolve divergent dualisms; it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it be through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties’. R. E. Park & E.W. Burgess (*Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921, p. 574) likewise treat conflict, as well as competition, as ‘forms of interaction’. In contrast to this view a number of scholars have seen in conflict a dissociative process (q.v.). Thus G.A. Lundberg (*The Foundations of Sociology*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939, p. 275) finds that conflict is characterized by ‘a suspension of communication between the opposing parties.’ L. Wilson & W.L. Kolb (*Sociological Analysis*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949, p. 714) likewise define conflict as ‘a disjunctive process’.

By, Lewis A. Coser

Gould, Julius; and William L. Kolb, A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY, 1964.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Cost-effectiveness analysis is the application of benefit-cost principles to compare alternative programs or projects in terms of effectiveness or efficiency, usually within a more limited framework. Its purpose is to analyze the productivity of the alternatives, but not to address the larger question of net addition to society’s welfare. Cost-effectiveness analysis relates more to *how* resources should be used in a project or program area, rather than [as in Benefit-Cost Analysis] *whether* they should be allocated to that area. In fact, it is interesting to note that in the parlance of systems analysis we tend to inventory resources and assume that they are to be used....

Not surprisingly, the difficulties associated with the practical application of benefit-cost analysis increase with the complexity of the problem being addressed. On the other hand, benefit-cost principles are being applied increasingly to issues that are less comprehensive than the question of whether resources should be used by the public sector. Under the general rubric of cost-effectiveness, methods of economic analysis are being employed to address the kinds of questions most often facing program analysts: Can existing resources be used differently so as to increase effectiveness, or can productivity be improved so as to maintain or increase effectiveness while holding the line on costs?

The use of cost-effectiveness analysis is occasioned by the need to address questions that are not feasible for benefit-cost analysis applications in an operational sense or are too constrained for the scope of benefit-cost analysis. This is the case with social goods, activities whose product is of a collective nature shared in equal amounts by all citizens; such as national defense, for example.

People do not reveal their preferences for more or less national defense in the economic marketplace, and the benefits of defense programs are not measured in dollars. In analyzing the deployment of strategic forces, for example, effectiveness might be measured in terms of “the numbers of particular types of forces which can be deployed to specific areas by a specific time” (Niskanen, 1967 p. 29). Alternative sites for basing such forces could then be compared both in terms of this measure of effectiveness and the costs of transporting the forces.

Second, cost-effectiveness has been found to be an attractive approach to problems characterized by major externalities or intangibles. Where these factors cannot readily be measured in dollar terms as required by benefit-cost analysis, they can be dealt with substantively in cost-effectiveness analysis, either by setting them equivalent across the alternatives or holding the alternatives to constraints set in terms of the intangibles. In developing an industrial park or airport, for example, rather than attempting to put dollar values on negative impacts on the physical environment, these impacts can be dealt with by excluding from consideration all those alternatives generating negative impacts above certain specified levels. Those alternatives meeting these constraints expressed in physical terms can then be analyzed and compared in the traditional benefit-cost format. Selection of the

preferred alternative plan will be based on differences in the tangible factors only, and there may be no precise indication of true net worth.

Poister, Theodore H., Public Program Analysis: Applied Research Methods, Ch. 11, Economic Analysis Methods, pp. 421

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: Fixed Utility

In the absence of the ability to determine real net benefit, alternative program strategies are often compared by holding the level of effectiveness constant and analyzing differences in their costs, or by holding costs constant and comparing levels of effectiveness. The former, referred to as the **fixed utility** approach, is commonly used in national defense analysis; a prescribed level of deterrent capability may be established and alternative systems configurations analyzed in terms of both deterrent capability and costs; the cost-effective alternative is the one that meets the prescribed level of effectiveness at least cost.

Examples of the usefulness of the fixed utility approach abound. A city planning department may set the objective of reducing the number of families housed in substandard dwelling units by 50 percent and compare the costs of attaining this objective through the construction of new housing and the rehabilitation of existing, substandard housing. Differences in social or psychological effects should also be noted and adjusted for if possible to ensure the validity of the comparison.

It should be understood that fixed utility will not always refer to final impacts in the sense in which the term effectiveness is used in this text, but rather the fixed utility may also be set in terms of intermediate effects and outputs. In essence then, the cost-effective alternative would be that which produces the specified type and level of outputs at least cost. One notable application of this approach was a study comparing the costs of five integrated transportation modes in providing service levels along a given route as specified in terms of carrying capacity, travel time, and convenience in terms of such factors as seat availability and waiting time (Meyer, Kain, and Wohl, 1966).

Poister, Theodore H., Public Program Analysis: Applied Research Methods, Ch. 11, Economic Analysis Methods, pp. 422.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: Fixed Budget

Cost-effectiveness analysis is perhaps used more frequently in the allocation of **fixed budget** amounts. It should be noted that resource allocation decisions made within the framework of budget constraints beg the central question addressed by traditional benefit-cost analysis: What level of resources, if any, should be invested in a given public program or project? In such a context, however, benefit-cost principles can be used to suboptimize within the budget constraint (Prest and Turvey, 1975, p. 95).

Given a fixed budget to be allocated between two program categories, they should be funded where their marginal benefits are equal. This will maximize the effectiveness of the program as a whole, but does not examine the more important question of whether the budget should be augmented or cut, with funds diverted to other programs. The use of the internal rate of return method has also been advocated for this kind of context, for example, in allocating job training program funds between programs teaching general skills and those teaching specialized skills. If one program's rate of return is higher than that of another, funds should be shifted from the first to the second until the point where the returns at the margin are equalized (Besen, Fechter, and Fisher, 1967, pp. 144-145)

With respect to ongoing, operating programs the fixed budget approach may be used more often than the fixed utility approach because the actual constraint is frequently a budget ceiling and because the available data often lend themselves to this method. For example, if a city police department has experimented with a fleet utilization plan and found that it was associated with a 10 percent decrease in the commission of certain types of crimes, it can measure the cost-effectiveness of that strategy by relating this observed effect to the cost of mounting the plan. If the department then wishes to compare this performance with those of other strategies, a foot patrol effort or a burglary prevention program, for example, it can do so more readily by holding costs constant than by trying to obtain exactly the same degree of effectiveness with each strategy. It can invest the same amount of funds spent on the fleet plan in each of the other two strategies, separately, and then compare the percent decrease in crimes associated with each of the three alternatives.

Poister, Theodore H., Public Program Analysis: Applied Research Methods, Ch. 11, Economic Analysis Methods, pp. 422-423.

Culture

A. It is difficult to settle upon a single definition of this complex and extremely important term, but the following definitions may each be useful for somewhat different purposes.

1. A.L. Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn present a synthesis that embodies the elements positively accepted by most contemporary social scientists: 'Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consist of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action' (*Culture: A critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology, vol. 47, no. 1, 1952, p. 181).

By, Clyde Kluckhohn

Gould, Julius; and William L. Kolb, A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY, 1964.

Decision Making, Incremental

A major approach to problem solving that suggest a conservative and practical view to administrators in order for them to meet new challenges slowly and progressively. Incrementalism recognizes that in their decision making administrators typically start with an existing body of policies, the most recent funding levels of programs, the store of knowledge each participant has of other participants' views, and the resources they can mobilize to influence the outcome of the process. Incrementalism prefers only minimal departures from the status quo, and decision makers are viewed primarily as problem solvers who may lack the intellectual capacity or the time to make a wide search for alternative solutions. Incrementalist policies are almost always more politically expedient than alternative approaches. The rational-comprehensive and mixed-scanning policies, for example, typically do not take into account the process of conflict, negotiation, persuasion, and cooperation among the private and public groups, institutions, and individuals with stakes in particular policies and decisions. The incrementalist decision-making sequence calls upon the decision maker to (1) identify the problem; (2) investigate how similar problems have been handled in the past; (3) analyze and evaluate a few solutions that appear to be plausible; and (4) choose one that makes some contribution to solving the problem without drastically altering existing practices and institutions. Incrementalism's main defender, Charles E. Lindblom, called this the science of muddling through. Administrators, according to Lindblom, muddle through in response to current events and circumstances rather than by the will of those in policy-making positions.

Significance Incremental decision making describes the most common form utilized in U.S. public administration. Its strength is that it reflects the society's commitment to gradual change and accepts the pluralism that exists among clientele groups and within public agencies. Incrementalism takes into account the triangular alliances that sometimes exist among an agency, its related congressional committees, and its clientele interest groups. It is short-term decision making in that decisions are a reply to immediate needs without much consideration for the long-term results. Yet, Lindblom may have claimed too much for incremental decision making when he argued that small changes help avoid monumental errors. That would be true only if the status quo itself were sound and conditions affecting it remained static. U.S. history is replete with examples of the necessity of bold and innovative changes in public policy, such as the freeing of slaves, regulating public utilities, and protecting consumers from false advertising. Still the prevalence of the incrementalist model illustrates its utility. The most powerful participants in the decision-making process often compromise using incrementalist techniques, each accepting a suboptimal service of an individual goal in order to get something out of the process. Each participant knows that the decisional process of incrementalism is episodic and diffuse. What is lost in the maximization of one's goals this year may be regained next year in another decisional arena. Since the values affecting incrementalist decisions are not distinct, the means of attaining such values, or ends, are also indistinct. Thus means-ends analysis is inappropriate and limited because means and ends are intertwined throughout the process.

Decision Making, Rational-comprehensive

A systems analysis approach based on principles of scientific investigation and scientific problem solving. The rational-comprehensive model of decision making is described by American political scientist Charles E. Lindblom as involving five features: (1) clarification of values; (2) means-ends analysis; (3) choice of most appropriate means to achieve desired ends; (4) comprehensive analysis; and (5) analysis that is theory-based. Rational-comprehensive

analysis defines the problem, develops alternative solutions, places values on the consequences of various alternatives, assesses the probability that they will occur, and makes a decision based on logical rules. It seeks to sort out and achieve the goals decision makers believe are most valued. The model attempts to serve the ideal embodied in Max Weber's view of bureaucracy in which decisions are based on impersonal rules and techniques. Rational-comprehensive decision making draws heavily on the economists' version of how a rational "economic man" should make decisions. It also relies on rational decision-making models developed by mathematicians and psychologists. The economics/mathematics/psychology analyses describe a single person - rather than a group or an institution - faced with the need to make a decision. These analyses also tend to idealize the decisional situation. The decision maker, for example, knows the objective clearly and is perfectly informed on all possible means to that end, including how much it will cost in money, time, and resources, and the degree of certainty with which each alternative will achieve the goal. Rational-comprehensive analysis assumes a static situation in which relevant conditions do not change, and no new information becomes available during the time period of analysis and decision.

Significance Rational-comprehensive decision making is at one pole of a continuum that includes incremental decision making at the opposite pole, and mixed scanning in the middle. Whereas incrementalism emphasizes political rationality, the rational-comprehensive approach emphasizes economic rationality. The systems analysis techniques that are at the core of the rational-comprehensive model were in fact widely utilized in the administrations of Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, particularly in the Department of Defense under Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Author David Hallberstam and other close observers of the systems analysis approach in the Kennedy-Johnson years charge that public administration rarely have the brains and never the time to complete the laborious steps of analysis involved in the systems analysis process. They also charge that cost-benefit analysis has no applicability to nonquantifiable areas of public policy, and that high-level decision making is far more a matter of political insight and wisdom than it is an act of comprehensive rationality. Three Canadian researchers have concluded that the rational-comprehensive approach is rarely used in government despite widespread discussion of it. Of 83 discrete policy choices, the researchers found serious analytic techniques employed in only 18 of the cases. Despite a management literature replete with examples of systems analysis, this empirical study shows that in case after case only one policy alternative is fully explored. What the Canadians documented was not rational-comprehensive decision making but what Herbert Simon has called "bounded rationality" and what Amitai Etzioni has called "mixed scanning." Critics generally emphasize that the most important issues in government cannot be resolved by numbers, computers, or cost-benefit tables. On complex issues, there is more likely to be conflict than agreement on values, and conflict over values is essentially a political question which cannot be subordinated to economic-modeled analytical techniques.

Ethics

The rules or standards governing the moral conduct of the members of an organization or management profession. Ethics is defined in moral philosophy as "that branch of philosophy dealing with values relating to human conduct, with respect to rightness or wrongness and ends of such actions." Ethics is commonly divided into four main schools of thought, which may be understood as alternative explanations for principles of human action. Actually the schools of thought overlap. They are (1) *Empirical theory*, which states that ethics are derived through human experience and are conceived by general agreement. Some forms of warfare are commonly agreed to be unethical, for example. The use of poison gas and hydrogen bombs is unethical because there would be no way to control such weapons once they were unleashed. Empirical theory bases itself on what can be seen, quantified, and measured. "Right" and "wrong" do not have an independent existence apart from facts and deeds. (2) *Rational theory*, which states that people determine what is good or bad through reason. Ethical action is a determination of logic, not of experience. Plato, Aristotle, and Spinoza were proponents of rational theory. It maintains that each situation is unique and requires a unique application of the human power of deduction to arrive at what is right or good. (3) *Intuitive theory*, which states that ethics are not necessarily derived from experience or from logic, but that human beings naturally and automatically possess an understanding of what is right and wrong, good and bad. Intuitive theorists frequently use the phrase "natural moral law" and are well represented in the writings which inspired and explained the French and American revolutions. (4) *Revelation theory*, which states that the determination of right and wrong comes from an authority above human beings. In this view the Bible as the Word of God is the final arbiter of conduct. Furthermore, God continues to make pronouncements regarding ethical decisions which must be made. Just who God speaks through on the occasions of his pronouncements is not always clear.

Significance Ethics is a relatively new concept in American public administration, although its classical antecedents are deep and varied. The reason it is new is that the closed model of organizations as represented by Max Weber, Frederick Winslow Taylor, Luther Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick, and as epitomized in the politics-administration dichotomy, had no place for moral choices. From this perspective, a public administrator needs morality no more than a hotel clerk carrying out his daily duties. Of what use was morality to a person who

did no more than execute the will of the state according to certain scientific principles? As long as public administrators accomplished their given tasks efficiently and economically, they were, by definition, moral. That is, they were responsible. Morality in the sense of ethical choice was simply not a function of the functionaries. But the closed model and the dichotomy were abandoned, because they had to be. Active public administrator and educator Paul H. Appleby was one of the first participant-observers to say simply the closed model and the dichotomy did not represent the way administration was actually done, whatever the doctrine stated. When politics and administration were recognized as being part of the same parcel, it was also admitted implicitly that morality had to be relevant to the bureaucracy. The public administrator was now forced to make decisions, not just on the comfortable bases of efficiency, economy, and administrative principles, but on the more agonizing criteria of morality as well. The question of ethics in the public service, therefore, revolves around answers to the question, "What is the public interest?" Ethics is focused on the lone bureaucrat who possesses considerable discretionary power, and who must make decisions defining the public good. The traditional schools of ethical theory may not help the administrator in this task. They do give him or her the context of the decision, however. Ethical sophistication—how to recognize it, how to develop it, how to communicate it—is at the cutting edge of modern public administration.

Ethics in Government Act of 1978

Legislation intended to promote and preserve the integrity of public officials through mandatory financial disclosure requirements and the prohibition of certain activities by former government employees. The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 was approved as Public Law 95-521, with five titles. Title I established a standby mechanism to appoint a special prosecutor, if needed, and an Office of Government Crimes in the Department of Justice. Title II created an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel to represent Congress in court, so that Congress would not be dependent on the Department of Justice – the executive branch – in trial cases. Title III required public disclosure of financial interest by high-level officers and employees of all three branches of the federal government. Disclosure is neither a net worth statement nor a detailed tax return. Income is reported in broad categories, and good faith estimates are sufficient, a provision described by critics as a weakness in the legislation. The reports are made available for public inspection. Title IV provided for an Office of Government Ethics, a small central coordinating organization designed to provide focus and consistent guidance on conflict-of-interest issues. The office is also responsible for formulating regulations for administering the act, especially for ensuring that heads of federal agencies bring the performance of their personnel into line with the act's provisions. Each agency is required to have an ethics officer who serves as liaison to the office. Title V dealt with prohibited activities by former officers and employees of the federal government. It added new restrictions to Chapter 18 of the United States Code, which already barred former government employees from acting as another party's representative to government in matters where the employee had been substantially involved.

Significance The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 was the product of post-Watergate concern about the integrity of government officials and the need for citizens to have confidence in government employees. In the wake of the act, and in response to criticism that it did not go far enough in describing ethical standards, Congress also enacted Public Law 96-303, that took effect October 1, 1980, prescribing a Code of Ethics for Government Service. The code states, "Any person in Government service should: I. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department. II. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion. III. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving earnest effort and best thought to the performance of duties. IV. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished. V. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or herself or for family member, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of governmental duties. VI. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private work which can be binding on public duty. VII. Engage in no business with the Government, either direction or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of governmental duties. VIII. Never use any information gained confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means of making private profit. IX. Expose corruption wherever discovered. X. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust."

The Ethics in Government Act and the Code of Ethics for Government Service were major efforts by Congress to deal with the basic problems of a progressive loss of faith in government and a widespread belief in the endemic nature of official wrongdoing. Problems relating to ethics in government came to the fore again in 1987 when Congress investigated the covert actions carried on by National Security Council (NSC) personnel relating to secret sales of arms to Iran and the illegal diversion of such funds to aid the *Contras* in Nicaragua. Lies, personal use of government funds, shredding of evidence, violations of the laws enacted by Congress (the Boland Amendment), and other excesses were justified by NSC officials on the ground that the ends sought justified the means used. Actions

were undertaken under the president's authority, but the president was not informed of critical decisions so that he could retain "plausible deniability."

Force-field Analysis

The factors operating either for or against proposed organizational change. Force-field analysis, as suggested by psychologist Kurt Lewin, incorporates a listing of factors that would encourage worker cooperation in a proposed organizational change, and other factors causing resistance to that change. Administrators then analyze the relative strengths of the two sets of factors. Lewin indicated two different ways to gain acceptance of change. One is to increase the pressure for change to the point where the pressure would simply overpower any resistance. The danger of this approach is that the resisting factors are not eliminated. They may eventually build up enough pressure to rebound, very much like a coiled spring. Lewin called this dramatic flareup of resistance after opposition had apparently been subdued the "coiled spring effect." The other and more appropriate way to gain acceptance of change is to attempt to eliminate, rather than subdue, the opposing factors. Lewin cited the example of dealing with female factory workers during World War II on the matter of wearing safety glasses. A force-field analysis indicated the workers objected to wearing the glasses because they were heavy and unattractive, and because there was no self-determination involved in the new policy. The other side of the force-field listed "protect eyes," "cooperate with company," and "follow rules" as positive factors for change. To gain acceptance of the policy by trying to eliminate the opposing factors, the company (1) found lighter, more comfortable frames and substituted them at a minimal cost increase per frame; and (2) announced a contest for each woman to decorate her glasses in whatever way she thought appropriate, thus giving each individual a chance for self-expression. The wearing of safety glasses in this case gained positive acceptance through force-field analysis.

Significance Force-field analysis is an alternative to giving up when there is resistance to change. Most managers are not allowed to give up, so there is a human tendency to overcome resistance with superior power. That frequently becomes a negative act because of the coiled spring effect. Force-field analysis suggests reducing the resistance—after its reasons have been identified—which usually requires less effort and creates far more goodwill. The process of charting the force-field situation can be very revealing to a manager. Force-field analysis provides a methodology for dealing with resistance to change in a consistent and rational way.

Hawthorne Studies

A series of experiments that provided the foundation for the development of the human relation school of organization theory. The Hawthorne studies were conducted from 1927 through 1932 by Professor Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger and their associates of the Harvard Business School. The site of the studies was the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne plant in Chicago. The purpose of the experiments was to determine the basis of productivity among workers. The experiments began by placing a group of five female workers in a test room, where observers carefully recorded changes in rates of production as working conditions were altered. The women's job was to assemble telephone relays. Twelve physically based variables were introduced into the workers' environment, such as work-room illumination, number and duration of rest periods, and length of the work day and work week. Contrary to the assumptions of scientific management, the productivity of the five workers continued to rise regardless of the favorableness or unfavorableness of the changes imposed. The control group on the main assembly line did fluctuate in rate of productivity as working conditions were altered. It became clear that physical surroundings and work hours were not the central influences underlying the behavior of the five women in the relay assembly test room. The researchers concluded that the operative influences were the workers' opportunity to function as a small primary group and the psychological payoffs that came from their being the steady objects of attention in the experiments. It was theorized that the workers on the main assembly line produced less than they were physically capable of because of social norms and controls imposed by co-workers. This effect was termed "artificial restriction of output." The major findings of the Hawthorne studies were summarized by sociologist Amitai Etzioni: (1) The level of production is set by social norms, not by physiological capabilities. (2) Noneconomic rewards and sanctions affect the behavior of workers and limit economic incentive plans. (3) Often workers act or react as members of groups.

Significance The Hawthorne studies introduced a social-psychological perspective to industrial management and opened the way to investigation of management factors other than formal organizational structure and process. These further investigations provided additional evidence for the human relations school of organization theory, although the school did not have its full impact in terms of practical applications until after World War II. When the practical applications were made, subsequent reorganizations of businesses resulted in as much as a 30 percent increase in worker productivity. Further research also showed the Hawthorne experiments to be somewhat restricted in scope and interpretation and rather artificially controlled. New organizational theories would more comprehensively address the complex interaction of the human personality with the environment. The

last impact of the Hawthorne studies was in the emphasis placed on the increased status of workers and the shared sense of participation felt by workers as members of a primary work group. Marxists and neo-Marxists explained the workers' increased productivity by referring to the increased power the worker had over the work situation. A revisionist view of the Hawthorne experiments was presented by R. H. Franke and J. D. Kaul in an article in the *American Sociological Review* (1978). An application of modern statistical techniques to the Hawthorne data convinced Franke and Kaul that most of the gain in productivity of the five relay assembly workers could be explained by (1) the assertion of managerial discipline in replacing two of the original five workers; (2) the onset of the Great Depression and consequent fear of job loss; and (3) the introduction of rest periods. They downplayed the social and psychological payoffs the workers received as part of the experiment. The description of these payoffs has been described in subsequent literature as the "Hawthorne effect."

Human Motivation: Motivation-hygiene Theory

A description of two factors believed to be present in every job: the maintenance factor and 'the motivation factor. Motivation-hygiene theory, also called two-factor theory, was developed by Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg was then a psychologist at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. He conducted experiments in motivation with two hundred engineers and accountants, finding that certain maintenance needs had to be met before the worker could begin to be motivated. The maintenance factors were identified as (1) company policy and administration; (2) technical supervision; (3) interpersonal relations with supervisor; (4) interpersonal relations with peers; (5) interpersonal relations with subordinates; (6) salary; (7) job security; (8) personal life; (9) work conditions; and (10) status. Herzberg called the maintenance factors *dissatisfiers*. They could not motivate, but they were prime negative factors if they were lacking. The motivational factors were identified as (1) achievement; (2) recognition; (3) advancement; (4) the work itself; (5) the possibility of growth; and (6) responsibility. These factors Herzberg called *satisfiers*. They are the things that could really bring about worker dedication to a job.

Significance Motivation-hygiene theory is an organization development concept that can be used in attempts to motivate an employee by increasing his or her satisfaction with work. The satisfiers are in agreement with Douglas McGregor's "Theory Y" view of organizations and with the top levels of Abraham Maslow's "ladder of needs." The principal contribution which motivation-hygiene theory makes to motivation theory is its focus on *the job itself*. The factors a worker can really sink his teeth into are not peripheral and extrinsic, such as another water fountain or carpets on the floor, but the job itself. Improving surroundings and developing harmonious relations among co-workers and supervisors may generate some euphoria, but what really produces high-level morale and productivity, according to motivation-hygiene theory, is doing a job worth doing. Herzberg saw that most organizational efforts to "motivate?" employees are really aimed at affecting the hygiene factors. People cannot be motivated by cutting the work week. Motivated people do not seek less time on the job; they want more. Such devices as human relations and sensitivity training merely deal with improved supervision and interpersonal relationships. These cannot motivate employees. They can only make them not dissatisfied. Motivation-hygiene theory leads directly to a strategy of job enrichment for organizations convinced of the theory's utility. Job enrichment can be achieved if jobs can be restructured to involve the theory's motivator factors.

Human Motivation: Need Theory

The belief that human needs are primary job motivators. Need theory was first advanced by clinical psychologist Abraham H. Maslow in "A Theory of Human Motivation" published in the *Psychological Review* in 1943. Maslow said there are five basic human needs that are sequential in nature, that is, they are arranged in a stepladder chart, with the most basic needs at the bottom of the ladder. The needs are prepotent. Until each one is relatively satisfied, a person will not strive very hard to meet the next level of need. The needs are (1) physiological; (2) safety and security; (3) love and belonging; (4) self-esteem; and (5) self-actualization. The most basic need is for air, food, shelter, sex, and elimination. Then comes physical safety, job security, and provision for old age. Because safety and security needs are *second* on the list, a person can reconcile a daily trip to work in dangerous mines or on lofty scaffolding to satisfy his or her need for food and shelter. Love and belonging are the individual's group needs, the need to be loved and accepted by significant others. Maslow's clinical data indicated that the failure to love and be loved is at the heart of many individual and group social problems. Self-esteem is the yearning to see oneself as a worthy and admirable person. How can we really like ourselves? Can we be right with ourselves by using the right deodorant and driving the right car? Maslow's data brought into serious question the accuracy of advertisers' promises of self-respect through possessions. Finally, self-actualization is an innate striving among human beings to create and to maximize One's talents. Self-actualized persons are fulfilled persons who demonstrate the following characteristics of mental health: (1) they can accept the way things are; (2) they are not afraid to get close to others; (3) they are efficient judges of situations; (4) they are creative and appreciative; (5) they march to a different drummer; and (6) they are willing to learn from anyone. Need theory maintains that when a person is reasonably well fed, secure, loved, and confident, he or she then has the physical and psychic power to begin to create, self-

direct, and accomplish. But the most basic needs must be met first. When there is no bread, humans live by bread alone.

Significance Need theory was developed from clinical experiences with brain-damaged and mentally disturbed persons. The tone of Maslow's philosophy is extremely positive. He saw human needs and drives as good rather than evil. He felt that each person has a natural drive toward health, happiness, and accomplishment, rather than a negative desire for failure and self-destruction. Need theory's emphasis on people instead of formal organization was the second major attack on Taylorism to come in a decade. Combined with the implications of the first attack, the Hawthorne studies, need theory provided the underpinning for a new approach to management in the United States. Yet, as discussed by J. D. Williams in *Public Administration: The People's Business* (1980), Maslow's work has been roundly criticized. The principal elements of criticism are (1) There is little empirical support for the hierarchy of needs theory in field studies. M. A. Wahba and L. G. Bridwell reviewed eight field studies, for example, and found no confirmation of the five-level needs ladder. (2) Culture makes a crucial difference in both the determination of needs and of how they are to be satisfied. The needs are not instinctive at birth. (3) Job satisfaction is heavily influenced by such factors as worker IQs, personalities, the technology employed, and many other factors unrelated to Maslow's restrictive list. (4) Self-actualized workers, each marching to the beat of their own drummers, would approximate organizational chaos. (5) The manager's real world includes many workers who are not, and probably will never be, self-actualized. Managers have to accept less than full worker motivation as a fact of life and adopt a more authoritarian leadership style than would be appropriate for a fully self-actualized work force. F. K. Gibson and C. E. Teasley suggested in the *Public Administration Review* in 1973 that need theory is based more on metaphysical attraction than empirical evidence.

Human Motivation: Theory X

A task-oriented theory of management that maintains an organizational climate of close control, centralized authority, autocratic leadership, and minimum participation in the decision-making process. Theory X was advanced as a typology by Douglas M. McGregor in his 1960 book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*. The assumptions of Theory X are (1) the average person dislikes work and will avoid it as much as possible; (2) most people have to be forced or threatened by punishment to get them to make the effort necessary to accomplish organizational goals; and (3) the average person is basically passive and therefore prefers to be directed, rather than assume any risk or responsibility. Above all else, he or she prefers security. Under Theory X, management's task is to harness human energy to meet organizational requirements. There is a well-defined organizational hierarchy with a narrow span of control. Workers are considered to be extensions of machines. The organizations that use Theory X successfully are highly mechanistic. They have a pronounced division of labor, direct supervisory controls, and formal rules to assure that the workers' contribution to the enterprise is simple labor. A Theory X organization has jobs of high task simplification and low task difficulty. The jobs are routine, repetitive, and simple, as in an assembly line. Conventional programs of performance appraisal apply, such as rewards geared to numbers of pieces produced. Organizations that apply Theory X seldom create opportunities for workers or encourage their growth. They provide strict leadership and high standards of conformity.

Significance Theory X is an application of management expert Frederick W. Taylor's scientific management principles. Taylor's key assumptions about people were that (1) the chief thing people want from their jobs is money; and (2) people are basically simpletons who require strict guidance to perform well. A study by N. Z. Medalia published in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* in 1955 suggests that when the worker is an authoritarian personality type, he or she is more productive when working for a Theory X manager. A similar study by A. D. Calvin published in the *Journal of Social Psychology* in 1957 found a 100 percent improvement in the output of workers of comparatively low intelligence under Theory X leadership in contrast to their output under democratic leadership. American scholar Robert Dubin reported in *Leadership and Productivity* in 1965 that Theory X methods are more appropriate for assembly line and continuous flow technologies (i.e., fully automated processes), but that nonauthoritarian leadership is more appropriate for "whole unit technologies." Whole unit technologies are the social worker, the highway patrol officer, and the sanitation inspector, for example. The possibilities of psychological repression are pronounced in Theory X and lead to the bureaupathic behavior described by Victor A. Thompson in *Modern Organization* (1961). Such behavior is explained as defensive reactions developed by individuals to protect their psyches from the frustration of not being able to achieve their personal goals within the organization. Whatever its liabilities, however, the Theory X organizational structure is the conventional and classical one in American public administration. It represents a strict hierarchy with close supervision.

Human Motivation: Theory Y

A people-oriented philosophy of management which holds that people have the capacity to direct their behavior

toward organizational goals. Theory Y was proposed in 1960 by management theorist Douglas M. McGregor, who believed strongly that the basic motivating force in a man or woman comes from within. Theory Y assumes that an effective organizational climate has looser, more general supervision than is present in Theory X. The Theory Y manager uses greater decentralization of authority, relies less on coercion and control and more on a democratic leadership style, and emphasizes participative decision making. Theory Y is based on the following set of beliefs: (1) work is as natural to humankind as play or rest and, therefore, is not avoided by human beings; (2) self-motivation and inherent satisfaction in work will be forthcoming in situations where the individual is committed to organizational goals; hence, coercion is not the only form of influence that can be used to motivate; (3) commitment is a crucial factor in motivation; it is a function of the rewards coming from it; (4) the average person learns to accept and even seek responsibility, given the proper environment; (5) contrary to popular stereotypes, the ability to be creative and innovative in the solution of organization problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population; and (6) in modern organizations human intellectual potentialities are only partially realized. Theory Y implies that, if management can make it possible for people in an organization to satisfy their needs and realize their potential by removing artificial barriers that frustrate need satisfaction, the organization will be more effective. McGregor and other organizational humanists maintained that, if an organization is to be healthy and capable of creatively responding to and managing change, an atmosphere conducive to individual growth is essential. The Theory Y manager creates opportunities, releases potential, removes organizational obstacles, encourages growth, and provides guidance. The theory relies on self-control and self-direction.

Significance Theory Y-oriented management works best in science-based organizations that must operate under conditions of environmental turbulence. Research has shown that Theory X, on the other hand, seems more applicable to programmatic endeavors, such as certain kinds of manufacturing and processing, characterized by stable conditions. The success of any management theory, however, depends on the appropriateness of the theory to the task at hand and the individual's motivation pattern. The tendency to label Theory X "bad" and Theory Y "good" is inappropriate. Theory Y has its critics. Among the doubts expressed about Theory Y are these: (1) Despite the evidence presented by Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg, not all employees are looking for self-actualization and more responsibility. Many workers just want to do their job and go home. (2) Theory Y errs in downplaying the enormous importance of economic rewards to most workers. (3) Participative management is basically manipulative. Managers use consensus-building techniques to win employee support for the course they have already decided on. (4) Hierarchy is not the great evil Theory Y suggests. It provides an orderly ladder for the upwardly mobile employee to climb toward increasing responsibility and authority. (5) The quality of group decisions may be considerably below that of decisions suggested by gifted staff people and bright people in the chain of command. (6) Managers who may have worked hard and stood in line for years to attain power are not about to share decision making with their employees. (7) Theory Y is blatantly utopian and attempts to fly in all kinds of weather, regard less of worker skills and personality, the job to be done, and the technology employed. Clearly Theory Y's prescriptions do not fit all management situations. But its central precepts—a whole view of the human personality, the need to make work worthwhile, and the potential which lies in self-actualized human beings—have left an indelible mark on public administration in the United States.

Human Motivation: Theory Z

A Japanese approach to management that emphasizes participative management from employees who are committed to their work through cultural tradition, shared socioeconomic values, and communal forms of decision making. Theory Z is characterized by personnel policies that reflect high levels of trust, lifetime or long-term job security, and holistic career planning. The term was popularized by William G. Ouchi in his 1981 bestseller, *Theory Z*. With Theory Z has come new attention to the phenomenon of *organizational culture*. Symbols and myths replace bureaucratic methods of giving orders and closely supervising workers, thus leading to increased productivity and mutually supportive relationships at the workplace. In its simplest form, the assumption of Theory Z is that people respond conscientiously when they feel wanted, needed, and trusted.

Significance Theory Z has taken its place alongside Theory X and Theory Y as a descriptive philosophy of management. Whereas Theory X places a strong emphasis on task orientation, and Theory Y just as strongly emphasizes people, Theory Z is transformation oriented. It assumes that the highest potential for the organization lies in a consciously fostered relationship between the organization and each of its employees. Theory Z postulates that productivity is dependent upon trust, intimacy, and flexible relationships among institutional actors. This view of the cultural properties of an organization represents an integration of humanistic and neoclassical organization theory. It occupies an increasingly prominent place in management literature, due in large part to timing. Given lagging productivity in the private sector, loss of public trust in governmental institutions, poor scholastic achievement scores, and a variety of other indicators of widespread organizational problems in the United States, the prescriptive framework of Theory Z has been very favorably received.

Jacksonian Democracy (Democracy, Jacksonian)

The move toward equalitarianism in American politics and social life, dating from ANDREW JACKSON'S election as president in 1828. It signaled the disappearance of the aristocratic tradition in politics by rejecting Thomas Jefferson's notion of a natural aristocracy and upheld in its place the notion that the desires of the common man should rule in all things. OTHER REFERENCES Marvin Meyers, *The Jacksonian Persuasion: Politics and Belief* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957); Lee Benson, *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961).

Source: Shafritz, Jay M., The Dorsey Dictionary of American Government and Politics, The Dorsey Press, 1988.

Leadership (Theodorson)

The exercise of influence and AUTHORITY within a social relationship or group by one or more members. The leadership function is primarily the coordination of group activities toward group goals. The dominance and prestige associated with the leadership role result from its being the focus of coordination and unification of activities, information, and decisions.

George A. Theodorson; and Achilles G. Theodorson, A Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Harper & Row, New York, NY, 1979, page 227-228.

Leadership, Authoritarian (Theodorson)

A form of LEADERSHIP in which the leader or body of leaders determines the goals and rules of behavior of a group. Absolute authority is invested in the leader, and he is not required to consult the members of the group or to take their opinions into account in making decisions. The composition and functions of the leadership hierarchy (if the group is large enough to have a well-developed hierarchy) are determined from the top down. The major requirement of the membership at large is obedience to the leaders, and those in the leadership hierarchy are in turn expected to obey their superiors. Authoritarian leadership may be found, for example, in armies, dictatorships, industrial and commercial organizations, patriarchal families, and some youth gangs.

George A. Theodorson; and Achilles G. Theodorson, A Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Harper & Row, New York, NY, 1979, page 227-228.

Leadership, Charismatic. See charismatic leadership.

Leadership, Democratic (Theodorson)

A form of leadership in which the leader or body of leaders believes in and acts in accordance with a social role that supports certain democratic attitudes, beliefs, and values. The democratic leader or leaders accept and value the right of all members of the group to participate in decision making that has an effect upon them. Democratic leadership is based on an acceptance of the belief that all members of the group have an essential dignity, and an acceptance of the values of cooperation, discussion, and consensus. This form of leadership has confidence in and commitment to get greater efficiency and practicality of the democratic process over the efficiency and practicality of authoritarian leadership. It is quite possible for democratic leadership to emerge in scattered subgroups of an authoritarian hierarchy, just as it is possible for authoritarian leaders to emerge in more democratic organizations, although it is more normative for each type of leadership to predominate in its own type of leadership to predominate in its own type of environment. As with every social ROLE, the incumbents of the role may believe in the ideals of the role to a greater or lesser extent. Thus in a democratic social environment, a person in a leadership position will, at a minimum, have to expose democratic ideals and follow certain democratic procedures, whether he really accepts the democratic ideology or not. The extent to which authoritarian leaders emerge and are tolerated within the structure of democratic organizations is probably a good index of the weakness and superficiality of the democratic ideology within the larger social organization. The reverse of this proposition is also probably valid. Certain groups within a society are without doubt more likely to demand democratic leadership than others; thus the modern urban family is more likely to be under (male) democratic leadership than is an industrial work group or a small military unit.

George A. Theodorson; and Achilles G. Theodorson, A Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Harper & Row, New York, NY, 1979, page 227-228.

Leadership (Gould)

A. *Leadership* denotes the occupancy of a status (q.v.) and the active performance of a role that mobilizes more or less organized collective and voluntary effort toward the attainment of shared goals and objectives. This is well summed in C. I. Barnard's rather general formulation that leadership refers to the quality of the behavior of individuals whereby they guide people or their activities in organized effort (*Organization and Management*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948, pl83) Leadership shades, on one side, into other informal types of influence lacking central importance for collective effort. On the other side, leadership shades into domination and formal authority. Any concrete leadership situation will, of course, involve elements of informal influence, emotional dominance, and authority.

B. In recent usage the idea that leadership might be reducible to some specific competence or to a list of personal attributes has been almost completely abandoned. The quality of leadership inheres not in an individual but in a role that is played within some specified social system. A summary of studies attempting to define the personal traits of leadership concludes that leadership is 'a relation that exists between persons in a social situation and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations' (R. M. Stogdill, 'Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A survey of the Literature', *The Journal of Psychology*, vol. XXV, 1948, p. 65). The concept of leadership so defined entails four elements, on which writers place stress in varying degrees; namely (a) role performance, (b) whose influence is (c) central with regard to (d) collective action.

1. Leadership is always effective action, not mere prestige, attainment, or competence. Thus H.D. Lasswell and A. Kaplan state that leadership 'has reference to both formal and effective power. ... Where the latter (is) present but little effective power is actually exercised, we speak of formalistic authority and not leadership' (*Power and Society*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950, p. 152).

2. Leadership, moreover, involves social interaction (q.v.). The manifestation of leadership behavior can be observed only in relation to other persons who act in response to the leader and who are collectively referred to as the *following*. But, in so far as leadership usually arouses opposition as well, this following is not coextensive with some organized group and therefore leadership is not always integrative. A. W. Gouldner (*Studies in Leadership*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950, p. 17) emphasizes this point in considering the 'leader as any individual whose behavior stimulates patterning of the behavior in some group' who constitutes his following but not necessarily the group as previously constituted.

3. The third element in usage is the requirement that the leader occupy a position of 'centrality' in the sense that he is the focal point for the activity of his group. The leader frequently initiates action for the group without waiting for the suggestions of his followers. An example is W. F. Whyte's finding that 'a follower may originate action for the leader in a pair event (which takes place between two people) but he does not originate action for the leader and other followers at the same time-that is, he does not initiate action in a set event (for two or more other) which includes the leader' (*Street Corner Society, Chicago*: University of Chicago Press, 1943, p. 262).

4. Finally, the central influence of leadership must be related to collective action. This last requirement is exemplified in Lasswell and Kaplan's proposition that 'the rank and file identifies with the leader and adopts his perspectives' (*power and Society*, p. 156).

C. It is important to differentiate clearly between leadership and other forms of influence. Efforts to define the concept of leadership in terms of group syntality (referring to factors derived from measured group performance) or personal influence (designating 'opinion leadership') reduce leadership to influence, as illustrated by R. B. Cattell's statement that 'every group member is ... in some degree a leader' ('New Concepts for Measuring Leadership in Terms of Group Syntality', *Human Relations*, vol. IV, 1951, p. 182).

Efforts have also been made to distinguish between the leader and a central person on whom primarily emotional relationships centre. If the dominant individual's position 'rests upon nothing more than his capacity to appeal to the members of the group through stimulating their emotions and offering suggestions to their instincts, he is to be classed as an agitator or as a demagogue (in the derogatory sense of this term), acting upon a mob in which individuals virtually cease to be independent agents' (R. Schmidt, 'Leadership', in E. R. A. Seligman (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933, vol. IX, p. 282). Kurt Lang

See also: AUTHORITY INFLUENCE

Gould, Julius; and William L. Kolb, *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY, 1964.

Leadership, Administrative Leadership in the Public Sector
(Rusaw / Van Wart)

Book Review of: Administrative Leadership in the Public Sector, edited by Montgomery Van Wart and Lisa A. Dicke, American Society for Public Administration, 2008.

Leadership, particularly in public administration, is an elusive concept. Often based on private sector management and leadership theories and practice, it has been underresearched as a practice and in theory. In existing studies of leadership in private and public organizational contexts, writers have defined leadership in three general camps: as a set of exemplary traits, values, and behaviors that individuals possess; the ability to influence action and motivation based on situational contexts and follower characteristics; and ascription among followers. Much of the scholarship has focused on individuals in charge of for-profit firms rather than in government. In the public sector, studies have centered on elected representatives and heads of organizations. *Administrative Leadership in the Public Sector* differs from the existing literature in its emphasis on leadership as influencing change at both the individual and organizational levels. The focus differs as well. Leaders are career public servants, for the most part, who may initiate and carry out the roles and responsibilities of leadership at multiple agency echelons. The authors identify these leaders as having personal characteristics and competencies that enable them to create and sustain interpersonal and organizational transformation from their knowledge and experiences within the public sector.

Editors Montgomery Van Wart and Lisa Dicke point out that the principles of scientific management have limited the conceptualization of leadership to a set of proscriptions for "best" ways. The legacies of Frederick Winslow Taylor and Henri Fayol have created a notion that there is little difference between public and private sector management. Elected leaders as well as corporate executives have tried to put these principles into practice by emphasizing productivity in terms of organizational inputs and outputs. The system of checks and balances among the branches of government, which implies that no one branch has sufficient power and authority to develop and implement goals and strategies, however, negates the use of a single source of planning, goal setting, and resource allocation. The editors rightly note that, for public sector leadership, the "best" principles are more in line with best styles, techniques, and practices in individual situations.

As an ASPA Classics volume, the book sets a foundation by identifying several generic leadership theories and concepts in Van Wart's "Public-Sector Leadership Theory" (chapter 2). In the main, however, most of the chapters adapt or build theoretical frameworks that are based on public management practice. The first part of the book provides a foundational description of contemporary views of leadership, including situational, ethical, transformational, and integrative approaches. Matthew Fairholm's "Different Perspectives on the Practice of Leadership" gives a distinctively public sector adaptation of these theories. Fairholm integrates personal leadership qualities with situational and behavioral characteristics to create a perspective theory of leadership. His leadership perspectives model includes spiritual, cultural, and values-based orientations with respect to follower relationships and tools and behaviors for implementing change. He also gives recommendations on how to use the model in public administration.

Part II adapts generic theory to public settings, and the editors' encourage administrative leaders to undertake assessments of task, role, resources, and follower relationships. This part opens with Paul Appleby's (1946) case study description of how an administrator incorporated assessments in developing and carrying out an organizing strategy. Subsequent chapters in this part describe ways that administrative leaders can use their assessments to achieve high performance among individuals and within organizations as a whole. Examples include adapting total quality management to government and managing and evaluating service performance.

The third section follows with a discussion of conditions that public leaders need to assess, such as organizational mission, size, and complexity. This section is particularly apt for public administrators because it describes tensions that are likely to confront administrative leaders, particularly in their interactions with a wide variety of stakeholders with different and often conflicting interests, goals, and levels of political influence. The chapter authors show how assessing context, situations, and stakeholders influenced goals, decision making, assuming responsibility and accountability, balancing entrepreneurship with democratic values and practices, and policy leadership.

The pragmatic formulation of leadership styles and strategies is evident; of the remaining six parts of the book, four are concerned with practical ways that leaders can develop skills, abilities, and competencies for defining and performing their roles. These four parts incorporate an array of models of leadership traits, styles, techniques, and examples. Part IV, on best traits and skills for public leaders, is a compilation of personal characteristics that characterize administrative leaders: a high achievement motivation, skills in technical, interpersonal, and intellectual functioning, and 10 exemplary personal traits. Part VI relates competencies public leaders need to manage others, organizational roles and functions, and technical and organizational changes.

The last section of the book relates back to the "great men" of leadership theory, but within a public sector setting. The editors define greatness through accounts of values, beliefs, and the actions of noteworthy public leaders. Their

definition of a "good" administrative leader on page 399 combines a moral sense of action with competent use of resources; in effect, an exemplary administrative manager promotes a "deft, efficient technical production, firm and compassionate utilization of human resources, a clear sensibility of what an organization needs to be doing and how it needs to adapt, and a sense of integrity that overlays it." The editors illuminate their description in the section's three chapters, the first of two parts relating to ethical and moral leader traits and behaviors. The remaining chapter exemplifies these characteristics in an account of Branch Rickey's courage in promoting racial integration in baseball.

The book provides a fairly clear portrait of the administrative leader in terms of the context of public administration. The image emerges from applications of leadership theory and praxis. The administrative leader is one who displays a subdued heroism and a willingness to assess difficult and changing conditions, identify action options, craft the best strategy based on available information, and take on levels of risk for the promotion of greater public or national causes. The administrative leader is drawn from theory, but has substance from the field of practice.

The varying areas of practice within public administration, however, make teaching effective administrative leadership skills and competencies difficult. The editors explain that the problem is worsened by the limitations of training-related organizations themselves. One major problem, the editors note, is the failure of training units to conduct holistic needs assessments and measure performance-based outcomes. In light of this, the book describes the adaptation of the Office of Personnel Management's competency-based approach, which specifies skills for each level of leadership responsibilities. The book also offers some practical advice for developing a succession management program and for evaluating executive performance.

Van Wart and Dicke maintain that a cornerstone of administrative leadership is the transformation of individuals and organizations. They point out the need for administrative leaders to orchestrate change, but transformation, particularly of large systems changes, gets relatively little emphasis. Chapters by Rudolph Garrity and Matthew Fairholm highlight public sector adaptations of transformational leadership models, but aside from a discussion of total quality management, the book provides scant guidance on how to implement such changes. Learning how to conceive of change in government organizations, planning and implementing change strategies, and assessing and measuring outcomes are vital features of the transformative role that leaders play. Creating conditions for a healthy work climate, higher levels of human productivity, and streamlined work processes for greater organizational performance are areas that administrative leaders need to master. In view of the deep structural changes over the last 25 years, which have affected foundational beliefs about the roles of government in social and human affairs, it would seem that more emphasis could be placed on best practices and techniques administrative leaders have used.

The book's practical emphasis makes it a valuable resource, particularly for managers. As a tool for future research in administrative leadership, however, the book provides little help. The editors note that few existing studies, particularly from leading public administration journals, have published administrative leadership research. Accordingly, little is known about the field. To help fill this gap, the editors might show how accounts of leadership practices, techniques, behaviors, and values could be used for developing empirical studies. Van Wart offers a sketch of a leadership model on page 14, but he gives readers little conceptual background. This model is depicted as the leader's assessment of environmental constraints and opportunities, along with personal traits and styles as well as organizational goals and fashioning them into an action strategy. From the formulation, and, by implication the implementation of it, the leader can evaluate strategy effectiveness. Similarly, the writer proposes a "possible" definition of leadership without referencing existing literature. The definition and its relationship to the sketch would enable researchers to further develop the concepts described in the section. The book also lacks a concluding or summarizing chapter, which could be used as a vehicle for future research. Central or emergent concepts from the chapters could shed much light for further studies and best practices. The concluding framework would do much to create reader ties between the 39 book chapters.

For its utility as a reference for understanding public leadership in particular contexts, *Administrative Leadership in the Public Sector* makes an important contribution to the field. It builds on classical administrative theories and integrates their applications in various public contexts. It offers suggestions for carrying out a key function of public administrators in shaping and administering policy. A weakness is the lack of research implications that could extend knowledge and competencies in change management and public leader theory development. As one of the few steps toward a broader conceptualization of administrative leadership, however, the book provides some much needed insight into the challenges of and opportunities for managing in complex, politically driven bureaucracies and the rewards of serving competently and heroically in the public's interest.

Book review by: A. Carol Rusaw, *Public Administration Review*, May/Jun 2009. Vol. 69, No. 3; pg. 551, 3 pgs

Lindblom, Charles E. (1917-)

Yale University political economist, author, and leading advocate of incrementalism in the formulation of public policy. Charles Lindblom published a classic critique of rational-comprehensive decision making in 1959, “The Science of Muddling Through.” In it he noted that the science of policy analysis assumed intellectual capacities and information that men do not possess. Lindblom contrasted the *root* method of rational-comprehensive decision making with the *branch* method, which he called a model of successive limited comparisons. The latter assumed that a historic chain of decisions exists which the administrator can use as a basis for future choices. In *The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making Through Mutual Adjustment* (1965), Lindblom presented in detail the benefits of muddling through, basing them on a process he termed “partisan mutual adjustment.” For Lindblom, muddling through (1) focuses on policies that differ only marginally or in a limited way from existing policies, rather than totally reassessing given policies; (2) limits alternatives and consequences available for comparison, thus simplifying the policy-making process; (3) does not insist that a solution to a problem be “right” or “ethical,” only that it be pragmatic, feasible, and the result of consensus among competing interest groups (in regard to this, Lindblom wrote: “It is not irrational for an administrator to defend a policy as good without being able to specify what it is good for.”); and (4) deals with solving current problems rather than creating what might be “sweeping social policy phantasms.” The idea of partisan mutual adjustment was first discussed in a book Lindblom wrote with fellow Yale professor Robert A. Dahl in 1953. In *Politics, Economics, and Welfare*, Lindblom and Dahl rejected the grand planning strategies of socialism and liberalism as inappropriate to governmental administration in a pluralist society. There is greater social value in having interest groups evaluate social policy than in having social scientists evaluate it, because interest groups will resolve conflict better. Each interest group knows what it wants and can be expected to protect its own survival. Partisan mutual adjustment is therefore the hidden hand in incrementalism. It is safer for democracy, because it draws information from sources outside the agency designing the policy, and thereby lessens the chances of bureaucratic imperialism. The agency’s acceptance of compromise in policy formulation introduces rationality at the proper point – not at the point of grandiose social planning, but at the point of the distribution of power.

Significance Charles Lindblom’s stature in political science is illustrated by the fact that he was president-elect of the American Political Science Association (ASPA) for 1981-1982. The incrementalist paradigm he advanced is uniquely comprehensive, including elements of pluralism, satisficing, bounded rationality, organizational drift, limited cognition, and decentralized authority. Lindblom’s leading critic is policy analyst Yehezkel Dror, a professor at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Dror maintains that when the results of past policies have been unsatisfactory, those results count for little in deciding what to do next, since incremental changes in them cannot produce significantly better results.

Line-Item Budget

A detailed financial plan of specific spending requests an executive presents to a legislative body for approval. In a line-item budget, each budgetary division is listed by *organizational unit*, such as a department or agency, and by *category* of expenditure, such as salaries, purchases, and supplies. Line-item budgeting, also called cash-based budgeting, was widely used in the United States from about 1900 through the middle 1930s. It gave legislative bodies maximum control over administrators. No expenditure (item) approved by the legislature could be changed subsequently by an agency administrator without authorization from the legislature. Administrators, therefore, had little discretion or flexibility in the management of their agency’s resources. If money had been allocated for a particular piece of equipment or program, administrators were required to spend it as specified even though conditions had changed and the money might better be saved or spent for another purpose. In the national government, congressional and executive control over the budget was increased and institutionalized by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. That historic act established the Bureau of the Budget, now the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the General Accounting Office (GAO). The OMB reviews all requests for funds before the president submits the budget to Congress, and the GAO examines expenditures to ensure they were made in accordance with congressional intent. Line-item budgeting favors those managers who “go by the book.” Meaning they follow a budget precisely with detailed accounting procedures. Although line-item budgeting has yielded to other forms of budgeting at the federal level, it is still widely used in state and local governments.

Significance Line-item budgeting reflects the scientific management school of thought and emphasizes honesty, efficiency, and inflexibility. If an agency fails to spend all the money it has been allocated, even if there are justifiable reasons, it can expect to be penalized in the next budget. Line-item budgets do not reward administrators who cut expenses in a program or who try to be flexible when suggested by circumstances. The implication of line-item budgeting is that administrators cannot be trusted, for if money remains on a line after the budgeted year, it is probably because the organization’s request was inflated. The main advantage of the line-item budget–tight control–is also its main limitation. A line-item budget tells administrators how much money is being spent for each item, but not whether the money is being expended wisely. Individual expenditures are not related to each other or to the agency’s goals or programs. Evaluation is extremely difficult in a line-item budget, and there is no direct linkage to public policy goals and objectives. All a line-item budget indicates is the total dollar amount for

each individual agency and category. It does not indicate what collective purpose the items are intended to serve. Hence, duplication of effort may be encouraged and remain undetected in line-item budgeting because control focuses on expenditures rather than on planning and evaluation. It also encouraged destructive competition among agency heads for the funds available.

Labor Laws

A general term for legislation that partly or wholly relates to matters of employment and the activities of employers and workers in relation to one another. Such laws, together with their interpretation in the courts, have had considerable influence on the course of the labor movement in the United States. Labor unions in the early 19th century has scarcely been formed before they were brought into court on the ground then, in the absence of specific statues, the English common law applied, and they represented a conspiracy against the public and hence were illegal. By the early 1900s a number of states had enacted laws protecting workers by limiting work hours, setting minimum wages, establishing compensation for on-the-job accidents, etc. Some of these laws were declared unconstitutional by the courts or were simply ignored (as was Clayton Antitrust Act; see under BOYCOTT). The most important of the Federal laws that relate partly or wholly to labor are listed in Fig. 45. See also RIGHT TO WORK LAW.

Fig. 45. Major Federal laws affecting U.S. labor

Law	Date	Provisions
Clayton Antitrust Act	1914	Exempted labor unions from antitrust laws; declared peaceful picketing was legal
LaFollette Seamen's Act	1915	Established working conditions on ships of American Registry
Adamson Act	1916	Established 8 hour work day on interstate carriers
Esch-Cummins(Transportation) Act	1920	Set up machinery for peaceful settlements of labor disputes to avoid disruption of rail service by strikes
Railway Labor Act	1926	Upheld right of rail workers to organize and bargain collectively. Amended (1934) by provisions for settling disputes
Davis-Bacon Act	1931	Required paying prevailing local wage to workers on public buildings or public works, in full, at least weekly.
Norris-LaGuardia Act(AntiInjunction Act)	1932	Made yellow dog contracts unenforceable and severely limited issues of our injunctions against unions.
National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA)	1933	Section 7a guaranteed labor's right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.
Federal Unemployment Tax	1935	Established unemployment insurance tax payable by employers to the Federal Government.
National Labor Relations	1935	Supported right of collective bargaining and banned management's anti-union activities as UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES; required employers to bargain in good faith with a union selected by majority vote; set up National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)
Social Security Act	1935	Set up Federal old age insurance system and basis for Federal state system of unemployment compensation

Byrnes Act(Antistrike breaking Act)	1936	Together with 1938 amendment, forbade interstate transport of persons hired to hamper picketing, collective bargaining, or self organization of employees; common carriers exempted
Walsh Healy Public Contract Act	1936	Established that Federal contractors must pay prevailing minimum wage the industry and conform to 8 hour day, 40 hour week in calculating overtime. Prohibited child and convict labor.
National Apprenticeship Act	1937	Established labor standards to safeguard apprentices; set up agency to support apprenticeship programs
Fair Labor Standards Act (Wage-Hour Law)	1938	Established minimum wage and maximum work hours; banned goods produced by child labor from interstate commerce.
Full Employment Act	1946	Set goal of maximum employment and production, with government taking responsibility.
Taft-Hartley Act(Labor-Management Relations Act)	1947	Revised National Labor Relations Act to curb power of unions, attaching list of “unfair union practices”; outlawed closed shop, secondary boycotts, mass picketing; encouraged state right to work laws (aimed against union shops); established cooling off period before strike could be called; outlawed automatic check off (deduction of union fees from paycheck); required unions to publish their finances, and allowed employers to sue union for broken contract or damage inflicted by striking.
Welfare Pension Plans Disclosure Act	1958	Required employers and unions to keep records and submit reports on their welfare pension plans(aimed at preventing misuse of such funds)
Landrum-Griffin Act (Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act)	1959	Required unions to give detailed reports of finances (to protect their members against corrupt union officials); provided safeguards against officials’ conflicts of interest and regulated internal government of unions; strengthened Taft Hartley Act provisions against hot cargo clause and limited picketing.
Manpower Development and Training act	1962	Established Broad program for retraining unemployed and underemployed workers
Work Hours Act	1962	Established uniform standard of 8 hour day, 40 hour week, and time and a half pay for overtime in excess of the standard for any work performed under Federal contracts or subcontracts
Equal Pay Act	1963	Prohibited discrimination in pay on basis of sex
Civil Rights Act (Title VII)	1964	Outlawed discrimination against any worker because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, with regard to pay, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, in the part of employers, employment agencies, and labor unions.
Economic Opportunity Act	1964	Set up Office of economic Opportunity to help open opportunities for job training and employment
Age Discrimination in Employment Act	1967	Outlawed discrimination against persons aged 40-65 in hiring, job retention, wages, and other work conditions in industries affecting interstate commerce.
Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act	1969	Established mandatory health and safety standards for coal mines, and disability payments for black lung disease. Amended (1977) to cover other kinds of mine and establish Mine Safety and Health Administration to

enforce mine inspection and stricter safety standards.

Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA)	1970	Set job safety and health standards for all employees, and a system of inspection and complaint procedures.
Emergency Employment Act	1971	Authorized public service employment program when national unemployment rate exceeds 4.5% and special aid to areas with high unemployment
Equal Employment Opportunity Act	1972	Expanded Title VII of 1964 Civil Rights Act; called for affirmative action with definite goals and timetables to redress past discrimination in employment against women and minorities
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)	1973	Provided Federal funds to local and state governments to identify manpower needs in their areas and provide training and other services to meet those needs. Amended so employers could participate directly through Private Industrial Councils and receive tax credits and other incentives for hiring disadvantaged workers.
Rehabilitation Act	1973	Required government contractors and subcontractors to employ qualified handicapped persons.
Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA)	1974	Required reporting and disclosure of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; safeguarded plan assets through fiduciary and funding standards; established participation and vesting standards
Job Training Partnership Act	1982	Replaced CETA and channeled job training programs for disadvantaged youth and dislocated workers through states, to work in conjunction with local Private Industry Councils (PIC's); continued activities of Job Corps.

Source: Ammer, Christine and Dean S. Ammer, **Dictionary of Business and Economics**, The Free Press, Inc., New York, 1977. pp. 255-257

Management by Objectives (MBO)

A process whereby organizational goals and objectives are set through the participation of organizational members in terms of results expected. Management by objectives was first discussed by Peter Drucker in his 1954 book, *The Practice of Management*. MBO encourages “self-management” and decentralization. It advocates an integrated approach to total management, stresses the concepts of communication and feedback, encourages organization development and change, and emphasizes policy research and the support of top management. MBO is an attempt to set objectives, track the progress of the appropriate program, and evaluate its results. The organization decentralizes by operationalizing its objectives and letting the individual managers most concerned with the program achieve those objectives in the most effective way possible. MBO has a managerial orientation that stresses common sense. It is concerned chiefly with program effectiveness, and in this orientation it is not unlike performance budgeting. The advantages of an MBO system are that it gives those people closest to the problem some latitude in dealing with it, while simultaneously measuring their performance according to criteria developed by policy makers at the highest level. An MBO system that works permits individual initiatives and innovation by on-line managers; yet their participatory policy making is limited by centrally planned operational goals.

Significance Management by objectives (MBO) became popular at all levels of government in the early 1970s when planning, programming, budgeting systems (PPBS) was largely abandoned. PPBS had what one observer called an “unfortunate association with a passion for uniformity and detail.” MBO looked like a flexible alternative. It was ironic that President Nixon’s administration embraced MBO, because MBO’s distinguishing characteristic was its emphasis on decentralization and on policy implementation by subordinates. The Nixon administration was not known for its trust of bureaucrats beyond the immediate confines of the White House. Frank P. Sherwood and William J. Page, Jr., wrote in a *Public Administration Review* article entitled “MBO and Public Management” in 1976 that “the attitude of the Nixon top management was one of low trust and contempt towards civil service.” Nevertheless, by 1975, MBO was popular enough in the federal government that the Office of Management and

Budget (OMB) issued Circular A-11, which required the submission of agency objectives with the fiscal year budget estimates. This was a new budgetary format in which OMB was implementing an MBO concept. Many state and local governments also adopted MBO. Management by objectives remains a remarkably successful administrative innovation, made effective by MBO's propensity to decentralize administrative responsibility.

Marx, Karl (1818-1883)

German theorist and radical leader (1818-83) who, with F. Engels, is considered the founder of communism. Though Marx had a doctorate in philosophy, he was considered too radical for a university post. He turned to journalism, and then was exiled from Germany. Moving to Paris, he published the COMMUNIST MANIFESTO (1848) and, at the request of the Prussian government, was again exiled. In 1849 he settled in London, where he remained until his death. In 1864 Marx founded the International Workingmen's Association, or First International, and gradually his writings, with the monetary help of Engels, became well known. In 1867 the first volume of *Das Kapital* ("Capital") appeared the fullest exposition of his ideas. The second and third volumes were completed by Engels after Marx's death, and a fourth volume, by Karl Kautsky, entitled *Theories of Surplus Value*, appeared in three parts (1905-10). For Marx's theories, see COMMUNISM, def. 1.

Source: Ammer, Christine and Dean S. Ammer, Dictionary of Business and Economics, The Free Press, Inc., New York, 1977. p. 290

Matrix Organization

An organizational form whereby teams of specialists from formal organizational units are created for purposes of achieving a specific objective while being supported by administrators who coordinate activities rather than function as superiors. Matrix organizations are also known as program or project organizations, utilizing styles of matrix management, also called program, project, or systems management. Matrix organization is an extension of public administrationist Luther H. Gulick's principle of organization by purpose. But rather than creating a formal permanent organization, a project-oriented suborganization is developed in order to solve a specific problem. Each matrix organization is headed by a project manager who recruits and coordinates the work of necessary specialists, and who reports to the senior executive in the regular permanent organization. Matrix organizations are nonhierarchical in that the project manager exerts no formal control over the specialists. Matrix organizations are usually temporary in nature and are dissolved on completion of a specific project. They are typified by a "unit of vision" among participating personnel because of the unique focus of their task. The need for matrix organizations developed as a result of the impact of technology on public administration, the emergence of large-scale organizations, and the application of systems analysis to organizational theory. Government agencies have found this form of organization useful for many kinds of projects involving rapidly changing and complex technologies. Aerospace projects are perhaps the best-known examples of matrix management, particularly the *Apollo* spacecraft program, which employed George Low as the program manager. Low's job was to coordinate and direct all aspects of the program, including the supervision of industrial contractors. Altogether he managed twenty subsystems and five division chiefs. Low believed the program was successful because (1) the matrix organization form allowed him to maintain an overall perspective on the system; (2) successes and failures in the project were visible, enabling him to judge whether or not objectives were being accomplished; (3) people were willing to accept authority that was not permanent; and (4) urgent deadlines added impetus to the completion of the project. Although matrix organizations were once associated predominantly with scientific research organizations, they have increasingly been adapted to all public agencies that experience the effects of rapid technological change.

Significance Matrix organization is one of the most important new developments in management science. A leading advocate of matrix management, James E. Webb, former administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) during the *Mercury-Gemini* era, believes that traditional organizational forms do not have the flexibility to adjust to rapid technological change, or to solve complex problems creatively. Webb does recognize the value and necessity of permanent, traditional organizational forms which provide ongoing routine functions such as budgetary processes, purchasing, public relations, and evaluation. Organization development expert Wendell French believes there are several unanswered questions about matrix organizations. One is about the psychological effects on experts who never work with permanent groups and who are perpetually forming and dissolving horizontal working relationships. Organizational humanist Chris Argyris has predicted that organizations will increasingly continue hierarchical and matrix management, whereby authority is based less on power or role, and more on the possession of relevant information and expertise.

New Public Administration

An effort by a school of professional administrators and academicians in the 1970s and 1980s to refocus public administration away from its traditional concerns for efficiency, effectiveness, budgeting, and good administrative techniques to a concern for social equity. The new public administration is characterized by an interest in normative theory, philosophy, and activism. It deals with values, ethics, and the personal development of individual members of the organization. Its tone is moral. Social needs, particularly the problems of urbanism and violence, are its primary focuses of attention. The new public administration was inaugurated in September 1968, when Dwight Waldo, as Albert Schweitzer Professor in Humanities at Syracuse University and as editor of the *Public Administration Review*, sponsored a conference of young public administrationists to consider the new approach. The meeting was held at the Minnowbrook conference site at Syracuse, hence occasional references in the literature to the “the Minnowbrook perspective.” Its proceedings were published in 1971 as *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, which remains the key work in understanding this school of thought.

Significance The new public administration movement paralleled a “new political science movement” and occurred simultaneously with the movement to rid political science of its emphasis on behavioralism. Both movements were led by “young turks” who had broader normative concerns than currently predominant technical emphases in the two fields would recognize. Many of the young turks soon became older turks who attained positions of high responsibility in public administration. H. George Frederickson, for example, one of the Minnowbrook participants who remarked during the conference that the new movement was “in alignment with good, or possibly God,” became president of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) in 1977. The new public administration was a declaration of independence from both political science and administrative science. Advocates of the new public administration noted that political science, its mother discipline, had practically disowned it. 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 (APSA). By 1967, public administration had disappeared as an organizing category in the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. In the year he called the Minnowbrook Conference, 1968, Dwight Waldo wrote that “many political scientists not identified with Public Administration are indifferent or even hostile; they would sooner be free of it.” He stated that the public administrationist had “second-class citizenship” in political science. Between 1960 and 1970, only 4 percent of all articles published in the five major political science journals dealt with public administration. New public administration adherents noted also that public administrationists had not fared much better in administrative science departments. The technical approach of statisticians, systems analysts, and economists which dominated administrative science in the 1960s left little doubt in many public administration minds that the *public* in public administration was being lost in the business-administration-school location of most administrative science departments. The business school was typically profit-conscious. The public administrationist had a sense of the public interest, without which many believed administrative science could be used for *any* purpose, no matter how immoral. The new public administration was therefore a reconsideration of public administration’s traditional intellectual ties with both political science and administrative science. It was a contemplation of the prospects of academic autonomy.

Organization

A goal-seeking group of individuals who use a structure designed to help achieve its objectives. Organization is concerned in particular with the ways in which personnel are organized to carry out their basic mission. In public administration, organization and personnel are the two basic factors subject to modification and change. If one devises the best possible organizational arrangement for carrying out an agency’s tasks, but personnel are listless, apathetic, and unmotivated, agency operations will suffer. If, on the other hand, an agency has dedicated, ambitious, and highly efficient personnel, but they must try to carry out their duties in an outmoded, inefficient, and convoluted organizational milieu, again the agency will probably fail in its basic mission. Organization, like personnel, is a critical factor in the operations of all political and administrative systems. Organization effectiveness deals with such subjects as the location of responsibility, the application of the principles of hierarchy, the role of line and staff, how accountability of each employee can be ensured, the coordination of efforts, and the most efficient use of personnel through specialization based on a division of labor. The lines of responsibility and accountability should flow smoothly from the lowest levels to the highest, and power and authority should be focused at the top and flow through the different echelons to the lowest ranks. The most effective organizations are those based on some coherent principle or operational characteristic. These might include (1) clientele, such as the Department of Labor or the Bureau of Indian Affairs; (2) specialized purpose, such as the Department of State or the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA); (3) skills or functions, such as the Office of Management and Budget (OMB); (4) geographical area, such as the

Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA); and (5) major purpose, such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). All agencies in the national administration are based on one or several of these patterns and some incorporate all of them.

Significance The importance of organization in carrying out policies and programs adopted by Congress has led that body to undertake frequent reorganizations of the executive branch with the objective of achieving greater efficiency at less cost. Because political considerations so often intervened in the efforts of Congress to organize the national government more efficiently, Congress in 1949 turned major authority and responsibility for determining organizational changes over to the president, although retaining the "veto" power over presidential actions. Each president since 1949 has submitted numerous reorganizational plans, and very few have been vetoed by Congress. Because of the growing emphasis on organization, scholars have developed organization theory which seeks to explain the nature and functioning of complex groups. The emphasis is placed on structure and design and on decision processes carried on within organizations. The study of organizations draws heavily from the pioneering work done by the sociologist Max Weber in his studies of complex bureaucratic organizations. Organization will continue to be one of the central focuses of the study of public administration because it is critical to governmental operations.

Organization Development (OD)

A behavioral science approach to organizational change which assumes a process of continuous self-renewal within organizations. Organization development involves employees in both problem analysis and the generation of solutions in a climate of trust and openness. The underlying philosophy of organization development is (1) employees are capable of diagnosing problems they live with; (2) employees are capable of suggesting viable solutions to organizational dilemmas; (3) the climate must be right to elicit employee suggestions; (4) implementation of reforms will be smoother if employees are involved at the analysis stage; and (5) the best remedy for entropy is continuous self-renewal. Organization development requires management to pay a great deal of attention to such maintenance activities as team building and harmonizing interpersonal relations. The most successful of the techniques used to do these things are transactional analysis (TA) and sensitivity training (T-groups). Their common goal is to reduce defensiveness, promote adult kinds of behavior, and generate a willingness to confront rather than dodge problems. Organization development seeks to build into an agency a problem-solving capability which offers a creative response not only to a current problem, but to any problem that may arise. It is planned change.

Significance Organization development ideas can be applied only if managers deeply value employee ideas, solicit them, and listen. Organization theorist Victor Thompson stated the case for organization development. He believed that involving larger parts of the organization in the search process would increase chances of acceptance and implementation of problem solutions. Not only must managers genuinely value employee ideas in the OD model, they must *recognize* existing or upcoming problems to assign to employee task forces. Managers frequently find it useful to bring an outside consultant on board to aid and abet the self-analysis that proceeds from problem identification. The consultant is primarily a feedback monitor, making sure feedback flows back to his or her client (that is, the manager) and to and through each team at work on the problem. The underlying psychological assumption in the organization development model is that involvement leads to commitment.

Organization Development: Managerial Grid

A two-dimensional scheme for describing managerial style on the basis of whether the manager is production oriented or people-oriented. The managerial grid was devised by organization development consultants Robert R. Blake and Jane F. Mouton in 1967, using questionnaire responses. Blake and Mouton gave descriptions of types of managers who may be found at five points on the classifying grid: at the four extremes and at the center. Concern for people was one axis of the grid; concern for production was the other. Along each axis, a score of one is the lowest, and nine is the highest. Four extremes of management styles were labeled: (1) 1,1—*Impoverished Management*: "Don't make waves. Do as little as possible to keep the boss happy"; (2) 9,9—*Team Management*: "Yes sir! This is the finest staff anybody could want to work with. They really work as a team to accomplish team goals"; (3) 1,9—*Country Club Management*: "Why should I worry about progress? My people know what they are doing and are very happy"; and (4) 9,1—*Task Management*: "The job's the thing. Accomplish the objective even if all the troops are lost in the battle." Blake and Mouton theorize that every managerial technique, approach, or style can be placed somewhere on the managerial grid. They offer not only a diagnosis, but also a prescription. Their goal is an organization that scores a nine on the production and a nine on the people scale. In such an organization Blake and Mouton believe there is mutual trust among organization members and that organizational goals become members' goals. Efficiency and satisfaction combine to enhance effectiveness in the model of the managerial grid.

Significance The managerial grid is used for managerial training and for identifying various combinations of leadership style. It is a useful device for helping managers to see how they manage—for production results or for people. The grid does not tell the student why a manager falls into one section or another of the grid, however, Blake and Mouton's model implies that combinations other than 9,9 are less desirable. As a result, training programs aim at the "ideal" (9,9) pattern, which is a pattern of equal concern for production and for people. There have not been many research studies of the effectiveness of the managerial grid approach. Those that do exist suffer from a number of difficulties, chief among which is that the information obtained tends to be anecdotal and subjective. Individuals were asked in one study to describe changes that had occurred more than a year earlier.

Most problems based on the managerial grid approach have been carried on without control groups. Indeed, most managerial grid analyses of organizations are not evaluated at all. The relatively few rigorous studies that do exist have generated mixed, and often contradictory, conclusions. Nevertheless "grid organization development," as the idea was first called, remains an excellent packaging concept. It is a method for explaining and developing training programs to focus sensitivity training and organizational development on the leadership concept. Blake and Mouton suggest many types of activities which might help leaders improve. Among these are *laboratory-seminar groups* to create an awareness of managerial qualities; *teamwork* in specifying the desirable characteristics of leaders; *intergroup action* among teams for discussion, analysis, and generalizations about growth experiences; and *goal setting* for specific, measurable progress development.

Organization Development: Sensitivity Training

An effort to train selected executives in new attitudes about "authentic" behavior in interpersonal relationships within the organization. Sensitivity training attempts to teach administrators how to let down their guards associated with hierarchical and competitive positions in the authority structure and how to clarify their own identities as human beings interacting with other human beings. Sensitivity training as a form of organization development activity seeks to transform the psychological atmosphere of the whole organization. The training takes the form of one or two weeks intensive exposure to "T-groups" (the "T" for "training" or "laboratory training"), which are led by a member of the human relations school of administrative management. The group leader takes a nondirective role, encouraging group members to engage in interpersonal dynamics characterized by extreme candor. T-groups are the same as "encounter groups," which also flourished in the troubled 1960s.

Significance Sensitivity training has produced a paucity of reliable evidence to support its claims. The evidence that exists seems to indicate that, although many participants value the T-group experience and alter their behavior back on the job, the new behavior may either improve or lessen their effectiveness in organizations. The effects of the T-group experience usually fade after a few months. The participants' organizations are not changed. The first major organization development (OD) effort undertaken in the federal government was launched in the State Department in the mid-1960s. The program was called ACORD, for Action for Organization Development Program, and it provided sensitivity training and team development workshops for high-level department officials, including ambassadors. Twenty of the most prestigious T-group trainers in the nation were employed in the program. It was terminated after only two years. Its stated objectives "were, at best, achieved only to a marginal extent," according to Michael H. Harmon in his paper, "Organization Development in the State Department: A Case Study of the ACORD Program." Despite this experience, OD programs were subsequently initiated in over half the bureaus and agencies of the federal government. Sensitivity training became a part of the program of the Federal Executive Institute, the government's training center for senior government officials.

Organization Development: Transactional Analysis

A theory of human behavior that attempts to describe what happens when any two people interact. Transactional analysis (TA) was originally developed by psychiatrist Eric Berne in his 1964 book, *Games People Play*. One of his associates, Tom Harris, developed the idea more fully in his 1969 book, *I'm O.K.—You're O.K.* Transactional analysis theorizes that everyone has three typical modes of behavior: the parent ego state, the adult ego state, and the child ego state. The theory also uses certain names for some of the characteristics of human interaction situations. Among these are *strokes*, *games*, *transactions*, and *life positions*. The *child* ego state is that body of experience stored in a person's brain that relates to childhood experience. It includes feelings of frustration, inadequacy, and helplessness. The child ego state is called the "felt concept of life" in TA. The *parent* ego state comes from a person's observation about the way his or her mother or father or other "big people" in one's early life behaved. Because of the little person's dependency, "they" were right. The parent ego state is referred to as the "taught concept of life" in TA. One's parent is the part of a person that lectures, moralizes, and lays down the law. The *adult* ego state is that part of a person that figures things out by collecting and looking at facts. He or she estimates probabilities, explains reasons, and suggests alternatives, rather than reacting emotionally. The adult ego state is described as the "thought concept of life" in TA. *Strokes* are defined as the special rewards human beings look for in interaction situations. Positive strokes may be words of praise, compliments, or smiles. Negative strokes come in

the form of critical comments, avoidance, or failure to return telephone calls. *Games* are defined as routines people use to get strokes. We play roles, adapt emotions, and act in ways which experience has taught us will get the kind of strokes we like. Games reinforce psychological positions and strengthen the “I’m not O.K.” and/or “You’re not O.K.” feelings people have. *Transactions* are exchanges of words and related behavior between two people. When we see each person involved in an exchange as having a parent, an adult, and a child, we are able to draw a diagram of what happened in the transaction, hence the term *transactional analysis*. *Life positions* summarize our characteristic behavior toward other people. They are based on our assumptions about ourselves. Life positions are classified as (1) *I’m not O.K. and you’re not O.K.* This person will defer or relinquish rather than feeling capable of contributing to a conversation or a problem-solving situation. (2) *I’m O.K. and you’re not O.K.* This is a distrustful life position. It usually results from a person being mistreated by grownups when he or she was small. He or she looks forward to growing up and being able to exercise control and power over others. When this person communicates, he or she will probably try to control the situation and dominate the conversation. (3) *I’m not O.K. and you’re not O.K.* This is a despairing outlook on life. It is totally negative in perspective. The person with this approach is likely to be withdrawn and resentful. (4) *I’m O.K. and you’re O.K.* This is a rationally chosen life position. It represents an adult decision and is likely to be made by a self-actualizing person who communicates by attentive listening and reflective posture. Transactional analysis has proved to be a powerful technique for analyzing communication activities in interpersonal relationships.

Significance Transactional analysis is used in public administration contexts as a technique of organization development. It is a communications mechanism that allows organizational team building. It permits managers to address the security, love, and self-esteem needs of employees as identified in the Abraham Maslow hierarchy of needs. TA also speaks to the satisfier elements of Frederick Herzberg’s two-factor theory of human motivation. Transactional analysis helps the manager to help workers free themselves from personal hangups to be more productive. The self-analysis that characterizes TA encourages employees to engage in organization problem solving, which is not unlike personal problem solving. Transactional analysis recognizes the simple fact of organizational and interpersonal relationships, that if *I’m O.K.*, there’s no way *you* can be O.K.

Organization Theory, Classical

The view of organizations as social systems in which power and authority flow from the top downward through a hierarchy, and accountability flows from the bottom upward. Classical organization theory states that the mission or goal of an organization can rationally be broken down into specific tasks, which lead to the accomplishment of that goal. The arrangement of work constitutes rules so that the organization can operate on a continuous basis. The members of the organization know what tasks they are responsible for doing. Once the various tasks that relate to the organization goal are identified, functional specialists can be hired to handle these tasks with a high degree of efficiency. The various functional specialists in an organization are coordinated and directed by bosses within the hierarchy, thus producing the familiar superior-subordinate relationships within the organization. The view of authority from above defines classical organization theory.

Significance Classical organization is believed by its proponents to have several benefits over organizations arranged along collegial or honorific lines. Chief among classical organization theory proponents is German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920). Classical organization theorists tend to believe in the historical inevitability of the increasing dominance of legal-rational organizations. Even Weber, however, who thought bureaucracy to be the best example of a legal-rational organization, worried in 1909 about the dehumanizing of people in the bureaucracy itself. The primary weakness of classical organization theory is its underestimation of the human factor in administration. It accepts the simplistic view that people in a hierarchical relationship to others will carry out orders. As neoclassical organization theory discovered, sometimes they will and sometimes they will not.

Organization Theory: Humanism

A view of organizations that is concerned with the quality of life of individual workers within the organization. Organizational humanism began with the recognized dehumanizing tendencies of the scientific management movement of the early 1900s. In humanism’s link to scientific management, however, both were concerned with workers’ productivity and such related matters as absenteeism and turnover. The humanists demonstrated in the 1950s and 1960s that happy workers were more productive workers. “Happiness” was usually called “job satisfaction” in the research studies and was unrelated to monetary and promotional rewards. Satisfaction was rooted in interpersonal relations in the small face-to-face group of fellow workers and their immediate supervisor. Humanism stated that a satisfaction-generating and productive atmosphere was not a bureaucratic one, but one that fostered democratic participation by the workers in decision making for the group. The supervisor was not the autocratic and directive, as in scientific management, but informal, consultative, trusting, and concerned for team members’ welfare. Organizational humanism had a normative commitment to the individual’s opportunity for self-

actualization and to the equality of persons. The primary spokesperson for the movement-also called the human relations movement –made clear the conviction that the large formal organization with its hierarchical authority structure is repressive. These and other ideological elements of the human relations movement were prominent in the formation of the new public administration in the late 1960s.

Significance Organizational humanism has been severely attacked by modern researchers. Accumulated evidence now seems to indicate that the conditions that make some workers happy make other workers unhappy, and that happy workers are not necessarily more productive workers. The grounds of criticism of the human relations school have been summarized by James W. Fesler as follows: (1) Most of the research providing the empirical proof of human relations school doctrines was conducted by “true believers.” (2) The sweeping contrast of the “bad” hierarchical organization with the “ideal” humanist organization was overdrawn and rested on assertion rather than scientific study of large organizations. (3) In humanism’s commitment to development of the whole person, the job was treated as if it were the whole life. Many people obtain important satisfactions apart from the job, and a high overall level of happiness is often achieved despite only moderate satisfaction with the job’s socio-psychological attributes. (4) Humanism’s normative commitments blocked out awareness that a qualified leader needs to lead and not just be one of the boys. Organizational humanism nevertheless survived and prospered in the form of organization development. Its emphasis continues to be on authentic interpersonal relationships within the organization.

Organization Theory: Pluralism

The view that society is characterized by the political warfare of groups seeking to have their interests prevail, and that administrative organizations are themselves the product of conflict and accommodation of interests. Pluralism regards the administrative process as another battleground to which interest groups carry their struggle from the electoral and legislative arenas. The administrative structure is fragmented, just as Congress is fragmented, and the president is just another player. The president is so occupied with policy and political leadership, speaking for the combination of forces which enabled him to attain power, that the president can give only partial and discontinuous attention to maximizing the administrative authority of the position as chief executive. Administrative agencies, therefore, will be responsive primarily to Congress, and especially to congressional committees and their leaders. That is the source of both substantive power and appropriations. The task of administration, therefore, is essentially the same as that of politics: to facilitate the peaceful resolution of conflicts of interest compatibly and to distribute power among groups in the society. The pluralist approach to public administration classically represented in David B. Truman’s *The Governmental Process* (1951) and J. Leiper Freeman’s *The Political Process: Executive Bureau-Legislative Committee Relations* (1965).

Significance The pluralist model of organization theory charged that the “textbook model” of classical organization theory is an unreal portrayal of the executive branch and is in conflict with democratic values. The classical model is one in which an organization is composed of clearly bounded units and subunits that are so arranged as to provide a hierarchical structuring of authority, often pictured as a pyramid. The pluralist model yields a more realistic description and explanation of what goes on in administration and politics. But as James W. Fesler points out, the fragmentation it describes “and even celebrates” as part of the genius of the U.S. political system affords little or no guidance as to what direction one should move in if he or she had the opportunity to express a preference or exert influence. Although pluralism separates what *is* from what *ought* to be, it does not help those confronted by opportunities to change organizations. The hierarchic model has the operational significance of a belief widely subscribed to. It has been the pattern advocated by every reorganization commission that surveys federal administration. Many of the advances made in administrative organization have been attempts to apply to a pluralistic government the arrangements of the hierarchic administrative model. Yet the advances have been limited by the power groups identified by the pluralist model, forces which do not wish their access to the administrative process blocked by a strengthened hierarchical administration. Efforts to improve government and its administration often emphasize the coordination, rationality, and legitimacy found in the hierarchic model. The pluralist model stands as a warning that, unless there is accommodation of the variety of interest groups, congressional committees, and government agencies that form the pluralist perspective, these efforts for improvement will have limited success.

Participative Management

A process by which workers are brought into organizational decision-making processes to varying degrees, primarily on matters that directly affect them. Participative management is a product of the human relations movement in management theory and is growing as a result of studies done in the 1960s which demonstrated that the more input workers have about what they do and how they do it, the more productive they will be. The goal of participative management is to increase the organization’s output, while simultaneously meeting the needs of

individual employees. The strategy worked well for such organizations as the McCormick Company, the Glacier Metal Company of Great Britain, the BEA Associates of New York. Each of these companies set up committees of employees who made decisions concerning job design, promotion, salary, and retirement plans. Those persons who used the files, for example, decided how to set them up. An organization may pay people for their judgment as well as their labor, so that creative approaches to management prevail. The participative management approach appears to work best in smaller organizations where subordinates are skilled professionals. It also works well in situations where organizations are in a state of change. Workers who have difficulty coping with change find change easier to accept if they have helped define their new working conditions.

Significance Participative management is based on studies such as those completed at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center in 1969 which showed that all of a sample of 1,533 workers interviewed ranked interesting work and personal authority far ahead of good pay and job security. An explanation for the survey's results can be traced back to Abraham Maslow's theory of human motivation and the hierarchy of human needs. People need not only income from their work, but some sense of status and recognition, as well as feelings of self-worth. Most of the advantages of participative management fall in three categories: (1) subordinate input can improve the quality of decisions; (2) participative management leads to acceptance of and commitment to organizational goals; people tend to support what they help create; and (3) participation promotes teamwork within the organization—it tends to erase the "tunnel vision" workers have if they do not have the whole picture. The disadvantages of participative management are (1) often there is not enough time to have the many meetings required to get everyone involved; (2) participation sometimes leads to conflict and antagonism between workers and managers; and (3) participative management can produce confusion of roles. Once a worker has been "given an inch," he sometimes "wants a mile." The disadvantages illustrate the key issue involved when a manager decides to allow his or her subordinates to participate in decision making: communication. People must be aware of the degree to which they will be participating in management decisions, as well as their role in the total organizational environment. Without effective communication, participative management practices will not achieve their aim, which is to allow workers to become mentally and emotionally involved in their job.

Pendleton Act (Civil Service Reform Act of 1883)

A major law enacted by Congress that ushered in a transition in the federal government's personnel system from a politically dominated, corrupt, and inefficient spoils system to a merit system based on professional competence. The Pendleton Act established the United States Civil Service headed by a Civil Service Commission (now the Office of Personnel Management [OPM] and the Merit Systems Protection Board [MSPB]) responsible for administering the system in the executive branch. Major changes ushered in by the act included (1) establishing a merit system based on recruitment, competitive examination, political neutrality, and job tenure; (2) permitting the president to expand the personnel placed under the protection of civil service from approximately 15 percent of federal employees in the 1880s to a current figure in excess of 90 percent; and (3) initiating a unique "open" personnel system whereby individuals can move from positions in the private sector to civil service jobs (lateral entry) and back again to private employment, thus providing flexibility and maximizing opportunity and expertise.

Significance The Pendleton Act began a process of replacing the spoils system that had been bought into the national government in the 1820s by President Andrew Jackson. By 1883, the voting public was thoroughly disappointed, even outraged, by the blatantly political abuses that typified the federal personnel system. Two other factors—the assassination of President James Garfield by a rejected office seeker and an effort by the Republican majority in Congress to oblige the public and at the same time ensure that Republican officeholders would remain in their jobs—contributed to the passage of the reform act. The basic principle embodied in the Pendleton Act—that the federal personnel system should be based on merit—served as a beacon which led the states and many local units of government to establish civil service merit systems. Although a number of major civil service acts have been passed by Congress since 1883, including the Ramspeck Act of 1940 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the Pendleton Act remains the basic personnel law governing the federal bureaucracy.

Performance Budgeting

A method of budgeting that collects and arranges individual expenditures into the functions, activities, and projects an organization is to perform. Performance budgeting, also called program budgeting, takes former line items and attempts to see how they relate to the larger purpose of the agency, rather than looking at them as a string of separate expense items. Performance budgeting gives administrators much more personal responsibility for their organization's budget than does line-item budgeting. While administrators must meet an efficiency objective, they are given considerable discretion in the use of appropriated resources. Line-item budgeting sees administrators essentially as clerks. Performance budgeting sees them as managers. Legislators exercise much less direct control over administrative agencies under performance budgeting than they do under line-item budgeting.

Significance Performance budgeting is primarily concerned with efficiency and economy in government, not with whether government effectively responds to public needs. Administrative and managerial skills tend to dominate agency decision making under performance budgeting, with budget analysis focused on precision accounting and control. There is heavy emphasis on work-cost measurement. The development of performance budgeting with its focus on evaluation represented progress from line-item budgeting, with its emphasis on how many typewriters and paper clips are needed. But even performance budgeting does not ask the basic questions: Should this particular program be implemented in the first place? A performance budget only assesses the program that has been determined as the one the agency should administer. The possibility remains that even though the program is being run efficiently, it is not the best one to meet the agency's or the government's goals. The result often is wasted money. Performance budgeting does not select the "best" program from among all the possibilities. It only assesses what is already in existence. Program selection as a part of budget making as the primary function of another approach to budgeting: planning, programming, budgeting systems (PPBS).

Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT)

A systems analysis and scheduling plan that specifies for the administrator how various parts of a project interrelate, especially what parts of the project must be completed before the remaining parts can be started. PERT was developed in the late 1950s by Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, a consulting firm employed by the United States Navy to assist in the complex task of constructing the Polaris missile system. PERT made it possible for the system to be completed two years ahead of schedule. The program evaluation and review technique is represented by a PERT chart, which depicts in network-analysis form points and paths that must exist to get all the parts of a project to occur. The steps involved in constructing a PERT chart are (1) identification of all activities necessary to complete the project; (2) arrangement of these activities in the most opportune order with respect to the time each requires and the sequence in which the activities occur; (3) charting itself to determine and show in months, weeks, days, and hours the time each task will require; and (4) rearrangement or reorganization of any activities that may streamline the tasks. For each time period, three estimates are given along with the associated cost: the optimistic completion time, the most likely completion time, and the pessimistic completion time. The formula for determining activity time is as follows:

O = optimistic completion time
M = most likely completion time
P = pessimistic completion time

$$\frac{O + 4M + P}{6} = \text{activity time}$$

PERT is thus an attempt to quantify program planning and control. It differs from other planning systems in that it seeks to systematize and mechanize the planning and control process by using computers and network flow plans. The flow plan is the fundamental tool used in the PERT approach, because once the schedule is created, continuing review by managers assures that actual progress conforms to planned accomplishment. Managers can intervene at appropriate times to correct deviation from planned objectives. In those cases where corrective action cannot put the project back on course, the whole time schedule must be recomputed. *See also* COMPUTER, 33; MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES (MBO), 279; PLANNING, 65.

Significance Program evaluation and review technique (PERT) has been implemented by almost all federal government research and development agencies. It is used by all United States military services, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Soviet government uses a variant of PERT for developing its five-year economic plans. As a management tool, PERT forces managers to focus attention on planning control and coordination. It facilitates conversation and cooperation between lower and upper level administrators because it emphasizes a bottom-up approach. The people who will eventually have to implement the plan are the ones responsible for putting the time estimates and schedules together. PERT is a catalyst for creating an atmosphere of teamwork and communication, commitment, and intelligent planning. PERT is not an advisable approach for mass production systems except in their design and development stages. Once an assembly line is set up and functioning, it would be expensive and wasteful to monitor repetitious production by network analysis. But for single-use plans or one-time events, PERT has not been equaled as a planning and monitoring system since its widespread application in the early 1960s.

Planning, Programming, Budgeting, Systems (PPBS)

An approach to budgeting which assumes that the search for a selection of goals, programs, and projects can be quantified. PPBS administrators identify all the possible alternatives in each budgeting category and then apply cost-benefit analysis to each one. The alternative that shows the most benefit for a given cost, or a predetermined benefit for the least cost, would be the best choice – the “best” choice being the “most rational” choice. Under PPBS (sometimes called PPB), administrators are involved with evaluation at virtually every step of the budgeting process. A great deal of managerial responsibility flows to top administrators. Their expertise as system analysts and “economic experts” tends to preempt legislative decision making. Under performance budgeting, for example, efficiency analysis is applied to a program *after* the legislature determines which one the agency should implement. In contrast, PPBS administrators have already completed most of the analysis before the legislative can determine policy. Thus legislative choices are severely limited by administrators who preselect policy alternatives.

Significance Planning, programming, budgeting, systems (PPBS) had a brief and glorious history in the federal service. PPBS was fully implemented in the Department of Defense in 1961 under Secretary Robert S. McNamara. PPBS was an effort to reduce competition among the armed services, each vying for control over a particular weapons system and each convinced its own program was essential to the national defense. PPBS worked well in gaining overall coordination of defense policy that it was adopted in all federal departments in 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson. By 1967, the Bureau of the Budget had implemented PPBS in twenty-one agencies and looked toward its implementation in many others. By 1971, however, the Budget Bureau’s successor, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), had issued a memorandum to all federal agencies indicating they were no longer required to submit a PPBS budget. What had happened in the interim was more than the coming of a new Republican administration to Washington. The basic weaknesses of PPBS had overtaken it. Chief among the weaknesses was the limitation of the rational decision-making model itself. It was difficult for administrators to identify and quantify all possible goals, programs, and projects. Trying to place an accurate and agreed-on dollar amount on the costs and benefits of social programs was virtually impossible. As one observer stated, “How does an administrator determine if a park is worth more or less than a library?” PPBS also ignored three political considerations, which undermined its usefulness and credibility. (1) Elected officials suspected that their control over many key policy decisions had been usurped by PPBS administrators. Legislatures believe they were not receiving all the information they needed, and that they had no way to evaluate the data they did receive. PPBS administrators controlled much of the policy making debate through their computer-simulation models, which turned out the analyses of the various alternatives. PPBS tended to reverse the role of legislators and administrators. The legislature was placed in the position of having to look to the bureaucracy for policy and information. This was not acceptable to most legislators. (2) Many of the planning projections in PPBS were for periods of five to seven years. Legislators tended to think and work within the shorter spans of their own terms in office or until the next elections. (3) PPBS ignored the political importance of individual politicians and groups. The most rational or cost-effective program according to PPBS might not be the most politically feasible one, especially if it failed to reflect the political strength of legislators or constituencies. Political realities or values could not be neglected. Despite the weaknesses of PPBS, however, its advocates did bring planning and rationality to the budget process. They made people aware of the need to evaluate critically various policy and program alternatives. PPBS employed techniques, such as cost-benefit analysis, that are still used for assessing the relative merits of policy choices.

Pluralism

A. The term has the following meanings:

1. It denotes the views which hold that political, cultural, and social systems may (or should) (a) be conceived as being constituted from a multiplicity of autonomous but interdependent groups or (b) be interpreted in terms of a multiplicity of factors.
2. It also denotes the views which claim that the multiplicity and autonomy of social groups are morally valuable or that by reason of these qualities such groups together constitute a significant or moral order.
3. Sometimes by extension it denotes the situation, actual or desired, which the holders of such views specify, admire, or value.

B. In philosophy pluralism is a system of thought which, as opposed to monism (q.v.), recognizes more than one ultimate principle of Being (see, for example, W. James, *A Pluralistic Universe*, London: Longmans, 1909). Political pluralism is the name applied to those political doctrines, ranging from extreme to modest claims on behalf of group interests in society, which assert that certain groups (e.g. family, church, union, local government) embody important social values prior to and independent of their authorization or approval by the state. The scope of pluralism is not usually interpreted including anarchism or revolutionary syndicalism because, unlike such theories,

most pluralists retain for government the functional responsibilities of compulsory citizenship and taxation, and admit the necessity for an inclusive governmental authority transcending group association to regulate, direct, or coordinate, inter alia, the domestic economy, personal liberties, national security, and foreign affairs (see F.W. Coker, *Recent Political Thought*, New York: Appleton-Century, 1934)

By, Avery Leiserson

Gould, Julius; and William L. Kolb, *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY, 1964.

Policy

A. The most common social and political usage of the term *policy* refers to a course of action or intended course of action conceived as deliberately adopted, after a review of possible alternatives, and pursued, or intended to be pursued. Thus H.D. Lasswell and A. Kaplan (*Power and Society*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950, p. 71) write 'policy is a projected program of goal values and practices: the policy process is the formulation, promulgation and application of identifications, demands and expectations'. This sense goes back to the 15th century and may be used both of individuals and organizations. So used the term appears to be peculiar to the English language (see B. Leoni, 'The Meaning of "Political" in Political Decisions', *Political Studies*, vol. V, 1957, p. 226).

B. There is some ambiguity in current usage. The term may indicate the existence of a considered intention, plan or programme (as in 'the Labour Party's housing policy'); but it is often used rather to refer to a course of action in some field where a plan or programme may exist but does not necessarily exist (as in 'Lord Palmerston's foreign policy', which could be used simply to refer to what Lord Palmerston did in the field of foreign affairs). It is also used very compendiously (as in the book title *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*) to refer to a series of policies rather than one policy.

Current interest centres on such questions as the nature of policy decisions. A question so far unanswered is how far the field of policy and policy decisions is separated from other fields of activity. Policy decisions are contrasted, for instance, with judicial decisions by reference to the relatively greater freedom of choice in the former. Judicial decisions are conceived as arrived at, at least in part, by reference to standards internal to a legal system, whereas policy decisions are thought of as being subject to no limitations other than such as arise from considerations of e.g. prudence or morals. On this basis the legislative rather than the judicial process tends to be thought of as being the process that turns policy into law.

This kind of distinction can be questioned. Thus, e.g. J. Stone (*The Province and Function of Law*, Sydney: Maitland Publications, 1950, p. 300) says: 'The Court's power to invoke public policy in new situations is no other than its duty, where a clear view of law has not emerged for the situation at bar, to adjust the conflicting interests by the creation of a rule of conflicting interests by the creation of a rule of law with its attendant rights'. Attempts to separate the fields of policy on the one hand and administration on the other are similarly questioned.

By, Wilfrid Harrison

Gould, Julius; and William L. Kolb, *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, The Free Press, NY, 1964.

Politics - Administration Dichotomy

The view that public administration should be premised on a science of management and kept separate from traditional partisan politics and general policy making. The politics-administration dichotomy suggested to American readers by Woodrow Wilson in his 1887 essay "The Study of Administration" posits a major distinction between politics and administration. Politics is the proper activity of legislative bodies and other policy-making groups. Administration is the proper activity of administrators, who carry out the policies stated in the laws of the jurisdiction or political unit. The context of the dichotomy was the reform movement of the 1880s, which had resulted in enactment of the Civil Service Act of 1883. Reformers, such as U. S. Senator George H. Pendleton, argued that public appointments should be based on fitness and merit rather than partisanship. Hence, "politics" was out of place in public service. The classic justification for the separation of policy and administration was made by Max Weber of the University of Munich in 1918. The essence of administration is to execute conscientiously the order of the political authority, he opined, even if it appears wrong to him. In the Weberian version of the politics-administration dichotomy, the administrator is impartial, passionless, and assumes no personal responsibility for policies executed. In modern life, the complexities of governmental operations have increasingly permitted and

even required administrators to become involved in making “political” decisions, especially in the regulation of the private sector.

Significance The politics-administration dichotomy was accepted somewhat uncritically in public administration until shortly before World War II. Wilson’s theme fell on the fertile intellectual ground of the Progressive movement in the United States, and Weber’s related ideas captured the authoritarian predisposition of the cameralist tradition in Europe, which was primarily concerned with developing administrative techniques for managing highly centralized states. The dichotomy broke down in the United States under the practical demands of loosely phrased laws which urged public administrators to carry out the public interest. Because much discretion was available to administrators, they, along with judges, became supplementary lawmaker. Paul H. Appleby observed in *Policy and Administration* (1949) that legislatures merely hold reserve powers to be invoked only if administrators violate the implied limits of their discretion. Administrators also blur the politics-administration distinction by formulating recommendation for legislation, by entering alliances with interest groups, and by withholding or giving only selected information to legislators. As early as 1930, Harold Lasswell, in *Psychopathology and Politics*, argued that the real significance of the dichotomy was that “the internal bureaucrat” who viewed his agency’s goals through “psychological spectacles” was able on the basis of his “hidden agenda” to exercise power which was informal, unseen, and greatly underestimated by doctrinaire proponents of the dichotomy.

POSDCORB

An acronym developed by Luther H. Gulick to describe managerial activities common to all organizations POSDCORB stands for planning, organization staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. In “Notes on the Theory of Organization” (the lead article in a volume Gulick edited in 1937 for the President’s Committee on Government Reorganization –called the Brownlow Committee after its chairman, Louis Brownlow), Gulick explained the seven basic function of executive. These are (1) *planning* – working out in broad outline those things that needs to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose of the organization; (2) *organizing* – establishing the formal structure of authority through which work is subdivided and defined; (3) *staffing* – recruiting and training a group of people to do the work, and maintaining favorable working conditions for them; (4) *directing* – making decisions and embodying them in general and specific orders and instructions, thus serving as leader of the enterprise; (5) *coordinating* – interrelating the various parts of the work of the organization; (6) *reporting* – informing those to whom the manager is responsible as to the progress of the work, by having the manager and his subordinates keep themselves informed by record keeping, research, and inspection; (7) *budgeting* – controlling the affairs of the organization through fiscal planning and accounting. POSDCORB was greatly influenced by the work of Henri Fayol (1841-1925), a French mining engineer and executive, and by Lyndall Urwick, a British consulting industrial engineer, who collaborated with Gulick in the preparation of *Papers on the Science of Administration* (1937).

Significance Gulick’s POSDCORB emphasis is more specific than Weber’s ideal types in a bureaucracy and more general than Taylor’s focus on organizational productivity. POSDCORB aimed at turning “principles” of administrative theory into administrative practice. Its primary concern is how organizations might actually be structured, and what the roles of their executives are. POSDCORB also describes staff activities that are supportive of organizational units not directly involved in the production of the services, or products that constitute the main functions of an agency. *Staff* activity may be contrasted with *line* activity, which refers to units directly engaged in producing the organization’s services or goods. Contemporary criticism of POSDCORB emphasizes that, as an analytical tool, it does not include all staff or executive functions carried on within a modern organization. Data processing and evaluation, for example, are two staff activities not included in POSDCORB. Some critics also charge that leadership is undervalued in Gulick’s scheme. In the context of the period when it emerged, however, POSDCORB made the classical tradition practical and gave easy-to-understand advice to novice administrators. Despite academic reservations about the inclusiveness of the concept, its continuing influence through government-sponsored training programs has been substantial. POSDCORB served as a convenient starting point for a generation of writers interested in dealing with different aspects of administration. They added to, subtracted from, and amended the acronym to meet their needs. POSDCORB was indeed a seminal idea.

Proverbs of Administration

The title of a 1946 article in the *Public Administration Review* authored by Herbert A. Simon. “The Proverbs of Administration” launched a major attack on Gulick’s POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) and its associated components. Simon believed them to be inconsistent, conflicting, and inapplicable to many of the administrative situations facing public managers. In a 1947 book, *Administrative Behavior*, Simon expanded on the “Proverbs” article in building a case against the premises of scientific management. He argued that the defect of the premises – that is, the principles or proverbs of

administration – is that “for almost every principle one can find an equally plausible and acceptable contradictory principle.” The proverbs or maxims Simon attacked are those which predicted increased administrative efficiency by (1) specialization; (2) arranging the group into a hierarchy of authority; (3) limiting the span of control; (4) grouping the workers, for purposes of control, according to (a) purpose, (b) process, (c) clientele, or (d) place. Each of these proverbs was demonstrated by Simon to be mutually contradictory. For example, he pointed out that the principle of narrow span of control is contradictory to the maxim that efficiency requires keeping the number of supervisory levels in an organization to a minimum. With devastating logic, Simon paired widely accepted principles and demonstrated that often implementing one would negate another.

Significance “The Proverbs of Administration” effectively discredited the classical school’s claim to scientific validity. Among the structuralists of the 1930s, best represented in Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick’s *Paper on the Science of Administration* (1937), there had been little doubt that their principles would stand the test of time. Indeed some of their principles do continue to influence how governmental agencies are organized. But Simon’s work, along with that of contemporaries and coauthors Donald Smithburg, Victor Thompson, James D. Thompson, and James G. March, set a new course for public administration following World War II. Having successfully questioned the premise that organizations can be laid out and administered in a fully rational way, Simon went on to build on the theoretical foundations of Chester I. Barnard and other advocates of a systems approach for examining the various facets of administrative behavior. The enduring significance of the proverbs episode in the history of American public administration is that it put organization theory and research on a firm scientific footing. Simon insisted that the methodology of logical positivism be followed rigorously, and must include (1) value neutrality; (2) logically derived operational hypotheses; and (3) controlled empirical testing of hypotheses. Logically convincing conclusions or generalizations extracted from simple observation are not enough.

Public Administration

Public Administration is the use of managerial, political and legal theories and processes to fulfill legislative, executive and judicial governmental mandates for the provision of regulatory and service functions for society as a whole or some segment of it.

Rosenbloom, David, and R. S. Kravchuk and R. M. Clerkin, Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector, 7th Edition, McGraw-Hill, Boston, 2009

Public Personnel Administration

Managing and developing policies for the body of persons in public employment. Public personnel administration (PPA) deals with “people problems” in the environment of public merit systems. Merit has not always been the environment of PPA, however, as the following analysis of the evolution of the field illustrates. Public administrationist Nicholas Henry divides the development of public personnel administration into six phases. Phase 1 (1789-1829) was the *Guardian Period*. This was the period of “government by gentlemen,” to use Leonard D. White’s term. President George Washington set the moral tone of the early federal bureaucracy by appointing men to office who were reputed to be persons of character as well as competence. Character was synonymous with merit, and merit from 1789 through 1829 meant a respected family background, a high degree of formal education, and substantial loyalty to the president. The public servant was a member of the establishment. Roughly 65 percent of the top-level federal appointees during the guardian period were drawn from the landed gentry, merchant, and professional classes, making the public service highly elitist in nature. Phase 2 (1829-1883) was the *Spoils Period*. Administrative historian Leonard D. White attributes the name of the period to a remark by United States Senator William L. Marcy of New York, who in 1832 commented that American politicians “see nothing wrong in the rule that in the victor belong the spoils of the enemy.” The rationale of the spoils system was that if presidents were to emerge from the class that earned its own living – as Andrew Jackson had emerged in 1829 – then politics had to be made to pay. This “democratization” of the public service meant that it became a system subject to bribes and graft. Appointive power was transferred from the gentry to political parties. Phase 3 (1883-1906) was the *Reform Period*. Reform of the spoils system was encouraged by two major developments in the year 1881: (1) the merger of thirteen state reform associations to form the National Civil Service Reform League; and (2) the assassination of President James A. Garfield by a dissatisfied office seeker. In 1883, Congress passed the Civil Service Act (Pendleton Act), which created a bipartisan Civil Service Commission (replaced in 1978 by the Office of Personnel Management and the Merit Systems Protection Board). The Civil Service Commission was charged with the duty of filling government positions by a process of open, competitive examination. In Phase 4, the *Scientific Management Period* (1906-1937), public administration in general and PPA in particular were decisively influenced by development in business administration. Business administration at that time was dominated by the time-motion, scientific management school represented by Frederick W. Taylor and Frank and Lillian Gilbreth. The ultimate value of this period was efficiency, which was compatible with the concepts and structure of the civil

service. During the reform period, efficiency had been associated with morality and lack of corruption and was “neutral.” Public personnel administration in the scientific management period that followed combined goodness, merit, morality, neutrality, efficiency, and science into one conceptual whole. Phase 5 (1937-1955) was the *Administrative Management Period*. The New Deal brought a new view of government into focus and into practice. Government should be active, aggressive, and positive in trying to solve public problems. *Management* became the new goal of public personnel administration. This view implied that there was something more to PPA than mere efficiency. People in public service were perceived as having a political as well as an administrative function the traditional politics-administration dichotomy was questioned, with “management” serving as something of a code word to express this new dimension of PPA. Phase 6 (1955-present) was the Professional Period. As a result of the work of the second Hoover Commission, whose report was issued in 1955, public personnel administration entered a new phase of professionalism. The report indicated a new awareness of professional education as a contributing factor to government effectiveness. Although the report represented the high-water mark of the administrative management period, it also viewed management itself as a profession. Administrative management was perceived as an area of research and learning that was needed for good government regardless of the specialization of an agency. Public personnel administration today continues this “professional” approach.

Significance Public personnel administration accurately reflects the growth and development of public administration. In some ways, PPA *is* public administration in that the main conceptual battles fought over the years—for example, the spoils system, the politics-administration dichotomy, efficiency in government, civil service laws and regulations, and the characteristics of professionalism—have all been developed to the point that there are now personnel directors in almost every agency of government. Rather than being staff appendages, these directors are a part of the centralized management of the agencies themselves. People, it has been generally recognized, are the key to effective government.

Representative Bureaucracy

A system in which public employees are seen as representative of various segments of the population rather than as neutral civil servants. Representative bureaucracy is based on the belief that the ratio of each minority at each employment level in a governmental agency should equal that group’s proportion in the general population. Representative bureaucracy is related to the concept of social equity in that it is based on the principle that in a true democracy, public service should reflect the racial, ethnic, and sex composition of government’s constituencies, so that responsive public policy can be made. It also embraces the principle that a bureaucracy exists not only to provide public service, but also to provide jobs and economic advancement for the public it serves. Public jobs are seen as right every group in society should share in equally. Representative bureaucracy is in conflict with the merit system, which emphasizes the hiring of people solely on the basis of objectively determined qualification, and it bears some resemblance to the patronage system. Proponents of representative bureaucracy insist that public employees under merit systems are not neutral people doing non-political tasks. They are policy makers using discretion in allocating public funds and deciding between and among competing interests. Classical political neutrality is seen as a sacrifice of the skills and assets an intentionally diverse group of public servants can bring to an agency. Furthermore, the merit system contains many considerations not really based on merit. Veterans preference points, for example, discriminate against women. The movement for increased representativeness in bureaucracy has accrued four major benefits: (1) increased minority and female employment increases the economic, social, and political status of those groups; (2) recipients of public services benefit because their group needs are better addressed; (3) bureaucracies benefit from increased responsiveness to minority problems and from having a more diverse staff; and (4) the entire democratic system benefits because the bureaucracy is a closer reflection of the population it serves.

Significance Representative bureaucracy is not a new concept in U.S. public administration. Concern for representatives in public employment was the rationale for the spoils system of President Andrew Jackson, and it’s reflected in the civil service reform movement of 1880s as well. The Pendleton Act of 1883 outlined a proportionate representation plan among the states for filling civil service positions in Washington, DC. The plan helped southern states gain representation they would not otherwise have had. The representativeness sought today is not geographical, however; it is aimed at affirmative action for minorities and women. In a number of major cities roughly half the population is black, and the overwhelming majority of victims of crimes are black as are the suspects. Yet the majority of police officers are white. Advocates of representative bureaucracy say a police force can deal more effectively with the public if it has roughly the same racial mix. Police officers are not seen as neutral public servants performing mechanical tasks, but as individuals who exercise discretion in their work and whose relationships with clientele groups are affected by their color. School teachers are also seen as public employees having a high degree of discretion in dealing with their “clients,” and whose race and sex affect relationships. Two frequently raised objections to representative bureaucracy are (1) it provides less technically competent public employees than merit systems provide; and (2) it discriminates in reverse.

Scientific Management (Taylorism)

The set of beliefs ascribed to Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915), a mechanical engineer who pioneered the scientific management movement in large U.S. organizations from 1885 to 1911. Taylorism is focused on the mechanistic characteristics of administration. With stopwatch and measuring tape, Taylor conducted precision studies of the physical movement of individual workers, demonstrating empirically that organizations could and should convert the management process to a system of scientific laws in which efficiency, standardization, and savings were the ultimate organizational goals. There was “one best way” to manage workers and “one best way” for workers to carry out their tasks. Otherwise, they would waste both time and motion. Taylorism this stressed high productivity and disciplined labor.

Significance Scientific management was one of the first efforts to analyze work methods systematically and to estimate management influence on productivity. Although it was abandoned as a comprehensive theory, scientific management provided measurable impact on the subsequent development of management and organizational theories. Scientific management has been criticized as incomplete because it failed to consider the human element in production, the importance of informal organizations, and the effect of organizational environment. With its obsession with efficiency and maximum productivity, it also failed to consider organizational goals and occasions when maximum productivity may not be desirable. Nevertheless, some organizations still operate on scientific management principles, and even those that do not often contain remnants of the Taylor system. For example, time and motion studies are still used by industrial engineers and by job analysts for training and appraisal purposes. Industrial psychologists sometimes use scientific management standards as part of employee selection criteria. Finally, scientific management had a direct impact on the establishment of public administration as an academic field. Early public administration theorists welcomed the idea of private sector scientific management because that meant *public* management might also be elevated to the status of a legitimate science. Among the public administrationists who were greatly influenced by Taylor’s work, and who used it as a springboard to launch new theories of their own, were Leonard White, Luther Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick. The “principles of administration” movement which became popular in the 1930s was directly related to the scientific management movement of the previous generation.

Simon, Herbert A. (1916 - 2001)

American administrative theorist and economist who dismissed the formal principles of administration as mere proverbs and called on public administrators to focus on behavioral issues, such as the decision to participate and the limits of administrative rationality. Simon is a multidiscipline scholar who holds the Richard King Mellon Chair in computer science and psychology at the Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh. He first ventured into public administration in 1938 with a pioneering study on measuring the results of government programs. Following World War II, he launched the behavioral revolution in public administration with his *Administrative Behavior*, published in 1947. The revolution had actually begun in 1946 with Simon’s iconoclastic piece in the *Public Administration Review* entitled “The Proverbs of Administration,” in which he pointed out the ambiguities and contradictions in the Gulic-Urwick principles stated a decade before. Simon methodically attacked each principle of classical schools’ synthesis. *Specialization* could be by place or by function, he said, and the principle of specialization does not help at all in choosing between the two. *Unity of command* is in conflict with the principle of specialization. Specialization asserts that confusion is reduced when tasks are accomplished by specialists. This leads automatically to a situation in which the specialists at the headquarters consult with the specialists in the field on matters of common concern without going through the official hierarchy. The result is a *dual* chain of command which promotes the advantages of the principle of specialization. It also violates the advantages of the principle of unity of command. *Span of control* conflicts with both the principle of specialization and the principle of unity of command. In a large, complex organization, whether the span of control is increased or decreased will, under certain circumstances, have either desirable or undesirable consequences. “What is the optimum point?” Simon asks. The principle also throws no light on the problem of whether an organization should be centralized or decentralized. *Organization, purpose, process, clientele, and place* each compete with the other as an organizing device. The one selected as the basis for establishing organization may be in conflict with one of the others. Public health administration, for example, might be organized on the basis of purpose, particular clientele served, or place located. Which organizing device would be most effective is not explained by the principle.

After Simon’s devastatingly effective attack on the proverbs or principles of administration, he suggested that organizations are primarily *processes* of decision making. To understand organizations it was necessary to understand the various elements and factors involved in making decisions. Decisions are made *in the mind*. Mental choices are decidedly limited because complete and absolute knowledge of all the data in a given situation is seldom available. This was Simon’s basic quarrel with the structuralists of the 1930s; that is, their underlying premise that organizations could be laid out and administered in a fully rational way. Every decision maker operates within a “bounded rationality,” he said, within unknowables, internal forces, and external developments that may be beyond

the control of management. That fact of life requires systems that are open, adaptable, and living in flux with their environments. Public administration's concern with the strictures imposed by bounded rationality should be at the point of decision making, since organizations are first and foremost decision-making networks. Their ability to generate and analyze information flows can compensate for bounded rationality, although limitations on knowledge can never be removed fully. Agencies must *satisfice* by accepting partial solutions rather than pursue illusory, perfect, or optimized solutions.

Significance Herbert Simon led an attack on the principles of administration that was logically successful but that had limited practical effect. POSDCORB may have been proverbial, but it was *useful* to administrators in a way that Simon's emphasis on administrative decision making was not. Ironically enough, since about 1960 Simon has moved more and more toward the position that a science of management may be possible after all. His position from the beginning was that it was impossible for managers to achieve a high degree of rationality in making decisions because the amount of information needed to evaluate was too great. That position was modified by the computer revolution. The computer, with its enormous capacity to process and organize information for managers, may give them the ability to make entirely rational decisions. Simon wrote not only about computers that prepare tax bills and payroll checks, speed up the design of roads and bridges by performing complex engineering calculations, and analyze the budget by breaking down the per-unit cost of operations. He also wrote about computers that can be programmed to think, innovate, and behave like managers. By 1973, Simon had solved the problem of bounded rationality by a cybernetic prescription of employee roles in formal and highly centralized organizations. Decisions were imposed by computer-output analyzing information coordinators. Human relations specialist Chris Argyris joined the computer issue with Simon at this point in the pages of the *Public Administration Review*, where a debate between Argyris and Simon took place during 1973. Argyris accused Simon of fomenting a rational-man theory, which would lead to more hierarchical, less humane organizations. He said Simon was a contemporary structuralist. Simon replied that Argyris suffered from a preoccupation with power. He accused Argyris of being against any kind of structure at all. Argyris replied that he was not against structure, but he was against management information systems which reduced the ability of administrators to use intuition. The extent to which Herbert Simon has become a rational-man theorist is indeed a matter of debate.

Smith, Adam 1723-1790)

A British economist and philosopher (1723-90), considered the founder of the CLASSICAL SCHOOL. He wrote one of the most famous books on economics of all time, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Smith was essentially concerned with how wealth is created but, unlike his predecessors, he argued that it arose not from a favorable trade balance (see MERCANTILISM) or from land (see PHYSIOCRATS) but from human labor. The division of labor, which renders production more efficient, increases wealth. Moreover, the more an economy is allowed to run itself, without government interference, the more wealth will be created. Smith believed that the satisfaction of individual self-interest, limited naturally by the self-interest of other individuals, will yield the greatest benefit for the greatest number. Hence he supported free, unregulated trade. Nevertheless, he recognized that some government interference is required to prevent injustice and oppression, to advance education, protect public health, and maintain those necessary enterprises that would not be established by private capital. Smith's ideas, welcomed particularly by the newly important industrialists of his time who chafed under the old mercantilist controls, had a strong influence on British economic policy for the next century or more. See also INVISIBLE HAND; VALUE, PARADOX OF.

Source: **Ammer, Christine and Dean S. Ammer, *Dictionary of Business and Economics*, The Free Press, Inc., New York, 1977. p. 428**

Socialism

1. Today, an economic doctrine often defined as a "middle way" between CAPITALISM and COMMUNISM and characterized by state ownership of the means of production, centralized economic planning, and the redistribution of income through taxation and social welfare programs. Under Western socialism, the state owns most of the critical industries—rails, coal mines, steel mills, etc.—but agriculture, services, and less critical manufacturing industries continue to be largely in the private sector. While socialism has manifested itself in many different forms and today exists to varying degrees in many countries (Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Australia, and New Zealand, among others), it tended to evolve gradually and peacefully by means of legislation and reform rather than by revolution or upheaval. In Great Britain it came about after World War II when the Labour Party came to power, beginning with the extension of social welfare programs and heavy taxation of income and estates and the NATIONALIZATION of the coal, electric power, and rail

industries. See also E. BERNSTEIN; BLANC: CHRISTAIN SOCIALISM; FABIAN SOCIALISM; GUILD SOCIALIS; UTOPIAN SOCIALISM; WELFARE STATE. For systems that contain elements of socialism even though they want to do away with the machinery of the state entirely, see ANARCHISM; MUTUALISM; SYNDICALISM.

2. In the mid-19th century, a term used for what is today generally called COMMUNISM (def. 1); in Marxist theory, the historical state of economic development following capitalism and preceding a classless society.

Source: Ammer, Christine and Dean S. Ammer, Dictionary of Business and Economics, The Free Press, Inc., New York, 1977. P. 429

Span of Control

The extent to which one person can extend his or her supervisory powers over other individuals or administrative units in an effective manner. The effectiveness of an administrator's span of control depends on many factors, including type of work, the personalities of the superior and of supervised individuals, the physical distance between supervisor and subordinates, and the staff and auxiliary help available to the supervisor.

Significance The importance of span of control as an administrative concept relates to the basic problem of efficient management in the public service. Most supervisors, including the president, the governors, big-city mayors, city managers, and department and agency heads are responsible for efficient supervision of what amounts in many cases to an unmanageable number of subordinates. Rather than reducing the number of individuals reporting to them, the president and most governors have sought help by strengthening their staff and auxiliary agencies. Although many presidents have come into office with the firm expectation of reducing their span of control to make it more effective, they have discovered that most agencies have powerful friends in Congress and among pressure groups that are opposed to change in the status of agencies. Although the figure is arbitrary, most management specialists advocate that not more than twenty units or individuals should report to and be supervised by a single executive. Many administrative reorganizations in national, state, and local governments are aimed at reducing the span of control for a chief executive or for top level administrators.

Strategic Planning

The process of making and implementing decisions concerning the use of resources to achieve an organization's goals and fulfill its mission. Strategic planning deals with the alternative uses of resources rather than the immediate control of how targeted resources are spent. It defines the structure of the organization and the basic nature of organizational services, products, and activities. Like long-range planning, strategic planning is future oriented. It does not deal with future decisions, however, but with the futurity of today's decisions. It allows for reaction to change or environmental factors, be they internal or external. Long-range planning suggests only the time frame for the strategic plan, which is normally five years.

Significance Strategic planning forces an organization to define its philosophy, mission, role, and goals. It is the responsibility of an organization's governing board to do such planning with the assistance of online management. Strategic planning is rooted in the need of an organization to stay in touch with those it seeks to serve, to assure that the services being provided are those that are needed.

Stress Management

A collection of skills that helps public managers maintain productivity and job satisfaction in the face of complex organizational and community pressures. Stress management's primary goal is to attain individual health and organizational well-being through applications from medicine, psychology, organization development, and public administration. Stress can be described as a body's response to change. It is a physical and chemical reaction to demands that are too high or too low. Too little stress results in low productivity. Too much stress also results in low productivity, with concomitant vulnerability to illness. Stress can be desirable and healthy when kept in balance with measured rates of change, hence the term *stress management*. The tools of stress management are (1) *medical*, which includes examinations, physical fitness programs, good eating habits, relaxation, and the individual's assumption of responsibility for personal health; (2) *psychological*, which includes employee counseling, alcohol and drug abuse programs, hot-lines, and crisis intervention; and (3) *organization development*, which includes seminars on what stress is and what causes it, how to recognize signs of extreme stress in co-workers and subordinates, what normal stress responses are, and how to assess stress-producing organization norms. Stress management identifies four major causes of job stress: (1) work overload and underload—too many demands with tight and competing deadlines, or too few demands so that depression results; (2) role ambiguity—lack of clarity

about what is expected by others; (3) role conflict—as when a co-worker, the boss, and a constituent have different but simultaneous demands on the individual; and (4) politics—person-to-person communication problems, intergroup conflict, conflicts of values or political views, and sexual harassment.

Significance Efforts to achieve stress management have resulted in organizational awareness that employees need different challenges as they progress through apprentice, specialist, and generalist stages of their work life. Stress management data indicate that 15 to 20 percent of the work force will experience a mid-life crisis shortly before or after age forty, when radical reassessment, depression, loss of drive, or impulsive job or lifestyle changes may occur. Organizations themselves also go through such life stages. When a crisis occurs, both individuals and organizations go through predictable periods of shock, denial, withdrawal, anger, resignation, and, finally, acceptance of the new circumstances. The public manager typically applies stress management skills when faced with events such as geographic relocation, change of administration, funding cutbacks, reorganization of priorities or work groups, strikes, and reductions in work force. The primary significance of stress management is that major changes and disruptions can be anticipated and their negative effects minimized by the individual. This can be achieved by (1) exercising daily; (2) eating regularly and moderately; (3) avoiding excessive drinking and drug taking; (4) doing things one enjoys; (5) taking time to relax; (6) thinking about what is really important; (7) thinking positively; (8) managing time; (9) setting goals; and (10) planning for the future. Stress management incorporates the notion of self-responsibility with skilled training in self-care, adaptive behavior change, and control over one's environment.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow (1856-1915)

An American mechanical engineer considered the father of scientific management, i.e., the science of discovering the most efficient method of performing any job. Taylor developed his philosophy of work while employed at the Midvale Steel Works in Philadelphia during the 1880s. The key to Taylor's system was his ability to discover scientifically the shortest possible time for performing any specific job. His tool was the stopwatch. Taylor would stand behind every worker in the machine shop at Midvale and record the time it took him or her to perform the most elementary motions: finding a steel rod, settling it on a lathe, picking up a tool. By studying a large number of workers, Taylor could identify the shortest possible time for performing each individual motion. By combining the best times, discarding useless motions, and adding in gaps for unavoidable delays and rest breaks, Taylor established a pattern of work that was invariably shorter than the workers' informal pace. By the time Taylor left Midvale in 1890, his time and motion studies had led to a complete reorganization of the firm: the centralization of planning and engineering, the centralization of purchasing and inventory control, the centralization of maintenance, the introduction of centralized cost accounting, and the development of assembly-line techniques on the job. Taylor attempted to introduce scientific management into public administration beginning in 1906, first in government arsenals and then in navy yards. When the workers at the Watertown, Massachusetts Arsenal heard that Taylor was coming, they went out on strike, the army placed a guard at the arsenal gates with fixed bayonets, and a special congressional investigation committee was formed. Louis Brandeis, Walter Lippmann, Georges Clemenceau, and V.I. Lenin all took Taylor's side. But Congress banned stopwatches in government-run factories, a law that remained on the books for forty years. Taylor has other failures, notably as general manager of a pulp-and-paper mill and as a consultant to the Bethlehem Steel Company, all for the same reasons. Workers resisted Taylor's system because it dehumanized them. They resisted despite the promise that their greater productivity would earn them more money. Despite his failures, however Taylor's principles of specialization were popularized by scholars such as Henri Ford and Luther Gulick and became a part of their classical synthesis. Taylor's main contributions were (1) *the division of work*, or the principle that work ought to be divided up so as to take maximum advantage of the specialized skills of the employees; and (2) *the principle of homogeneity*, also called unity of direction, which asserts that similar activities ought to be grouped together in the same unit under a single supervisor and a single plan. See also FAYOL, HENRI, 14; GULICK, LUTHER, 17; SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT, 22; TAYLORISM, 25.

Significance Frederick Winslow Taylor created a world of work which was scientific rather than spontaneous. He ventured into a philosophy of human control that contains the potential for tyranny. Taylor's view of the effective administrative state was one in which experts determined the one best way of working and standardized that method. The experts then controlled the worker through incentives and threats so as to maintain the central work standard. This made the study of work a science. The selection and training of workers was also a science. Scientific management took away from workers their ability to control the flow of work by elevating it to a science of administration run out of a central office. The worker became just another machine in the technology of progress. The extent to which Taylor's principles were applicable over time was called into question by the Hawthorne Studies commissioned by the National Academy of Science in 1924. But, for a generation, scientific management was as American as baseball.

The efficiency standard which Taylor helped establish has been roundly criticized by humanists who abhor the man-as-machine concept. It is easy, however, to forget two things about Taylor's Principles. One is that the

standard industrial system of Taylor's day paid workers by piecework, which meant workers who were more productive earned more for themselves as well as their employers. The other is the possibility that efficiency can serve humanism as well as any other value. Taylorism, however, continued to antagonize many workers and contributed to the growth of the labor union movement. The man-as-machine model is still very much a part of the federal government personnel administration practice. One example is the use of psychotechnology by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in its training of astronauts. The objective of NASA's use of psychotechnology is to integrate the astronaut with the technological environment of his or her space capsule or station, both mentally and physically, in order to reduce response time. Psychotechnology is essentially Taylor's work updated, but with the added element of psychoemotional as well as physical conditioning being practiced.

Taylorism

The set of beliefs ascribed to Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915), a mechanical engineer who pioneered the scientific management movement in large U.S. organizations from 1885 to 1911. Taylorism is focused on the mechanistic characteristics of administration. With stopwatch and measuring tape, Taylor conducted precision studies of the physical movements of individual workers, demonstrating empirically that organizations could and should convert the management process to a system of scientific laws in which efficiency, standardization, and savings were the ultimate organizational goals. There was "one best way" to manage workers and "one best way" for workers to carry out their tasks. Otherwise, they would waste both time and motion. Taylorism thus stressed high productivity and disciplined labor.

See also POLITICS-ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY, 70; SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT, 22.

Significance The development of Taylorism paralleled the rise of large public and private organizations in the United States and Europe. It transferred to human beings the established industrial criterion of proper mechanical functioning. Thus each worker was trained to perform those tasks for which he or she was best suited. This mechanistic view of human labor generated a deep reaction among humanists. Yet, its doctrine of efficiency and amorality simultaneously supported other current ideas about the splitting away of public administration as the "machinery of government," which should be "oiled properly" and "kept running smoothly," Taylorism downplayed notions of the public interest and the complex psychological drives of human beings. It encouraged a generation of scholars to consider bureaucratic organization and management efficiency as two of the main concerns of the field of public administration.

Unity of Command

A basic principle of personnel management that provides for clarity in the relationship between those who issue orders and those who are subject to obey orders. Unity of command, as practiced within a hierarchical personnel structure, means that no person is subject to orders from more than one superior. Most supervisory officials issue orders to those within the sphere of their jurisdiction and, at the same time, are responsible to those officials who are above them on the supervisory ladder.

Significance The typical military organization tends to maximize the principles of hierarchy and unity of command. In applying the principle of unity of command to civilian agencies, however, difficulties arise because of the great variety of tasks to be performed, and the undesirability of trying to foster the strict discipline that characterizes the military. In the federal service, unity of command has been encouraged by giving the President power to appoint and remove top level administrators and to hold all individuals serving in the executive branch accountable through the hierarchical structure. The principle is weakened, however, by the existence of various independent agencies and commissions, by the difficulties involved in trying to remove personnel, especially individuals hired under affirmative action programs and those with veterans' preference, and by the tendency for informal chains of command to develop within administrative units. Unity of command is applied even less to administrative units on the state and local levels, where elective officials often contest with each other and with appointive officials for decision-making power. Administrative experts generally support the unity of command principle and advocate policies that will help make it effective, such as integrating units that perform similar functions, establishing a hierarchy of power (from top to bottom) and accountability (from bottom to apex), and vesting authority for making decisions in a single individual.

Weber, Max (1864-1920)

German sociologist and intellectual father of the bureaucratic model of organization theory. Weber advanced a theory very similar to the classical model of Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick, although Weber reached his conclusions by a different route. Weber was a contemporary of Fayol, Gulick, and Urwick, as well as Woodrow Wilson and Frederick Taylor, but his views did not become widely known in the United States until 1946 and 1947,

when translations of his work by H. H. Gerth, C. Wright Mills (*From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*), A. M. Henderson, and Talcott Parsons (*The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*) appeared. Weber focused an important part of his work on why people feel an obligation to obey commands without assessing their own attitudes about the value of each command. This focus was part of Weber's emphasis on the organization of society as a whole and the role of the state in particular. He wanted to understand the relationship between power—the ability to make people do what they do not ordinarily do—and authority. Weber described authority as *legitimate* power. He said that a subordinate's belief in legitimacy produces a stable pattern of obedience and deference to the source of command in the organizational system. Authority cannot depend on appeals to a subordinate's purely material interests and a calculation of personal advantage, or on affectional motives such as liking or admiration of the superior. Neither can authority depend on ideal motives.

Weber developed three “pure” types of legitimate authority as discussed by James W. Fesler in *Public Administration: theory and Practice* (1980). (1) Traditional authority claims legitimacy on the basis of control patterns that have been handed down from the past and that, presumably, always existed. The immemorial traditions are sacred. Legitimacy is closely related to a citizen's felt obligation of personal loyalty to the individual who has attained chiefship in the traditional way. Change is inhibited by precedent. Those exercising authority are afraid to stretch the traditional ways of doing things because the ensuing change might undercut their own source of legitimacy. Whim is allowed in traditional authority systems, because there is an intensely personal relationship between the rulers and the ruled. If the traditional ruler oversteps the loose, traditional bounds of arbitrariness, however, he or she personally may be deposed; but a successor would be chosen by traditional means, and the system of authority would continue. (2) Charismatic authority rests on personal devotion to an individual because of the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of that person. The position a charismatic leader occupies in society is not sanctified by traditional criteria. The charismatic person is not bound by traditional rules and is capable of sparking revolutionary changes. Charismatic authority does not accept any system of rules for organizing society. There is no law, no hierarchy, no formalism except the basic demand of devotion to the charismatic figure. His or her followers are duty-bound to follow the leader's commands, which are supposed to lead to accomplishment of his or her mission. The followers obey because of personal devotion, not because rules force them to obey. The leader intervenes whenever and wherever he or she feels like it, unbound by tradition or law. Charismatic authority is opposed to regularized routines. Both traditional and charismatic authority may legitimately be exercised arbitrarily or by revelation and inspiration. Both types of authority therefore lack rationality. *Weber believed they were responsible for almost all organized action in the world before the Industrial Revolution.* The early modern period demanded the establishment of social organization on a stable basis, but one which was still open to change. (3) *Legal-rational* authority is based on a “legally established impersonal order.” Obedience is due “the persons exercising the authority of office under it only by virtue of the formal legality of their commands and only within the scope of authority of the office.” The legal-rational system of authority is based on rules—rules rationally developed by people. Such rules can be intentionally changed to cope with changes in the environment in a systematic, more highly predictable way than is possible under either traditional or charismatic authority. The quintessence of legal-rational authority is bureaucracy. The heart of bureaucracy is the system of authority relations defined by rationally developed rules.

Significance Max Weber was one of the most influential figures in modern intellectual history. His ideas on legal-rational authority closely parallel the principles of classical organization theory as developed in the United States. Both emphasized efficiency. Both emphasized administrative regulations establishing fixed and official jurisdictional areas of responsibility as part of a systematic division of labor. Both emphasized the authority to give the commands required for the discharge of duties assigned. Both emphasized principles of office hierarchy and levels of graded authority in a firmly ordered system of superior and subordinate. Both emphasized that a rational bureaucracy should be composed of officials who were full-time, salaried, appointed careerists, with thorough and expert training for the career who were selected on the basis of technical qualifications. Both insisted that the human beings who constitute “the bureaucratic machine” should be stripped of their human differences. Given these and other similarities, it is an oddity in administrative history that classical organization theory has been scathingly attacked, while Weber's bureaucratic organization theory continues to command profound respect in widely diverse intellectual circles. It is not as though Weberian theory does not have its weaknesses. One weakness is the unacknowledged conflict between the hierarchic authority Weber emphasizes and the specialized, professional knowledge and technical competence he also recognizes. Weber fails to note that this technical knowledge gives “authority” to subordinates having such specialized knowledge and competence. Another weakness of Weber's theory is the uneasy relationship between bureaucratization and modernization in developing societies. The Chinese critique of bureaucratic forms of organization is a powerful one, based on objections to the Weberian emphasis on technical competence and on a strong Maoist affirmation of political purity. During the Great Leap and the Cultural Revolution periods of Maoist history, the Chinese press was full of examples of highly trained specialists who could not solve the simplest work problems, and of unskilled personnel who, using common sense and political inspiration, were able to come up with vital work innovations. “Specialists in command” was a

slogan that came to signify an ideological position in China strangely related to, but very unlike, the Weberian bureaucratic model. A statement much easier to understand was Mao Tse-tung's exhortation in 1933: "This great evil, bureaucracy, must be thrown into the cesspool." Throughout his career, Mao held a sharply critical view of bureaucracy and bureaucrats. For a profound discussion of Weber's theoretical weaknesses, the reader should consult Martin King Whyte's "Bureaucracy and Modernization in China: The Maoist Critique" in the *American Sociological Review*, April 1973.

White, Leonard D. (1891-1958)

American Administrative theorist, historian, author, reformer, and sometime Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, Leonard D. White was a political scientist and historian at the University of Chicago who published the first text in public administration, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, in 1926. Some believe this work spawned public administration as a separate field of study. Like Henry Fayol, White believed that public administration had universal applicability and principles that pertained to a variety of organizations. The assumption underlying White's pioneering text was that public administration was not based in the law or the court system but in management. Unlike other management texts, however, White's work emphasized personnel administration. White's corollary belief that political science was also foundational for public administration was illustrated in his famous administrative histories, *The Federalists* (1948), *The Jeffersonians* (1951), *The Jacksonians* (1954), and *The Republican Era* (1958). White was deeply affected by the reform movement in public administration and was himself an ardent advocate of it. He devoted himself to the personnel issues which had emerged as part of the reform agenda: recruitment, dismissal, standardization of salaries, personnel evaluation, promotion, morale, and retirement. In the late 1920's White conducted the first study of public opinion about public employees. He sent out questionnaires to people of different occupations and social status, discovering a widespread negative opinion of public administrators. Federal employment had greater prestige than state and municipal employment, but two-thirds of the respondents regarded private employment more favorably than public employment. Private sector employees were judged to be more trustworthy, polite, and competent than their counterparts in public service, findings which were verified by Brookings Institution studies in 1964. White influenced the creation of the Junior Civil Service Examination in 1934 as a vehicle for establishing a formal system of recruitment for public administration generalists who could develop expertise in specific areas of public service. The examination paved the way for later improvements in the overall system of securing adequate manpower for the federal service. See also FAYOL, HENRI; PUBLIC PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION; WILSON, WOODROW.

Significance Leonard D. White was one of the architects of American public administration. His *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* competes only with Woodrow Wilson's 1887 essay, "The Study of Administration," and the writings of Frank J. Goodnow as the work most responsible for the beginning of public administration central to the field, although later texts gave budgetary matters equal emphasis. As White published his histories, public administrationists came to respect and value historical study in a new way. Previously, historians had focused only on specific institutions rather than on public administration *per se*. White's interest in reform also led him to do pioneering work in the areas of public opinion, prestige, and morale. White was greatly influenced by Max Weber's use of the term *prestige* and was one of the first theorists to apply the word to public administration. He believed the morale of public administrators is directly related to their prestige. Favorable public opinion enables administrators to have increased public support and compliance, which turn increases job efficacy and morale.

Wilson, Woodrow (1856-1924)

American educator, historian, public administrator, and twenty-eighth president of the United States. Wilson is widely credited with being the first American scholar to advocate the systematic study of the operations of government. As a political science professor, he wrote a famous essay in 1887 entitled "The Study of Administration," which marked the beginning of American academic interest in professional public administration. Wilson's essay reflected the values of the progressive movement which four years earlier had gained passage of the civil service act and which was pressing to reform the management of American government at every level. Typical of these powerful citizen associations were the Civil Service Reform League, of which Wilson later became president, and the New York Bureau of Municipal Research which was founded in 1906. The reformers were motivated by a sense of outrage against the corruption of the spoils system and by the belief that they could never bring "efficiency and economy" to government so long as the vagaries of party politics interfered with governmental management. Public administration could be made scientific only if administrators were free to concentrate on the execution of policy after the legislature and chief executive defined it. Both politics and policy making were therefore to be taken out of public administration. According to James W. Fesler in *Public Administration, Theory and Practice* (1980) Wilson stepped boldly into this movement with advice for both reformers and scholars. He asked them to forget their "paper pictures" of good government and study how administration really worked. The

French and the Prussians, Wilson pointed out, had developed the most advanced administrative systems in the world and Americans should study them to learn how to manage public programs. Wilson took exception to his colleagues in jurisprudence and politics who were concerned with the great constitutional issues, such as the separation of powers. Such debate was largely irrelevant to the reforms needed in public administration. Wilson established four guiding assumptions to chart a course for the immediate future in the study and practice of public administration: (1) the science of administration should be based on a single organizational prototype universally applicable to all political regimes; (2) any good science of administration must divorce itself from the field of politics; (3) the guiding value of the science of administration is efficiency; and (4) efficient public administration requires a single dominant center of governmental power. Despite public administration's later discomfort with Wilson's paradigm, and Herbert Simon's blistering attack on it, the paradigm remained for many years in the mainstream of academic public administration. Simon tried to demonstrate that the basic principles of administration, being imprecise, would produce *inefficiency*. But he was unsuccessful in his attack because he failed to erect any alternative model in the place of Wilsonian orthodoxy. Simon suggested that scholars study administrative decisions, but the idea never caught on.

Significance Woodrow Wilson's influence on the development of American public administration—its theory, study and practice—can hardly be overestimated. Yet his analysis of the universal elements of public administration—those independent of time, place, and political system—contained a central and profound contradiction. Basic to much of Wilson's thought was his perception of administration as a neutral instrument, distinct from policy, politics, and particular regimes. Such a perception seems essential to define a distinct field of study, separate from the study of policy and politics. It was a critical assumption for Wilson's thesis that nowhere in the whole field of politics can the historical, comparative method be used more safely than in administration. Wilson firmly believed that Americans, therefore, could learn administration from the Prussian and French (Napoleonic) autocracies without being infected by their political principles. Wilson advanced two themes contradictory to this line of argument. One was that administration must be fitted to a particular nation's political ideas and constitutional system. The science of administration, Wilson opined, has been adapted to the needs of a compact state, and to centralized forms of government. We must Americanize it. The second contradictory theme blurs the distinction Wilson made elsewhere between policy and administration. Wilson therefore pleaded for the vesting of large powers and unhampered discretion as the indispensable conditions of administrative responsibility. This is hardly the limited role for public administrators Wilson insisted on earlier. These contradictions in the thought of Wilson do not detract substantially from his achievement, however. They illustrate the varied positions that together form the whole truth about public administration. Modern scholars still debate the extent to which Woodrow Wilson was ambivalent about what public administration really is, but none dispute the impact of his one unambiguous thesis – the public administration is worth studying.

Zero-base Budgeting (ZBB)

A system of budgeting that requires all spending for a program or an agency to be justified anew each year. ZBB was developed at the Texas Instruments Company in 1969 and was first adopted in government by Governor Jimmy Carter in preparation of the fiscal 1973 budget of Georgia. It challenges the principle of incrementalism in budgeting, which assumes that next year's budget will begin at or near the funding level of the current year's budget. ZBB questions the *need* for a program at *any* funding level. Its three basic operational elements are (1) identifying *decision units*; (2) analyzing *decision packages*, each reflecting a different level of effort for carrying out the work in the decision unit; and (3) *ranking* of decision packages, in descending order of importance.

Significance Zero-base budgeting provides a means for eliminating or reducing low-priority programs. The ZBB may be used to shift resources within an agency to high-impact programs that might not otherwise receive funding increases, or it may be applied to seeking to achieve a balanced budget. The national government first became involved with the ZBB approach in 1977 when, in a letter to department and agency heads, President Jimmy Carter ordered the adoption of zero-base budgeting throughout the executive branch. The estimates for fiscal 1979 incorporated ZBB into the budget preparation process. The Government Economy and Spending Reform Act of 1976 requires a congressional zero-base review and evaluation of government authorization for programs and activities every five years. Both executive and congressional review address two questions: (1) Are the current activities efficient and effective? (2) Should current activities be eliminated or reduced to fund new, higher priority programs or to reduce the current budget?