STUDYDADDY

Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor

Get Help

CHAPTER TEN

UNDERSTANDING PEOPLE IN PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS

Values, Incentives, and Work-Related Attitudes

The internal and external impetuses that arouse and direct effort—the needs, motives, and values that push us and the incentives, goals, and objectives that pull us—obviously play major roles in motivation. Every theory of work motivation discussed in Chapter Nine includes such factors in some way. Classic debates have raged, however, over what to call them; what the most important needs, values, goals, and incentives are; and what roles they play. These debates raise serious challenges for both managers and researchers. This chapter discusses these topics, and also describes important work-related attitudes, such as job satisfaction, that OB researchers have developed. These work attitudes provide valuable insights that help us to analyze and understand the experiences that people have in their work. All these topics are related to work motivation, but differ from it in important ways. They are covered here separately not only because they are distinct from motivation and motivation theory, but also because discussing all these topics together would make for a very long chapter!

For a long time, the concepts of values, motives, and incentives have been prominent in the theory and practice of management, including public management. If anything, they have become even more prominent in recent years. Studies of leadership, change, and organizational culture—topics covered in later chapters—have increasingly emphasized the importance of shared values in organizations. Writers and consultants exhort leaders to learn to understand the values of the members of their work groups and organizations, and the incentives that will motivate them. DiIulio (1994) showed how particularly important this can be in public organizations by describing how members of the Bureau of Prisons display a strong incentive to serve the organization's values and mission, in part because some of the bureau's long-term leaders have effectively promoted those values. Goodsell (2010) describes the motivating effects of the missions of government organizations that appeal to the values and motives of the members of those organizations.

As described in Chapter Nine, people in all types of organizations, including government organizations at all levels of government and in many different nations, have responded to surveys that ask about their work attitudes and the value they place on various rewards or incentives. In 2005, a consortium of researchers administered the International Social Survey Program in many nations in Asia, Europe, and North America. The survey asked numerous questions about the respondents' lives, including about their work. These included questions about how important to them were each of a list of work rewards, and about the rewards that attracted them to their jobs. Two of the questions asked whether the respondent regarded his or her work as providing the ability to help others, and whether it was useful to society. Additional questions asked the respondent to rate the importance she or he attached to having a job that helps others and that is useful to society. On such questions, respondents in twenty-nine out of thirty nations were higher in agreement, to a statistically significant degree, than respondents who worked in the private sector. The public sector respondents also rated work that is useful to society and helpful to others as more important to them, as compared to the private sector respondents. Very consistently across the nations, people who worked for government were more likely to say that they consider it important to have work that helps others and benefits society and that they felt that their work does benefit society and help others (Stritch, Bullock, and Rainey, 2013).

Exactly what these responses mean, and how important they are as influences on the respondents' work behaviors, is not entirely clear. Yet remember the "generic" view of organizations that Chapters One and Two discussed, that assumes or contends that there are no important differences between public and private organizations? If that is so, how do we get such internationally consistent responses from people that appear to contradict that generic perspective in important ways? More generally, the example of this survey illustrates the challenges practicing managers and researchers face in analyzing and understanding the needs, values, and motives of people in organizations.

How can managers and scholars understand values, motives, incentives, and related concepts? This chapter approaches the problem by reviewing many of the efforts to specify and define important needs, values, motives, and incentives. This review provides a complex array of approaches to the problem, but it also gives a lot of examples and suggestions from which managers can draw.

Motivation theorists use the terms we have been using—such as *need, value, motive, incentive, objective,* and *goal*—in overlapping ways. We can, however, suggest definitions for them.

- A need is a resource or condition required for the well-being of an individual.
- A motive is a force acting within an individual that causes him or her to seek to obtain or avoid some external object or condition.
- An incentive is an external object or condition that evokes behaviors aimed at attaining or avoiding it.
- A goal is a future state that one strives to achieve, and an objective is a more specific, short-term goal, a step toward a more general, long-term goal.
- Rokeach (1973), an authority on human values, offered an often-quoted definition of a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (p. 5).

Many people would disagree with these definitions and switch some of them around. The challenge for public managers, however, is to develop a sense of the range of needs, values, motives, incentives, and goals that influence employees. The research on motivation tells us to expect no simple list, because these factors always occur in complex sets and interrelationships. The next section provides a description of some of the most prominent conceptions of these topics.

Attempts to Specify Needs, Values, and Incentives

Tables 10.1 and 10.2 present some of the prominent lists and typologies of needs, motives, values, and incentives. These lists illustrate the diversity among theorists and provide some of the most useful enumerations of these topics ever developed. Murray's typology of human needs (1938), for example, provided one of the more elaborate inventories of needs ever attempted, but even so, it failed to exhaust all possible ways of expressing

TABLE 10.1. THE COMPLEXITY OF HUMAN NEEDS AND VALUES

Murray's List of Basic Needs (1938)	Maslow's Need Hierarchy (1954)	Alderfer's ERG Model (1972)	Rokeach's Value Survey (1973): Terminal Values	Rokeach's Value Survey (1973): Instrumental Values
Abasement	Self-actualization needs	Growth needs	A comfortable (prosperous) life	Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)
Achievement	Esteem needs	Relatedness needs	An exciting (stimulating, active) life	Broad-minded (open-minded)
Affiliation	Belongingness/ social needs	Existence needs	A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)	Capable (competent, effective)
Aggression	Safety needs		A world at peace (free of war and conflict)	Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
Autonomy	Physiological needs		A world of beauty (of nature and the arts)	Clean (neat, tidy)
Counteraction			Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	Courageous (standing up for one's beliefs)
Defendance			Family security (taking care of loved ones)	Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
Deference			Freedom (independence, free choice)	Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
Dominance			Happiness (contentedness)	Honest (sincere, truthful)
Exhibition			Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)	Imaginative (daring, creative)
Harm avoidance			Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
Nurturance			National security (protection from attack)	Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
Order			Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	Logical (consistent, rational)
Play			Salvation (eternal life)	Loving (affectionate, tender)
Rejection			Self-respect (self-esteem)	Obedient (dutiful, respectful)
Sentience			Social recognition (respect, admiration)	Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
Sex			True friendship (close companionship)	Responsible (dependable, reliable)
Succorance			Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)	Self-controlled (restrained, *self-disciplined*)
Understanding				

TABLE 10.2. TYPES OF INCENTIVES

Incentive Type	Definitions and Examples
Barnard (1938)	
Specific Incentives	*Incentives "Specifically Offered to an Individual"*
Material inducements	Money, things, physical conditions
Personal, nonmaterialistic inducements	Distinction, prestige, personal power, dominating position
Desirable physical conditions of work	
Ideal benefactions	"Satisfaction of ideals about nonmaterial, future or altruistic relations" (pride of workmanship, sense of adequacy, altruistic service for family or others, loyalty to organization, esthetic and religious feeling, satisfaction of hate and revenge)
General Incentives	*Incentives That "Cannot Be Specifically Offered to an Individual"*
Associational attractiveness	Social compatibility, freedom from hostility due to racial or religious differences
Customary working conditions	Conformity to habitual practices, avoidance of strange methods and conditions
Opportunity for feeling of enlarged participation in course of events	Association with large, useful, effective organization
Condition of communion	Personal comfort in social relations
Simon (1948)	
Incentives for employee participation	Salary or wage, status and prestige, relations with working group, promotion opportunities
Incentives for elites or controlling groups	Prestige and power
Clark and Wilson (1961) and Wilson (1973)	
Material Incentives	*Tangible rewards that can be easily priced (wages and salaries, fringe benefits, tax reductions, changes in tariff levels, improvement in property values, discounts, services, gifts)*

(continued)

TABLE 10.2. TYPES OF INCENTIVES (*Continued*)

Incentive Type	Definitions and Examples
Solidary Incentives	*Intangible incentives without monetary value and not easily translated into one, deriving primarily from the act of associating*
Specific solidary incentives	Incentives that can be given to or withheld from a specific individual (offices, honors, deference)
Collective solidary incentives	Rewards created by act of associating and enjoyed by all members if enjoyed at all (fun, conviviality, sense of membership or exclusive-collective status or esteem)
Purposive incentives	Intangible rewards that derive from satisfaction of contributing to worthwhile cause (enactment of a law, elimination of government corruption)
Downs (1967)	
General "motives or goals" of officials	Power (within or outside bureau), money income, prestige, convenience, security, personal loyalty to work group or organization, desire to serve public interest, commitment to a specific program of action
Niskanen (1971)	
Variables that may enter the bureaucrat's utility function	Salary, perquisites of the office, public reputation, power, patronage, output of the bureau, ease of making changes, ease of managing the bureau, increased budget
Lawler (1971)	
Extrinsic rewards	Rewards extrinsic to the individual, part of the job situation, given by others
Intrinsic rewards	Rewards intrinsic to the individual and stemming directly from job performance itself, which satisfy higher-order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization (feelings of accomplishment and of using and developing one's skills and abilities)

Incentive Type	Definitions and Examples
Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957)	
Job "factors" or aspects, rated in importance by large sample of employees	In order of average rated importance: security, interest, opportunity for advancement, company and management, intrinsic aspects of job, wages, supervision, social aspects, working conditions, communication, hours, ease, benefits
Locke (1969)	
External incentive	An event or object external to the individual which can incite action (money, knowledge of score, time limits, participation, competition, praise and reproof, verbal reinforcement, instructions)

human needs and motives. Maslow's needs hierarchy (1954), described in Chapters Two and Nine, proposed five categories of needs, arranged in a "hierarchy of prepotency" from the most basic physiological needs through safety needs, social needs, and self-esteem needs, and up to the highest level, the self-actualization needs.

Researchers trying to determine whether individuals rank their needs as the theory predicts have found that Maslow's five-level hierarchy does not hold. Instead, the evidence points to a two-step hierarchy: lower-level employees show more concern with material and security rewards, while higher-level employees place more emphasis on achievement and challenge (Pinder, 2008). Analyzing the results of a large survey of federal employees, Crewson (1995b) found this kind of difference between the employees at lower General Schedule (GS) salary levels (GS 1–8) and the highest GS levels (GS 16 and above). He found that respondents at the lower salary levels rated job security and pay as the most important job factors, while executive-level employees gave the highest rating to the importance of public service and to having an impact on public affairs. The executive-level employees also gave their lowest ratings to job security and pay. This suggests that the self-actualization motives among public sector executives focus on public service, a point to which we will return later.

Alderfer's typology of existence, relatedness, and growth needs (1972) provided still another example of an effort to specify basic human needs. On the basis of empirical research, Alderfer reduced Maslow's categories to this more parsimonious set.

As Crewson's analysis shows, this distinction between higher- and lower-order motives holds in public organizations. Other surveys have also shown that lower-level public employees attach more importance to job security and benefits than public managers and executives, who say they consider these factors less important than accomplishment and challenging work. Managers coming into government often say they are attracted by the opportunity to provide a public service and to influence significant events. At the same time, as discussed shortly, prominent motivation theorists argue that employees at all levels can be motivated by higher-order motives and should be treated accordingly.

Human values are also basic components of motivation. Rokeach (1973) developed two corresponding lists of values—instrumental values and terminal values (see Table 10.1)—and designed questionnaires to assess people's commitment to them. Sikula (1973a, 1973b) compared government and business executives using the Rokeach instrument, compiling responses from managers in twelve occupational groups. Six of the groups consisted of managers from industry, education, and government, including fifty-four executives in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW, now the Department of Health and Human Services). The other six groups consisted of people in nonmanagerial roles. The value profile of the HEW executives was generally similar to that of the other managerial groups, whose members all placed a higher priority on values related to competence (being wise, logical, and intellectual) and initiative (imagination, courage, sense of accomplishment) than the members of the other groups. Among the six managerial groups, the HEW executives placed the highest priority on being responsible, honest, helpful, and capable. They also gave higher ratings than any other group to the terminal values of equality, mature love, and self-respect, and they were lower than the other groups on the terminal values of happiness, pleasure, and a comfortable life. Sikula's limited sample leaves questions about whether the findings apply to all public managers. Yet the emphasis on service (helpfulness) and integrity and the de-emphasis on comfort and pleasure conform with other findings about public managers described later in this chapter and in the next one.

Researchers continue to use the Rokeach concepts and methods to study values among people in government and the nonprofit sector. Simon and Wang (2002), for example, used this approach to assess value changes over time in Americorps volunteers. Among other changes, they found increases in the ratings of freedom and equality among the volunteers after their service, compared with their expressed values prior to their service.

Incentives in Organizations

Other researchers have analyzed incentives in organizations as a fundamental aspect of organized human activity. As described in Chapter Two, some very prominent theories about organizations have depicted them as "economies of incentives." Organizational leaders must constantly maintain a flow of resources into their organization to cover the incentives that must be paid out to induce people to contribute to the organization (Barnard, 1938; March and Simon, 1958; Simon, 1948). In analyzing these processes, these theorists developed the typologies of incentives outlined in Table 10.2, which provides about as thorough an inventory as anyone has produced (although Barnard used some very awkward terms). The typologies reflect the development across the twentieth century of an increasing emphasis in management theory on incentives besides material ones, such as personal growth and interest and pride in one's work and one's organization. Barnard, March, and Simon implied that all executives, in both public and private organizations, face these challenges of attaining resources and providing incentives.

Clark and Wilson (1961) and Wilson (1973) followed this lead in developing a typology of organizations based on the primary incentive offered to participants—*material, solidary* (defined as "involving community responsibilities or interests"), or *purposive* (see Table 10.2). Differences in primary incentives force differences in leadership behaviors and organizational processes. Leaders in solidary organizations, such as voluntary service associations, face more pressure than leaders in other organizations to develop worthy service projects to induce volunteers to participate. Leaders in purposive organizations, such as reform and social protest organizations, must show accomplishments in relation to the organization's goals, such as passage of reform legislation.

Subsequent research on this typology of primary organizational incentives has concentrated on why people join political parties and groups; it has not specifically addressed public agencies. The concept of purposive incentives has great relevance for government, however. For many public managers, a sense of valuable social purpose can serve as a source of motivation. In addition to the Crewson (1995b, 1997), DiIulio (1994), and Goodsell (2010) examples described earlier, large surveys of federal employees have found that high percentages of them agree that the opportunity to have an impact on public affairs provides a good reason to join and stay in government service, especially at higher managerial and professional levels, and especially in certain agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency.

Extrinsic and Intrinsic Incentives. The distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic incentives described in Table 10.2 figures importantly in research and practice related to motivation in organizations. Since the days of Frederick Taylor's pay-them-by-the-shovelful approach to rewarding workers (see Chapter Two), management experts have increasingly emphasized the importance of intrinsic incentives in work.

The "Most Important" Incentives. The variety of incentives presented in Table 10.2 shows why we can expect no conclusive rank-ordered list of the most important needs, values, and incentives of organizational members. There are too many ways of expressing these incentives, and employees' preferences vary according to many factors, such as age, occupation, and organizational level. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) compiled the importance ratings shown in Table 10.2 from sixteen studies covering eleven thousand employees. Other studies have come to different conclusions, however. Lawler (1971), for example, disagreed with the Herzberg ratings, indicating that a wider review of research suggested that people rate pay much higher (averaging about third in importance in most studies). He argued that management scholars have often underestimated the importance of pay because they object to managerial approaches that rely excessively on pay as a motivator. He pointed out that pay often serves as a proxy for other incentives, because it can indicate achievement, recognition by one's organization, and other valued outcomes. Pay can serve as an effective motivating incentive in organizations, if pay systems are designed strategically (Lawler, 1990).

Anyone interested in public management and public organizations should be aware of theories and research results about the importance of certain motives and incentives in public organizations. Downs (1967) and Niskanen (1971), two economists who developed theories about public bureaucracies, proposed the inventories of public managers' motives listed in Table 10.2. They made the point that for public managers, political

power, serving the public interest, and serving a particular government bureau or program become important potential motives.

Downs developed a typology of public administrators on the basis of such motives. Some administrators, he argued, pursue their own self-interest. Some of these people are climbers, who seek to rise to higher, more influential positions. Conservers seek to defend their current positions and resources. Other administrative officials have mixed motives, combining concern with their own self-interest with concerns for larger values, such as public policies and the public interest. They fall into three groups of managers who pursue increasingly broad conceptions of the public interest. Zealots seek to advance a specific policy or program. Advocates promote and defend an agency or a more comprehensive policy domain. Statesmen pursue a more general public interest. As public agencies grow larger and older, they fill up with conservers and become rigid (because the climbers and zealots leave for other opportunities or turn into conservers). Among the mixed-motive officials, few can maintain the role of statesmen, and most become advocates. In the absence of economic markets for outputs, the administrators must obtain resources through budget allocation, and they have to develop constituencies and political supports for their agency. This pushes them toward the advocate role and discourages statesmanship.

For years, Downs's book (1967) was a widely cited work on government bureaucracy, but researchers have seldom tested his theory in empirical studies. Its accuracy remains uncertain, then, but it does make the important point that public managers' commitments to their agencies, programs, and the public interest become important motives for them. They also face difficult decisions about the relative importance of these motives and the relationships among them.

Niskanen (1971) also was interested in how bureaucrats "maximize utility," as economists put it. He theorized that, in the absence of economic markets, bureaucrats pursuing any of the incentives listed in Table 10.2 do so by trying to obtain larger budgets. Even those motivated primarily by public service and altruism have the incentive to ask for more staff and resources and hence larger budgets. Government bureaucracies therefore tend to grow inefficiently. Public managers clearly do defend their budgets and usually try to increase them. Yet many exceptions occur, such as when agency budgets increase because of legislative adjustments to formulas and entitlements that agency administrators have not requested. Some agencies also initiate their own cuts in funding or personnel or accept such reductions fairly readily (Golden, 2000; Rubin, 1985). In the 1980s, the Social Security Administration launched a project to reduce its workforce by seventeen thousand, about 21 percent of its staff (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1986). As part of the National Performance Review, the major federal government reform initiative during the Clinton administration, federal agencies eliminated over 324,000 jobs in the federal civilian workforce (Thompson, 2000). For reasons such as this, Niskanen's more recent work focused on discretionary budgets—those parts of the organizational budget over which administrators have some discretion (see Blais and Dion, 1991). An increasing body of research finds mixed support for many of Niskanen's basic assumptions about the motives and capacities of bureaucrats to engage in budget maximizing (Bendor and Moe, 1985; Blais and Dion, 1991; Dolan, 2002).

Both of these theories reflect some theorists' tendency to argue that public bureaucracies incline toward dysfunction because of the absence of economic markets for their outputs (see, for example, Barton, 1980; Tullock, 1965). The theories may accurately depict problems to which public organizations are prone. Later chapters discuss the ongoing controversy over the performance of public organizations and point out that in fact they often perform very well.

Attitudes Toward Money, Security and Benefits, and Challenging Work. Government does not offer the large financial gains that some people make in business, although civil service systems have traditionally offered job security and well-developed benefits programs. One might expect these differences to be reflected in public employees' attitudes about such incentives. We have increasing evidence that they do. Numerous surveys have found that government employees place less value than employees in business on money as an ultimate goal in work and in life (Houston, 2000; Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown, 1998; Karl and Sutton, 1998; Khojasteh, 1993; Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings, 1964; Lawler, 1971; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Rainey, 1983; Rawls, Ullrich, and Nelson, 1975; Siegel, 1983; Wittmer, 1991). Some studies have found no difference between public and private employees in the value they attach to pay (Gabris and Simo, 1995). Such variations in research results probably reflect the way such attitudes vary by time period, organizational level, geographical area, occupation, and type of organization. Gabris and Simo used a sample containing only two public and two private organizations, so the sample may not be representative of the two sectors. Yet this possibility reminds us that we have to be careful, in designing research and drawing general conclusions, to take into account such factors as the organizational and professional levels of the individuals.

Organizational level figures importantly in comparisons of attitudes about pay because, obviously, at top executive levels and in certain advanced professions, public sector salaries are usually well below those in the private sector. Below the highest organizational levels, however, pay levels are often fairly comparable in the public and private sectors (Donahue, 2008). Studies have sometimes found that federal white-collar salaries were lower than private sector salaries for similar jobs, by about 22 percent according to one study (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1990).

For such reasons, analyzing the comparability of pay between the two sectors can be complicated. Public employee unions often emphasize studies showing lower levels of pay in the public sector, but economists and other analysts often respond by pointing out that even when such differences exist, superior benefits in the public sector, such as greater job security and security of health and retirement benefits, eliminate the difference in total compensation. Differences between the two sectors tend to be concentrated at certain levels and in certain occupations and professions, and when all forms of compensation are taken into account, public sector compensation levels often appear comparable or superior to those in the private sector at lower organizational levels (Donahue, 2002). Gold and Ritchie (1993), for example, pointed out that average salaries for state and local government employees tend to be higher than average salaries for private sector employees in the same state. Yet public sector workers with higher skill levels and those at higher levels make less than comparable private sector employees. These differences are due to a different skill mix in the two sectors. The private sector has a higher proportion of blue-collar workers, and the public sector has a higher proportion of technical and professional workers, who tend to get higher pay than blue-collar workers. So the higher average in the public sector is apparently due to the employment of a larger proportion of higher-paid technical and professional employees, although these same employees may make less than comparable employees in the private sector (Gold and Ritchie, 1993).

Langbein and Lewis (1998) analyzed results of a survey of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers and compared the engineers in the public sector and in defense contractor firms to those in the nondefense-related private firms. They found evidence that the engineers in the public and defense contractor organizations had lower levels of productivity than the engineers in the nondefense-related firms, but the public and defense contractor engineers were significantly underpaid compared with the private sector engineers, even after controlling for productivity.

As this suggests, at the highest executive levels and for professions such as law, engineering, and medicine, the private sector offers vastly higher financial rewards, and the differences in these areas have been increasing (Donahue, 2008). Studies of high-level officials who entered public service have found that most of them took salary cuts to do so. Compensation did not influence their decision, however; challenge and the desire to perform public service were the main attractions (Crewson, 1995b; Hartman and Weber, 1980). In sum, many people who choose to work for government do not emphasize making a lot of money as a goal in life, even though at lower organizational levels many public employees do not work at markedly lower pay than people in similar private sector jobs. Because top executives and professionals in government work for much lower salaries than their private sector counterparts, they must be motivated by goals other than high earnings.

Nevertheless, pay issues can still have a very strong influence on the motivation of public sector employees. As pointed out earlier, pay can have a symbolic meaning, as a recognition of an employee's skill and performance (Lawler, 1990). Studies with limited samples have also found that some public managers attach higher importance to increases in their pay than do private sector managers. Apparently these midlevel public managers felt that they had little impact on their organizations and turned to pay rather than responsibility as a motive (Schuster, 1974).

Research also indicates that security and benefits serve as important incentives for many who join and stay with government, although the research results on this point are mixed. Decades ago, a major survey by Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings (1964) found that vast majorities of all categories of public employees, including federal employees, cited job and benefit security (retirement, other protective benefits) as their motives for becoming a civil servant. Sixty-two percent of their sample of federal executives (GS 12 and above) held this view. A survey of about seventeen thousand federal employees by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987) found that 81 percent considered annual leave and sick leave benefits as reasons to stay in government, and 70 percent saw job security as a good reason to stay. Houston (2000) and Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown (1998) also reported surveys in which public employees placed higher value on job security or on security and stability in general than did private sector respondents to the surveys.

As described earlier, however, a version of the Maslow needs hierarchy tends to apply. Compared to employees at lower salary levels, smaller percentages of the public sector executives, managers, and professionalized

employees (such as scientists and engineers) responding to surveys attached a high level of importance to benefits and job security (Crewson, 1995b), and at least one study found that they placed lower value on job security than private sector respondents did (Crewson, 1997). It appears reasonable to conclude that job security and other forms of security such as stable health and retirement benefits have served as significant incentives and attractive work factors for many public sector employees, although employees at higher salary, managerial, and professional levels tended to attach less value to them in their responses to surveys.

As compared with employees at lower salary levels, managers and executives generally attach more value to intrinsic incentives, in that they report more attraction to opportunities for challenge and significant work. Some evidence indicates that public sector employees—especially managers, executives, and those at professional levels—give higher ratings of the importance of intrinsic incentives than do their private sector counterparts (Hartman and Weber, 1980). The large Federal Employee Attitude Surveys of the late 1970s and early 1980s asked newly hired employees to rate the importance of various factors in their decision to work for the federal government. Virtually all of the executive-level employees (97 percent of GS 16 and above) rated challenging work as the most important factor. Employees at lower GS levels rated job security and fringe benefits more highly than did the executives, but about 60 percent of them also rated challenging work as the most important factor. Rawls, Ullrich, and Nelson (1975) found that students headed for the nonprofit sector—mainly government—showed higher "dominance," "flexibility," and "capacity for status" ratings in psychological tests and a lower valuation of economic wealth than did students headed for the for-profit sector. The nonprofit-oriented students also played more active roles in their schools. Guyot (1960) found that a sample of federal middle managers scored higher than their business counterparts on a need-for-achievement scale and about the same on a measure of their need for power. We have some evidence, then, that government managers express as much concern with achievement and challenge as private managers do—or express even more concern.

Khojasteh (1993) found that intrinsic rewards such as recognition had higher motivating potential for a sample of public managers than for a sample of private managers. Crewson (1997) analyzed two large surveys that indicated that public sector employees placed more importance than private employees on intrinsic incentives such as helping others, being useful to society, and achieving accomplishments in work. Gabris and Simo (1995) found no differences between public and private employees on perceived importance of a number of extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, but they did find that the public sector employees placed more importance on service to the community. Karl and Sutton (1998) reported survey results showing that workers in both the public and the private sectors appear to be placing more importance on job security than in the past, but public sector workers report that they value interesting work more than private sector workers do, whereas the private sector workers place more importance than public sector respondents do on good wages. Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown (1998) reported that public sector employees gave higher ratings than private employees to having the chance to learn new things and the chance to use their special abilities. Comparing a large sample of federal executives to a large sample of business executives, Posner and Schmidt (1996) found that the federal executives placed greater importance on such organizational goals as quality, effectiveness, public service, and value to the community. The business executives, however, attached more importance to morale, productivity, stability, efficiency, and growth than did the federal executives.

These studies suggest that challenging, significant work and the opportunity to provide a public service are often the main attractions for public managers. Perceptions of public service vary over time, however, with changes in the political climate, the economy, and generational differences. Surveys of career preferences among top students at leading universities have found that these students place a high priority on challenging work and personal growth. They see government positions as less likely than positions in private industry, however, to provide challenging work and personal growth (Partnership for Public Service, 2002; Sanders, 1989). They see government employment as providing superior opportunities for service to society, but they rated that opportunity as intermediate in importance.

On the other hand, researchers have found that younger workers in the public sector are expressing higher levels of general job satisfaction than younger workers in the private sector (Steel and Warner, 1990) and that employees entering the public sector show higher levels on certain measures of skill and quality than do those entering the private sector (Crewson, 1995a). These findings appear to apply to all of the broad populations of workers in the public and private sectors. They may indicate that, overall, government does provide working conditions that are generally superior to those in the private sector, because private employers can more readily fire, lay off, and otherwise impose difficulties on workers. The differences may not hold, however, for highly talented young people considering

the public service as a career. Yet if the public sector can indeed attract high-quality employees, the challenge of providing them with challenging work becomes all the more important.

The Motive for Public Service: In Search of the Service Ethic

The need to provide challenging work in the public service and the motives for pursuing such work brings us to the motive that should make people want to work for government—the service ethic, the desire to serve the public. Remember the international survey, described earlier, that found that in dozens of nations, government employees give higher importance ratings than private sector employees to work that benefits society and that helps others? In the past two decades, scholars have begun to refer to this topic as public service motivation (PSM).

In a sense, the topic is many centuries old, and evidence of a motive for public service has been appearing for years. Public executives and managers tend to express motivation to serve the public, as shown by Sikula's survey (1973a), described earlier. Similarly, Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings (1964) found that when they asked federal executives, scientists, and engineers to identify their main sources of occupational satisfaction, the respondents gave higher ratings than their counterparts in business to the importance of doing work that is worthwhile to society, and to helping others. Surveys of federal employees have found that high percentages of managers and executives entering the federal government rated public service and having an impact on public affairs as the most important reasons for entering federal service, with very low percentages of these groups rating salary and job security as important attractions (Crewson, 1995b). Findings such as these suggest the common characteristics of persons motivated by public service: they place a high value on work that helps others and benefits society, involves self-sacrifice, and provides a sense of responsibility and integrity. Public managers often mention such motives (Crewson, 1997; Hartman and Weber, 1980; Houston, 2000; Kelman, 1989; Lasko, 1980; Sandeep, 1989; Wittmer, 1991).

As indicated in Tables 10.1 and 10.2, many analyses of values, motives, and incentives in organizational research and the social sciences do not focus directly on PSM. Many pay no attention to such motives. This suggests the need for a distinct concept of PSM. While it is by no means restricted to government employees, PSM should play a major part in the development of theories of public management and behavior in public organizations. But the surveys and findings mentioned earlier use general questions about benefiting society and helping others. This leaves questions about what we mean by PSM. Can we define such a pattern of motivation clearly? Can we measure and assess how much of it a person has? These questions have both intellectual and practical importance. Earlier chapters and sections have cited examples of how such motives can stimulate and energize people in their work. Such a pattern of motivation can serve as a source of incentives alternative to pay and other rewards that are often constrained in government.

For these reasons, researchers began to pursue the meaning and measurement of PSM. Perry and Wise (1990) suggested that public service motives can fall into three categories: *instrumental motives*, including participation in policy formulation, commitment to a public program because of personal identification, and advocacy for a special or private interest; *norm-based motives*, including desire to serve the public interest, loyalty to duty and to government, and devotion to social equity; and *affective motives*, including commitment to a program based on convictions about its social importance and the "patriotism of benevolence." They drew the term *patriotism of benevolence* from Frederickson and Hart (1985), who defined it as an affection for all the people in the nation and a devotion to defending the basic rights granted by enabling documents such as the Constitution.

Drawing on these ideas, Perry (1996) provided evidence of the dimensions of a general public service motive and ways of assessing it. He analyzed survey responses from about four hundred people, including managers and employees in various government and business organizations, and graduate and undergraduate students. He analyzed the responses to the survey questions in Table 10.3 to see if the respondents answered them in ways that supported the conclusion that their public service motives fall into these dimensions. Perry's dimensions and questions present a conception of public service motivation that challenges researchers, practicing managers, and professionals to consider whether this is a conclusive answer to the question of what we mean by PSM and how we measure it. We will return later to the point that responding to this challenge has become a very international process, drawing in researchers from many different nations.

In addition to developing definitions and measures, researchers have found evidence linking PSM to other important factors in public organizations. Brewer and Selden (1998) analyzed the results of a large survey of federal employees about whistle-blowing (exposing wrongdoing). They found more public-service-related motives among employees who engaged in whistle-blowing than among those who did not. Naff and Crum (1999)

TABLE 10.3. PERRY'S DIMENSIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE MEASURES OF PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION

Dimension	Examples of Questionnaire Items
Attraction to public affairs	The give and take of public policymaking doesn't appeal to me. (Reversed)[a] I don't care much for politicians. (Reversed)
Commitment to the public interest	I unselfishly contribute to my community. Meaningful public service is very important to me. I consider public service a civic duty.
Compassion	I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged. (Reversed) Most social programs are too vital to do without. It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress. To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.
Self-sacrifice	I believe in putting duty before self. Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself. I feel people should give back to society more than they get from it. I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.

[a]"Reversed" indicates items that express the opposite of the concept being measured, as a way of varying the pattern of questions and answers. The respondent should disagree with such statements if they are good measures of the concept. For example, a person high on the compassion dimension should disagree with the statement, "I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged."

Source: Perry, 1996.

found that the respondents to another large survey expressed higher levels of PSM, expressed higher job satisfaction, and had higher performance ratings from their supervisors, and otherwise expressed more positive attitudes toward their work. Alonso and Lewis (2001), analyzing the results of two surveys of very large samples of federal employees, also found that one of the surveys indicated that employees with higher levels of PSM received higher performance ratings from their supervisors. Complicating matters, however, the other survey showed a negative relationship between the supervisor's performance ratings and the respondent's expression of PSM.

Much of the research has used questionnaire surveys of government employees and social service volunteers, such as Perry's PSM questionnaire or similar questions. Researchers have assessed the Perry questionnaires' reliability and conceptual structure, and have developed shorter or alternative versions of the Perry instrument (for example, Coursey and Pandey, 2007; Vandenabeele, 2008). Recent research has identified antecedents and influences that relate positively to PSM, including a strong religious orientation, a family background that encourages altruistic service to others, gender, organizational factors such as positive leadership, low levels of red tape, and other sociodemographic and organizational factors (DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, and Pandey, 2006; Pandey and Stazyk, 2008; Park and Rainey, 2008). Wright (2007), for example, finds that when government employees express higher levels of "mission valence," they report higher levels of PSM; that is, when they consider their organization's goals important and when their job goals are specific and difficult, they report higher service motivation. Studies in PSM also show positive relations to important work and organizational attitudes, such as organizational commitment, work satisfaction, self-reported performance, intent to turn over (that is, to leave the organization), interpersonal citizenship behavior (helpful and supportive behaviors toward other employees), perceptions of leadership and organizational mission, and charitable activities (Bright, 2007, 2011; Frank and Lewis, 2004; Houston, 2006; Leisink and Steijin, 2009; Pandy and Stazyk, 2008; Pandey, Wright, and Moynihan, 2008; Park and Rainey, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2007, 2009; Wright, Moynihan, and Pandey, 2012). Adding a distinctive contribution to this stream of research and theory, Francois (2000) proposed a formal model that postulates that public sector organizational activities can operate as efficiently and effectively as private business organizations, when PSM acts as a basic incentive.

Perry's index of PSM implies that it is a general motive on which people are higher or lower. What if people vary in the way they perceive and approach public service? Brewer, Selden, and Facer (2000) analyzed the responses concerning PSM from about seventy government employees and public administration students and concluded that the respondents fell into four categories of conceptions of public service: *samaritans* express a strong motivation to help other people, *communitarians* are motivated to perform civic duties, *patriots* work for causes related to the public good, and *humanitarians* express a strong motivation to pursue social justice. This differentiation of conceptions of PSM makes the important point that PSM is likely to vary among individuals and organizations.

Researchers have also found evidence that the beneficial effects of high levels of PSM depend on the fit between the person and the job and work environment. The environment and job need to have characteristics that fit the person's needs and skills (Stijn, 2008; Vigoda and Cohen, 2003). Persons with high levels of PSM tend to attain jobs in the public sector, but those jobs must provide conditions that will fulfill public service motives.

Grant (2008) reports a particularly interesting experimental analysis of undergraduate students who were employed as telephone fundraisers for their university. One randomly assigned group received communication from the recipient of a fellowship based on the funds raised. The recipient told the fundraisers that their work had made a beneficial difference in her life. Another group of fundraising students served as a control group and received no communication from a fellowship recipient. The group that heard from the fellowship recipient afterward attained a significantly higher number of donation pledges and a higher total amount of money donated than was attained by the control group during the same period. The results indicate the performance-enhancing potential of showing people with prosocial motives the beneficial impact of their work. Bellé (2013) also reports experimental evidence showing that Italian nurses involved in a humanitarian project showed higher levels of performance when they had contact with the beneficiaries of their efforts and when they engaged in "self-persuasion" activities in which they reflected on the importance of their work.

An interesting issue in the analysis of PSM concerns the "motivation crowding" hypothesis; this proposes that pay can diminish intrinsic motives, such as PSM, under certain conditions. Ryan and Deci (2000a, 2000b) analyze the conditions under which extrinsic rewards such as money can diminish intrinsic motives such as enjoyment of the work itself. This crowding out of intrinsic motivation depends on the level of a person's perceived self-determination. Intrinsic motivation depends on self-determination. If a person feels under the control of another person, intrinsic motivation diminishes. Frey and Reto (2001) suggest that a person's PSM can go down when pay or salary is administered to the person in a way that reduces self-determination. Andersen and Pallesen (2008) provide an analysis of this hypothesis in a study of 149 Danish research institutions implementing new financial incentives for research productivity. Researchers received pay supplements for academic publication. Andersen and Pallesen report that the more the researchers perceived the incentives as supportive, as opposed to reducing self-determination, the more the incentives encouraged researchers to publish.

One important aspect of recent research on PSM is the international attention to the concept. Recent studies, cited in earlier paragraphs, report empirical analysis on data from Australia, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, and the United States. These studies indicate that measures of PSM generally show relations to other important variables in different nations, and thus indicate an international application and significance of PSM. Vandenabeele and Van de Walle (2008) employ an international social science survey to test whether there are differences in manifestations of public service motivation across nations and regions. They find that public service motivation has a universal character, but only to a certain extent. Patterns of public service motivation are different for various regions across the world. For example, because the Perry scale was developed for use with American respondents, Vandenabeele (2008) conducted a survey of Flemish civil servants with a scale developed with an orientation toward European society. He found that despite differences in questions and terms, the new scale confirms the dimensional structure of the Perry scale, except that the Flemish results include an additional dimension of "democratic governance." These studies vary in the way that they conceive and measure PSM, and this accounts for some of the variations in their findings and directions.

Seeking to address this variation in a project that epitomizes the international character of this research, Kim, Vandenabeele, Wright, Anderson, and eleven other authors (2012) developed a questionnaire about PSM that they used to survey local government employees in twelve nations. They sought to develop an index of PSM that would be applicable in different nations. They developed questions that asked about dimensions similar to those of the Perry questionnaire, but modified; the dimensions included attraction to public service, compassion, self-sacrifice, and commitment to public values. The results indicated that the questions did not provide a common measure of PSM that applied in the same way in all the nations. There were similarities among nations that have similar political cultures, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. The evidence indicates, however, that while PSM plays an important role in the motivation of public employees in many nations, it can have different meanings and will require different measures in different cultures.

This discussion includes only a portion of the research on PSM, which now includes at least sixty published studies (Sassler, 2013). As just described, the research involves complexities and variations about the

meaning and measurement of PSM. Still, the stream of research and theorizing has sufficient consistency and momentum to establish PSM as a viable topic in public administration as well as in related fields, one that has significance for both research and practice. People interested in public service in many settings, both as employees and researchers, have a role in deciding how to define, identify, and reward the motive to engage in public service.

Motives, Values, and Incentives in Public Management

In spite of the complexities in analyzing all the possible motives, values, and incentives in organizations, the research has produced evidence of their patterns among public sector employees and the differences between public sector and private sector employees. The evidence in turn suggests challenges for leaders and managers in the public sector. Even though many public employees may value intrinsic rewards and a sense of public service, often more highly than private sector employees value them, other chapters in this book describe some experts' concerns that the characteristics of the public sector context can impede leaders' efforts to provide such rewards. Yet other chapters also present examples and evidence of how public organizations and their leaders can and do provide rewarding experiences for employees and enhance their motivation.

In addition, while motivation is obviously very important, motives, values, and incentives also influence other work attitudes and behaviors that are related to motivation, but not the same as motivation. The rest of this chapter describes and discusses important work-related attitudes.

Other Work-Related Attitudes

As noted earlier, motivation as a general topic covers numerous dimensions, including a variety of work-related attitudes such as satisfaction, roles, involvement, commitment, and professionalism. Motivational techniques often aim at enhancing these attitudes as well as work effort. Researchers have developed many of these concepts about work attitudes, often distinguishing them from motivation in the sense of work effort. Increasingly, in the United States and in other nations, business, government, and nonprofit organizations have encouraged their employees' positive work-related attitudes. Part of this process has involved conducting surveys of the members of an organization (Brief, 1998; Gallup Organization, 2003;

Stritch, Bullock, and Rainey, 2013; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2013). Many government agencies regularly measure the work satisfaction of their people.

These work-related attitudes have importance in their own right, but they are also interesting because researchers have used some of them to compare public and private managers. The following sections define and discuss major concepts of work attitudes. Later sections then describe the research on their application in the public sector and in comparisons to the private sector.

Job Satisfaction

Thousands of studies and dozens of different questionnaire measures have made job satisfaction one of the most intensively studied variables in organizational research, if not the most studied. Job satisfaction concerns how an individual feels about his or her job and various aspects of it (Gruneberg, 1979), usually in the sense of how favorable—how positive or negative—those feelings are. Job satisfaction is often related to other important attitudes and behaviors, such as absenteeism, the intention to quit, and actually quitting.

Years ago, Locke (1983) pointed out that researchers had published about 3,500 studies of job satisfaction without coming to any clear agreement on its meaning. Job satisfaction nevertheless continues to play an important role in recent research. The different ways of measuring job satisfaction illustrate different ways of defining it. Some studies use only two or three *summary items*, such as the following:

- In general, I like working here.
- In the next year I intend to look for another job outside this organization.

General or global measures ask questions about enjoyment, interest, and enthusiasm to tap general feelings in much more depth. They often employ multiple-item scales, with the responses to be summed up or averaged, such as the following from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967):

- I definitely dislike my work [reversed scoring].
- I find real enjoyment in my work.
- Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.

Specific, or *facet*, satisfaction measures ask about particular facets of the job. The following examples are from Smith's "Index of Organizational Reactions" (1976):

Supervision: "Do you have the feeling you would be better off working under different supervision?"

Company identification: "From my experience, I feel this organization probably treats its employees ____________" [five possible responses, from "poorly" to "extremely well"].

This index also includes scales for kind of work, amount of work, coworkers, physical work conditions, financial rewards, and career future. The Porter Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire (Porter, 1962) asks respondents to rate thirteen factors concerned with fulfillment of a particular need, rating how much of each factor there is now and how much there should be. The degree to which the "should be" rating exceeds the "is now" rating measures need dissatisfaction, or the inverse of satisfaction. The need categories are based on Maslow's need hierarchy, including, for example security needs, social needs, and self-actualization. This method has been used in some of the research on public sector work satisfaction described later.

Determinants of Job Satisfaction. Different measures of job satisfaction use different definitions of it. Studies using different measures—and hence different definitions—often come to conflicting conclusions about how job satisfaction relates to other variables. Partly because of these variations, researchers do not agree on a coherent theory or framework of what determines job satisfaction. Research generally finds higher job satisfaction associated with better pay, sufficient opportunity for promotion, consideration from supervisors, recognition, good working conditions, and utilization of skills and abilities.

It is obviously unrealistic to try to generalize about how much any single factor affects a worker's satisfaction. Any particular factor in a given setting contends with other factors in that setting. Various studies suggest the importance of individual differences between workers: level of aspiration, level of comparison to alternatives (whether the person looks for or sees better opportunities elsewhere), level of acclimation (what a person is accustomed to), educational level, level in the organization and occupation, professionalism, age, tenure, race, gender, national and cultural background, and personality (values, self-esteem, and so on). The influence of any one of these elements, however, depends on other factors. For example, tenure and organizational level usually correlate with satisfaction. Those who have been in an organization longer and are at a higher level report higher satisfaction. This makes sense. Unhappy people leave; happy people stay. People who get to higher levels should be happier than those who do not. Yet some studies find the opposite. In some organizations, longer-term employees feel undercompensated for their long service. Some people at higher levels may feel the same way or may feel that they have hit a ceiling on their opportunities. Career civil servants sometimes face this problem.

Researchers also look at *job characteristics* and *job design* as determinants of job satisfaction. The most prominent approach, by Hackman and Oldham (1980), also drew on Maslow's need-fulfillment theory. These researchers report higher job satisfaction for jobs higher on the dimensions measured by their Job Diagnostic Survey, which includes the following subscales: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job. Measures of these dimensions are then combined into a "motivating potential score" that indicates the potential of the job to motivate the person holding it. Hackman and Oldham's findings conformed to a typical position among management experts—that more interesting, self-controlled, significant work, with feedback from others, improves satisfaction. The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (2012) used questions representing these job dimensions in their survey of over forty-two thousand federal employees. They used the results to draw conclusions about the motivating potential of federal jobs and to make recommendations about ways of improving the way jobs are designed to enhance their motivating potential.

Consequences of Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction has received a lot of attention for years, because it has very serious consequences. For years authors regularly pointed out that job satisfaction showed no consistent relationship to individual performance (Pinder, 2008). They typically cited Porter and Lawler's interpretation of this evidence (1968), which pointed out that the relationship between satisfaction and performance depends on whether rewards are contingent on performance. A good performer who receives better rewards as a result of his or her good performance experiences heightened satisfaction. Yet a good performer who does not get better rewards experiences dissatisfaction, thus dissolving any positive link between satisfaction and performance. The link between performance and rewards, they concluded, plays a key role in determining the performance-satisfaction relationship. Some meta-analytical studies—analyses of many studies to look for general trends in their results—suggest that the relationship of job satisfaction to performance is generally stronger than this typical interpretation suggests (Petty, McGee, and Cavender, 1984).

Researchers have also pointed out that satisfaction shows fairly consistent relationships with absenteeism and turnover. Some studies have also found work satisfaction to be related to life satisfaction, general stress levels, and physical health (Gruneberg, 1979). These behaviors and conditions cost organizations a lot of money, and they obviously can impose hardship on individuals. Job satisfaction thus figures very importantly in organizations. Distinct from motivation and performance, it can nevertheless influence them, as well as other important behaviors and conditions in organizations.

Role Conflict and Ambiguity

In an influential book, Kahn and his colleagues (1964) argued that characteristics of an individual's role in an organization determine the stress that the person experiences in his or her work. These ideas about organizational role characteristics are meaningful for anyone working in an organization or profession. A number of "role senders" seek to impose expectations and requirements on the person through both formal and informal processes. These role senders might include bosses, subordinates, coworkers, family members, or anyone else who seeks to influence the person's role. If these expectations are ambiguous and conflicting, the stress level increases. Researchers developed questionnaire items to measure role conflict and role ambiguity (House and Rizzo, 1972; Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970). *Role ambiguity* refers to a lack of clear and sufficient information about how to carry out one's responsibilities in the organization. The role ambiguity questionnaire asks about clarity of objectives and responsibilities, adequacy of a person's authority to do his or her job, and clarity about time allocation in the job.

Role conflict refers to the incompatibility of different role requirements. A person's role might conflict with his or her values and standards or with his or her time, resources, and capabilities. Conflict might exist between two or more roles that the same person is expected to play. There might be conflict among organizational demands or expectations, or conflicting expectations from different role senders. The survey items about role conflict ask whether there are adequate resources to carry out assignments, and whether others impose incompatible expectations.

The two role variables consistently show relationships to job satisfaction and similar measures, such as job-related tension (Miles, 1976; Miles and Petty, 1975). They also relate to other organizational factors, such as participation in decision making, leader behaviors, and formalization.

Individual characteristics such as need for clarity and perceived locus of control (whether the individual sees events as being under his or her control or as being controlled externally) also influence how much role conflict and ambiguity a person experiences. These concepts are important by themselves, because managers increasingly concern themselves with stress management and time management. Managing one's role can play a central part in these processes.

Job Involvement

In observing increasingly technical, professional, and scientific forms of work, researchers find differences among individuals in their involvement in their work. For some people, especially advanced professionals, work plays a very central part in their lives. Researchers measure job involvement by asking people whether they receive major life satisfaction from their jobs, whether their work is the most important thing in their life, and similar questions. Job involvement is distinct from general motivation and satisfaction but resembles intrinsic work motivation. It figures importantly in the work attitudes of highly professionalized people who serve in crucial roles in many organizations. The concept has also played an interesting role in the research on public managers, as described further on.

Organizational Commitment

The concept of organizational commitment has also figured in research on public and private managers (discussed later in this chapter). Individuals vary in their loyalty and commitment to the organizations in which they work. Certain people may consider the organization itself to be of immense importance to them, as an institution worthy of service, as a location of friends, as a source of security and other benefits. Others may see the organization only as a place to earn money. Professionals such as doctors, lawyers, and scientists often have loyalties external to the organization—to the profession itself and to their professional colleagues.

Scales for measuring organizational commitment ask whether the respondent sees the organization's problems as his or her own, whether he or she feels a sense of pride in working for the organization, and similar questions (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982). Studies also show the multidimensional nature of commitment. For example, Angle and Perry (1981) showed the importance of the distinction between *calculative commitment* and *normative commitment* to organizations. Calculative commitment is based on the perceived material rewards the organization offers. In normative commitment, the individual is committed to the organization because he or she sees it as a mechanism for enacting personal ideals and values.

Balfour and Wechsler (1996) further elaborated the concept of organizational commitment in a model for the public sector based on a study of public employees. Their evidence suggested three forms of commitment. *Identification commitment* is based on the employee's degree of pride in working for the organization and on the sense that the organization does something important and does it competently. *Affiliation commitment* derives from a sense of belonging to the organization and of the other members of the organization as "family" who care about one another. *Exchange commitment* is based on the belief that the organization recognizes and appreciates the efforts and accomplishments of its members.

Professionalism

For years, sociological researchers have studied the way in which highly trained specialists control complex occupations. Technological advances have made certain valuable types of work increasingly complex and difficult to apprehend. Specialists in these areas must have advanced training and must maintain high standards. Only specialists, however, have the qualifications to establish and police the standards. From the point of view of society and of large organizations, these factors raise problems involving monopolies, excessive self-interest, and mixed loyalties. Government and business organizations also face challenges in managing the work and careers of highly trained professionals.

Researchers have offered many definitions of the term *profession*, typically including these elements:

- Application of a skill based on theoretical knowledge
- Requirement for advanced education and training
- Testing of competence through examinations or other methods
- Organization into a professional association
- Existence of a code of conduct and emphasis on adherence to it
- Espousal of altruistic service

Occupational specializations that rate relatively highly on most or all of these dimensions are highly "professionalized." Medical doctors, lawyers, and highly trained scientists are usually considered advanced professionals without much argument. Scholars usually place college professors, engineers, accountants, and sometimes social workers in the professional category. Often they define less-developed specializations, such as library science and computer programming, as semiprofessions, emerging professions, or less professionalized occupations.

In turn, management researchers analyze the characteristics of individual professionals, because they play key roles in contemporary organizations. They point out that, as a result of their selection and training, professionals tend to have certain beliefs and values (Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976):

- Belief in the need to be expert in the body of abstract knowledge applicable to the profession
- Belief that they and fellow professionals should have autonomy in their work activities and decision making
- Identification with the profession and with fellow professionals
- Commitment to the work of the profession as a calling, or life's work
- A feeling of ethical obligation to render service to clients without self-interest and with emotional neutrality
- A belief in self-regulation and collegial maintenance of standards (that is, a belief that fellow professionals are best qualified to judge and police one another)

Members of a profession vary on these dimensions. Those relatively high on most or all are highly professional by this definition.

The characteristics of professions and professionals may conflict with the characteristics of large bureaucratic organizations. Belief in autonomy may conflict with organizational rules and hierarchies. The situation at the Brookhaven National Laboratory described at the beginning of Chapter Eight is an example of such conflict. The scientists chafed under the new rules and procedures imposed on them by administrators seeking to enhance safety and public accountability. Emphasis on altruistic service to clients can conflict with organizational emphases on cost savings and standardized treatment of clients. Identification with the profession and desire for recognition from fellow professionals may dilute the impact of organizational rewards, such as financial incentives and organizational career patterns. Professionals might prefer an enhanced professional reputation to salary increases, and they might prefer their professional work to moving "up" into management. Without moving up, however, they hit ceilings that limit pay, promotion, and prestige. Some studies in the past have found higher organizational formalization associated with higher alienation among professionals (Hall and Tolbert, 2004).

Conflicts between professionals and organizations do not appear to be as inevitable as once supposed, however. Certain bureaucratic values, such as emphasis on the technical qualifications of personnel, are compatible with professional values (Hall and Tolbert, 2004). For example, professionals may approve of organizational rules on qualifications for jobs. Professionals in large organizations may be isolated in certain subunits, such as laboratories, where they are relatively free from organizational rules and hierarchical controls (Bozeman and Loveless, 1987; Crow and Bozeman, 1987; Larson, 1977). Certain professionals, such as engineers and accountants, may want to move up in organizations in nonprofessional roles (Larson, 1977; Schott, 1978).

Golden (2000) describes how professionals in certain federal agencies during the Reagan administration disagreed with many of the policies of the Reagan appointees who headed their agency, but regarded it as their professional obligation to discharge those policies effectively, once they were decided and established. Berman (1999) found no major differences in the levels of professionalism expressed by public, private, and nonprofit managers, although he found indications of differences in the contexts that influence their professional orientations. This conception of professionalism among managers differs from the concept of highly professional occupations such as law and medicine, but Berman's finding makes the point, as did Brehm and Gates (1997), that professionalism can be an important motivating factor among many managers and employees in the public sector.

Management writers offer some useful suggestions about the management of professionals. They prescribe dual career ladders, which add to the standard career path for managers another for professionals, so that professionals can stay in their specialty (research, legal work, social work) but move up to higher levels of pay and responsibility. This relieves the tension over deciding whether one must give up one's profession and go into management. Some organizations rotate professionals in and out of management positions. Some government agencies have adopted the policy of rotating geologists in administrative positions back into professional research positions after several years. Some organizations also allow professionals to take credit for their accomplishments. For example, they allow them to claim authorship of professional research reports rather than requiring that they publish them anonymously in the name of the agency or company. Organizations can also pay for travel to professional conferences and in other ways support professionals in their desire to remain excellent in their field.

Motivation-Related Variables in Public Organizations

Researchers have made comparisons on a number of motivation-related variables between public and private samples, shedding some light on how the two categories compare.

Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Organizational Goal Clarity

For some work-related attitudes, researchers have found few differences between managers in public and private organizations. This has been the case with the most frequent observation in all the literature on the distinctive character of public management: public managers confront greater multiplicity, vagueness, and conflict of goals and performance criteria than managers in private organizations do. There is a fascinating divergence between political economists and organization theorists on the validity of this observation. Political scientists and economists tend to regard this goal complexity as an obvious consequence or determinant of governmental (nonmarket) controls, whereas many organization theorists tend to regard it as a generic problem facing all organizations.

Little comparative research directly addresses this issue, however. Rainey (1983) compared middle managers in government and business organizations about the role conflict and role ambiguity items described earlier, asking questions about the clarity of the respondents' goals in work, conflicting demands, and related matters. The government and business managers showed no differences on these questions nor on questions about whether they regarded the goals of their organization as clear and easy to measure. More recent surveys have confirmed these results (Bozeman and Rainey, 1998; Rainey, Pandey, and Bozeman, 1995). One explanation may be that public managers clarify their roles and objectives by reference to standard operating procedures, whether or not the overall goals of the organization are clear and consistent.

These findings point to important challenges for both researchers and practitioners in further analyzing such issues as how managers in various settings (such as public, private, and hybrid organizations) perceive objectives and performance criteria; how these objectives and criteria are communicated and validated, if they are; and whether these objectives and criteria do in fact coincide with the sorts of distinctions between public and private settings that are assumed to exist in our political economy. Wright (2004) reports evidence that state government employees who perceive

greater clarity of work and organizational goals also report higher levels of work motivation, so the frequent generalizations about vague goals in public organizations do not mean that leaders and managers in government cannot and should not continue efforts to clarify goals for organizational units and employees.

Work Satisfaction

Many studies have found differences between respondents from the public and private sectors concerning other work-related attitudes and perceptions. In the United States and other nations where such studies have been conducted, public employees and managers express high levels of general work satisfaction and other general attitudes about work, such as having a sense of worthwhile work, usually comparable to that reported by their private sector counterparts (Bozeman and Rainey, 1998; Cho and Lee, 2001; Davis and Ward, 1995; Gabris and Simo, 1995; Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings, 1964; Light, 2002a; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1979, 2007a, 2013). Some of these studies have found that public sector respondents express higher levels of satisfaction with certain facets of work, such as health care benefits and job security. Large-scale surveys have shown that younger members of the public sector workforce show higher levels of general work satisfaction than younger private sector workers do (Steel and Warner, 1990) and that persons entering the public sector workforce are higher on certain measures of quality than entry-level private sector employees (Crewson, 1995a).

However, numerous studies across several decades that compared the work satisfaction of public and private sector employees, especially at managerial levels, have reported somewhat lower satisfaction among public sector employees in various specific facets of work (Buchanan, 1974; Bogg and Cooper, 1995; Bordia and Blau, 1998; Hayward, 1978; Kovach and Patrick, 1989; Lachman, 1985; Light, 2002a; Paine, Carroll, and Leete, 1966; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Rainey, 1983; Rhinehart and others, 1969; Solomon, 1986; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2013).

These studies used different measures of satisfaction and varied samples, which makes it hard to generalize about them. For example, Paine, Carroll, and Leete (1966) and Rhinehart and his colleagues (1969) found that groups of federal managers showed lower satisfaction than business managers on all categories of the Porter Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire (Porter, 1962), described earlier. Conversely, Smith and Nock (1980), analyzing results of a large social survey, found that public sector blue-collar workers show more satisfaction with most aspects of their work than their private sector counterparts, but public sector white-collar workers show less satisfaction with coworkers, supervisors, and intrinsic aspects of their work.

Hayward (1978) compared employees and managers in a diverse group of public and private organizations and found that satisfaction ratings were generally high among both groups. The public sector respondents, however, gave somewhat less favorable ratings concerning their job overall, their ability to make necessary decisions, the adequacy of the supplies in their organization, the amount of duplication with which they have to contend, and the amount of work they are expected to do. Rainey (1983) found that state agency managers scored lower than business managers on their satisfaction with promotion opportunities and with coworkers. Light (2002a) found that federal employees express higher satisfaction than private sector employees with job security and benefits and with the ability to accomplish something worthwhile, but the federal employees were lower on satisfaction with the public's respect for their work, with the extent to which their jobs were dead-end jobs, and with the degree to which they can trust their organizations. Cho and Lee (2001) reported that in their Korean sample the public managers perceived higher levels of prestige in their jobs than did the private sector managers.

The findings of these studies vary a great deal and are not easily summarized. The public and private responses often did not differ greatly, yet it is hard to dismiss as accidental the consistent tendency of the public managers and employees to score lower on various satisfaction scales. Taken together, these studies reveal comparable levels of general or global satisfaction among respondents from the public and private sectors. The studies also indicate lower satisfaction with various intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of work in many public organizations as compared to private ones. Some of the findings appear to reflect the administrative constraints described earlier—personnel system constraints (promotion and pay) and purchasing constraints (supplies). Others appear to reflect related frustrations with administrative complexities and complex political and policymaking processes, public sector realities that diminish some intrinsic rewards. The findings suggest that many public sector employees show high levels of satisfaction in their work, comparable to those of employees in the private and nonprofit sectors, and comparable or higher levels of satisfaction with certain facets of work, such as benefits and security, and sometimes with a sense that their work is important and socially valuable. Those public employees who express lower satisfaction with facets of work tend to be concerned over frustrating administrative and political constraints

and complexities, and over certain extrinsic factors, such as constraints on pay and promotion.

Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement

Research has provided evidence about organizational commitment and job involvement in public organizations, much of it based on comparisons of public and private managers and employees. The research has produced some indications of particular frustrations in the public service. As with other topics, such as motivation and work satisfaction, however, the evidence is sometimes conflicting, but leads to the conclusion that public organizations and managers may face particular challenges, but the situation in the public sector is not necessarily worse than in other settings, such as the private and nonprofit sectors. The research further provides suggestions for public managers, and indications that public organizations and managers can take them effectively.

The stream of research began with studies by Buchanan (1974, 1975), who found that groups of federal executives expressed lower organizational commitment and job involvement than executives from private firms. He concluded that the public managers felt less commitment for several reasons. They did not feel as strong a sense of having a personal impact on the organization; the organization did not expect as much commitment; and their work groups were less of a source of attachment to the organization. Buchanan also suggested that the lower involvement scores indicated a frustrated service ethic, and he expressed concern that it reflected weak public service motivation on the part of the public managers. His evidence showed that the public managers' weaker involvement responses resulted from a sense of holding a less challenging job, of working in less cohesive groups, and of having more disappointing experiences in the organization than the managers had expected when they joined it. These disappointments, he thought, might arise when idealistic, service-oriented entrants confront the realities of large government agencies, in which they feel they have little impact.

Flynn and Tannenbaum (1993) also reported a study in which a sample of public managers expressed lower organizational commitment than a sample of private sector managers. The public managers were lower on their ratings of the clarity, autonomy, and challenge of their jobs. Their lower scores on clarity and autonomy appeared to be the strongest influences on their lower commitment scores. Brown (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of job involvement studies and found a modest relationship between employment in the public or private sector and job involvement. For public sector respondents, several determinants of job involvement—such as the job's motivating potential, pay satisfaction, and participative decision making—were weaker. Moon (2000) reported survey results in which a sample of public managers expressed lower organizational commitment than a sample of managers in private business.

Though they have not measured organizational commitment directly, other studies and observations have indicated similar general characteristics of the public sector work context. Boyatzis (1982) drew a conclusion similar to Buchanan's from his comparisons of public and private managers. Chubb and Moe (1990) found a generally lower perceived sense of control and commitment among staff members and teachers in public schools than among their private school counterparts. Michelson (1980) described examples of hardworking bureaucrats in "nonworking" bureaucracies. They work hard, he observed, but the diffuse goals and haphazard designs of some programs make their efforts futile. Cherniss (1980) observed that many public service professionals experience stress and burnout as a result of their frustrated motivation to help their clients and because of the bureaucratic systems that aggravate their frustrations.

Other studies, however, have found that public employees were not necessarily lower on organizational commitment (Balfour and Wechsler, 1990, 1996). Steinhaus and Perry (1996) analyzed data from a major national survey, the 1991 General Social Survey, and found that public sector employees showed no significant difference from private sector employees on a measure of organizational commitment. They found that the industry in which a person was employed predicted organizational commitment better than whether the person worked in the public or private sector. They concluded that a public versus private dichotomy is too simple a distinction for analyzing organizational commitment. The International Social Survey, described earlier, found that levels of organizational commitment among public and private employees differed in a number of nations, but not in all of the thirty nations studied, and not in a consistent pattern (Stritch, Bullock, and Rainey, 2013).

These mixed results raise some important challenges for public sector managers and researchers alike. First, they emphasize the question of whether all the assertions about the context of public organizations reviewed in earlier chapters influence organizational commitment. The studies that found a public-private difference concentrated on managers, whereas those that did not, such as the Steinhaus and Perry study (1996), looked at all levels together, or mostly at nonmanagerial employees. This

pattern suggests that the constraints and interventions that impinge on public organizations may have their greatest influence at managerial levels.

The evidence also raises doubts about Buchanan's concerns about weakened motivation in government agencies. Public managers and employees may show lower scores on organizational commitment because they feel strongly committed to serving clients or to more general societal values and missions and do not regard the organization itself as the most important object of pride and loyalty (Romzek and Hendricks, 1982). In addition, other chapters in this book describe the substantial body of evidence showing highly committed administrative leaders and professionals in government.

The studies of organizational commitment in the public and private sectors provide suggestions for both managers and researchers. Balfour and Wechsler (1996) found that four factors appeared to increase all three dimensions of commitment: more participation in decision making, lower political penetration (less external political influence on hiring, promotion, and treatment of clients), more respectful and supportive supervision, and more opportunity for advancement. In a similar vein, on the basis of her own research and that of others, Romzek (1990) concluded that highly committed employees in government feel that their jobs are compatible with their ethics, values, and professional standards. They also feel that their families and friends support their affiliation with the organization for which they work. Although the studies reviewed here indicate difficulties in bringing about such conditions in some public organizations—probably in very complex, controversial, and highly politicized ones with diffuse mandates—public managers can often overcome these problems. As the research also shows, the problems in the public sector may not be more severe than those in the private sector, but rather simply different.

The Challenge of Stimulating Motivation and Positive Work Attitudes in Public Organizations

The topics discussed here dramatize the challenge for everyone concerned with effective public management. The evidence indicates frustrations, constraints, and problems of working and managing in the public sector, but also reflects a strong current of motivation, effort, and constructive attitudes in public organizations. The challenge for leaders and managers involves dealing effectively with the complex environment of public organizations so as to support and make the most of the human resources in public organizations. For all of us, the challenge is intensified by the absence of a conclusive, scientific solution to these problems in the research and theory of organizational behavior and related fields. Yet, as the review and examples here have shown, that body of knowledge does offer ideas, concepts, and methods that provide valuable support for those of us determined to pursue those challenges.

Instructor's Guide Resources for Chapter Ten

- Key terms
- Discussion questions
- Topics for writing assignments or reports
- Case Discussion: The Case of the Vanishing Volunteers
- Case Discussion: The Case of Joe the Jerk (Or, Joe the Very Capable Jerk)
- Case Discussion: A Funeral in the Public Service Center

Available at www.wiley.com/college/ rainey.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

LEADERSHIP, MANAGERIAL ROLES, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

All of the preceding chapters discuss topics that pose challenges for leaders at all levels in public organizations, and the framework presented in Chapter One implies the crucial role of leadership. As earlier chapters have discussed, some perspectives on organizations question whether leaders truly wield important influences or whether they are actually under the control of more powerful circumstances that determine the course of events. Recent research on leaders in private firms tends to find that there are weak relationships between leader behaviors and objective performance measures such as sales and profit margins, or at least that the effects of leadership are highly contingent on other factors (Klein and Kim, 1998; Waldman, Ramirez, House, and Puranam, 2001). Studies of leaders in the public sector, however, have recently been attributing a lot of influence to leader behaviors (such as Brudney, Hebert, and Wright, 1999; Hennessey, 1998; Kim, 2002; Thompson, 2000), and this chapter later returns to the question of whether leaders in the public sector make much difference, given the shared power, politics, oversight, and other factors that can limit their impact in government. Whether or not leaders shape the destinies of their organizations and stride like titans over the rest of us, anyone who has served in an organization knows how much leaders can mean, or fail to mean, in the apparent direction and success of an organization and in the work lives of the people they purportedly lead. Yet in spite of such debates, the literature on leadership in the social sciences and elsewhere—including religious, literary, and philosophical discourse over the centuries—looms before us as a vast, complex body of human thought and effort (Kellerman and Webster, 2001) that, like other topics in the social sciences and related fields, ultimately plays out as rather confused and inconclusive.

As with previous topics, such as motivation, we are presented with the challenge of what to make of this body of work. This chapter takes the approach of first reviewing many of the theories and ideas about leadership and managerial roles that have developed in the field of organizational behavior and organizational psychology, and then examining concepts and ideas about organizational culture. Leaders need to influence organizational culture, which in the past several decades has become one of the most widely used (and misused) terms in popular discourse on management and organizations. Business firms cannot merge without setting off an explosion of discussion in business magazines and business sections of newspapers about whether the cultures of the two firms will clash. Governmental challenges, such as poor coordination among agencies and reorganizations such as the design of the Department of Homeland Security, spark heated discourse over the clashing cultures of different agencies. Lurie and Riccucci (2003) have described how proponents of the most significant reform of the social welfare system in the United States in recent history, the 1996 Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act, envisioned the reform as a means of actually changing the culture of welfare agencies and the welfare system. Because of such significant applications of the concept, even though *organizational culture* has risen to buzzword status in popular discussion, it still represents an interesting, important topic (Khademian, 2002). People preparing for roles in and research on public management need to confront the basic literature and research on it, in part to retrieve it from the dustbin of buzzwords that have gone before it.

Although scholars and experts have repeatedly asserted that leaders in government agencies can have only weak influence on their organizations and related events, in the past several decades a genre of literature on influential, innovative, effective leaders in governmental administrative settings has developed. This chapter concludes with a review of this work that identifies, describes, and analyzes such leaders.

Leadership Theories in Management and Organizational Behavior

An immense body of research on leadership in organizational settings offers a vast assortment of definitions and perspectives on leadership (Yukl, 2001). By *leadership*, most people mean the capacity of someone to direct and energize people to achieve goals. Faced with the challenge of understanding this topic, how have management researchers attacked the problem?

Trait Theories

First, researchers have tried to determine those characteristics, or traits, that make a person an effective leader. Midcentury leadership researchers concentrated on this approach. They tried to identify the traits of effective leaders—physical characteristics such as height, intellectual characteristics such as intelligence and foresight, personality characteristics such as enthusiasm and persistence. They identified many important characteristics such as these, often demonstrating a relationship between these traits and effective leadership, and leadership characteristics of various sorts have remained an important element of leadership research. No one, however, has ever identified a common set of traits for excellent leaders. Leaders come in a variety of sizes, shapes, talents, and dispositions. The quest for universal traits has been replaced by other approaches.

The Ohio State Leadership Studies

The social sciences developed rapidly during the middle of the twentieth century. More and more studies used new techniques such as questionnaires and computer analysis, and there was an increasing emphasis on systematic observations of human behavior. Drawing on samples from the military, schools, and other organizations, researchers at Ohio State University developed questionnaires that asked people to report on the behaviors of their superiors. After repeated analyses of the questionnaire results, they found that observations about leaders fell into two dimensions—*consideration* and *initiating structure*. These would become central issues, under various names, in much of the subsequent work on leadership. Consideration refers to a leader's concern for his or her relationships with subordinates. Questionnaire items pertaining to consideration ask whether the leader is friendly and approachable; listens to subordinates' ideas and makes use of them; cares about the morale of the group; and otherwise deals with subordinates in an open, communicative, concerned fashion. Initiating structure refers to a leader's emphasis on setting standards, assigning roles, and pressing for productivity and performance. The two dimensions tend to be related to each other, but only to a limited extent.

This research played a pivotal role in moving the field into empirical research on leadership. It drove the trait approach into disrepute by showing that effective leaders vary on these dimensions and do not display a uniform set of traits. It also set these two dimensions in place in the literature as two key aspects of leader behavior. Yet reviewers raised questions about the adequacy of the questionnaire measures and noted that the two dimensions do not make for a complete picture of leadership practice and effectiveness. Researchers moved off in search of more complete models.

The Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid

The Ohio State leadership studies had a significant impact on Blake and Mouton's managerial grid approach (1984) to improving management practices. Blake and Mouton characterized organizations according to two dimensions with clear roots in the Ohio State studies—concern for people and concern for production. Organizations low on the former and high on the latter have *authority-obedience management.* Those high on concern for people and low on concern for production have *country club management.* Those low on both have *impoverished management.* This approach sought to move organizations toward high levels of both factors—to *team management*—through open communication, participative problem solving and goal setting, confrontation of differences, and teamwork. This framework supported Blake and Mouton's popular organization development consulting method, which they applied in a broad range of government, business, and third sector organizations.

Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership

Researchers still sought more complete theories, especially theories that would better address the numerous situations that leaders face. Fiedler's contingency theory (1967) received a lot of attention because at the time it offered one of the best frameworks for examining the relationship between leadership style and organizational setting and how that relationship affects a leader's effectiveness. Fiedler used the *least preferred coworker* (LPC) scale

to distinguish between types of leadership styles. The LPC scale asked a leader to think of the person with whom that leader could work least well and then to rate that person on about twenty numerical scales of personal characteristics, such as pleasant or unpleasant, tense or relaxed, boring or interesting, and nasty or nice. After repeated studies, Fiedler and his associates felt that the responses indicated two basic types of leaders: high-LPC leaders gave relatively favorable ratings to this least preferred associate, and low-LPC leaders rated the associate much more unfavorably. The responses of high-LPC leaders showed that they had more favorable dispositions toward coworkers and thus were relationship-oriented. The low-LPC leaders were task-oriented; they concentrated on task accomplishment over relationships with coworkers, and found less desirable coworkers more irritating because they hindered successful work.

Fiedler's theory holds that either type of leadership style can be effective, depending on whether it properly matches the contingencies facing the leader. According to the theory, the key contingencies, in order of their importance in determining effective leadership, are *leader-member relations,* marked by the degree of friendliness, trust, initiative, and cooperativeness of the leader and the subordinates; *task structure,* shaped by the clarity and specificity of what must be done; and *position power of the leader,* determined by the amount of formal power the leader has.

Leadership situations vary on each of these dimensions, from good to bad. Obviously, a leader enjoys the most favorable setting when all three are good and the least favorable when all three are bad. Moderately favorable settings have a mixture of good and bad conditions, such as good leader-member relations but an unstructured task setting and weak position power. Fiedler contended that low-LPC (task-oriented) leaders perform most effectively in the very favorable or very unfavorable settings, whereas high-LPC (relationship-oriented) leaders do best in the intermediate settings.

Fiedler's rationale for this conclusion evades easy explanation, but the logic appears to go like this: low-LPC leaders do well in the best situations because everything is in place and the subordinates simply need to be given direction (and they accept the leader as authorized to give such direction). For example, the leader of an airplane crew who has the benefits of clear power, a strong task structure, and good relations with subordinates does best if he or she concentrates on giving orders to accomplish the task. The low-LPC type also does well in very bad situations that have so much potential disorder and disaffection anyway that worrying about establishing good personal relations simply wastes time. In such settings, the leader might as well go ahead and press for structure, order, and output. High-LPC leaders do best in the intermediate situations because an emphasis on good relations can overcome the one or two bad dimensions and take advantage of other favorable aspects of the setting. For example, a weakly empowered chair of a newly formed, poorly structured interdepartmental committee who has good relations with the committee members can take advantage of those good relations, encouraging participation and opinion sharing, to overcome the committee's other problems.

Fiedler argued that his theory shows that rather than trying to train leaders to fit a particular setting, organizations must alter the setting to fit the leader. He and his colleagues developed a *leader match* procedure, in which leaders use questionnaires to assess their own style and their leadership situation and then consider ways of changing the situation to make it better fit their style.

Critics questioned the adequacy of Fiedler's evidence and the methods he used. Clearly, the theory includes a very limited picture of the possible situational factors and variations in leadership styles. Still, it raises key issues about leadership processes and has advanced the effort to develop more complete theories.

The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

The path-goal theory of leadership draws on the expectancy theory of motivation described in Chapter Nine. Expectancy theory treats motivation as arising from expectations about the results of actions and the value of those results. Similarly, path-goal theory holds that effective leaders increase motivation and satisfaction among subordinates when they help them pursue important goals—that is, when they help them see the goals, the paths to them, and how to follow those paths effectively. Leaders must do this by showing subordinates the value of outcomes over which the leader has some control, by finding ways to increase the value to subordinates of those outcomes, by using appropriate coaching and direction to clarify the paths to those outcomes, and by removing barriers to those paths and frustrations that arise along the way.

The theory also considers a variety of leadership styles, characteristics of subordinates, and situational factors that affect the proper approach to a leader's path-goal work (Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976; House, 1971; House and Mitchell, 1974). House and Mitchell considered four leadership styles: *directive*, when the leader gives specific directions and expectations; *supportive*, marked by encouraging, sympathetic relations with subordinates; *achievement-oriented*, when the leader sets high goals and high expectations for subordinates' performance and responsibility; and *participative*, when the leader encourages subordinates to express opinions and suggestions.

Which style is best depends on various situational factors, such as whether the task is structured and provides clear goals, whether subordinates have well-developed skills and a sense of personal control over their environment (locus of control), how much formal authority the leader has, and whether the work group has strong norms and social relationships. When factors such as these provide weak path-goal indications and incentives, the proper leadership style can enhance them. The leader must avoid behaviors that impose redundancies and aggravations, however.

Researchers have predicted and tested relationships such as these:

- Directive leadership enhances satisfaction and expectancies if the task is ambiguous, but hurts them if the task is well structured and clear.
- Clear tasks already provide clear paths to goals, and subordinates may see more directions from a leader as redundant and irritating.
- Supportive leadership enhances satisfaction when tasks are frustrating and stressful, but can be inappropriate when the task, the work group, and the organization provide plenty of encouragement. In such situations the leader need only clarify directions as needed and set high standards.
- Achievement-oriented leadership increases performance on ambiguous tasks, either because those conditions allow (or require) ambitious goals more often than simple tasks do, or because achievement-oriented subordinates tend to select such tasks.
- Participative leadership works best for ambiguous tasks in which subordinates feel that their self-esteem is at stake, because participation allows them to influence decisions and work out solutions to the ambiguity. For clear tasks, however, participative leadership is effective only if subordinates value self-control and independence.

As these examples show, the theory weaves together leadership styles and situational factors to make sufficiently subtle predictions to capture some of the complex variations in real leadership settings. However, a lot of research based on the theory produced mixed results and much debate concerning its validity (Pinder, 2008, pp. 359–360; Yukl, 2001, pp. 212–216). House (1996) offers an elaborate reformulation of the theory, the adequacy of which remains to be established in research. Whether validated or not, the theory offers a number of interesting and useful suggestions for leaders to consider, about how to adapt leadership approaches to particular situations.

The Vroom-Yetton Normative Model

Vroom and Yetton (1973; see also Vroom and Jago, 1974) proposed an elaborate framework for leaders to use in deciding how and how much to involve subordinates or subordinate groups in decisions. The framework takes the form of a decision tree that guides the leader through a series of questions about how important the quality of the decision will be, whether the leader has the necessary information to make a high-quality decision, whether the problem is well structured, whether acceptance of the decision by subordinates is important, and whether conflict among them is likely. The decision-making process guides the leader in selecting from various ways of handling the decision, such as delegating it or making it after consulting subordinates.

Life-Cycle Theory

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) developed another form of contingency theory. Their life-cycle theory suggests that leadership styles must fit the level of maturity of the group being led. Mature groups have a higher capacity for accepting responsibility because they are well educated, experienced, and capable at accomplishing group tasks, and they have well-developed relationships with one another and with the leader. With groups that are very low on these dimensions, however, leaders must engage in telling, emphasizing task directions more than developing relationships with the group, to move the group toward better task capabilities. As the group moves higher on some dimensions of maturity but remains at a low level of maturity overall, the leader must do more selling, or heavy emphasizing of both tasks and relationships. As the group moves to moderately high maturity, participating becomes the most effective style. The leader relaxes the emphasis on task direction but still attends to relationships. Finally, for a very mature group, delegating becomes the effective approach. The leader deemphasizes his or her own role in directing tasks and maintaining relationships and shifts responsibility to group members.

Loosely defined concepts plague the theory, but they make important points. Leaders often face the challenge of assessing just how much delegation the group can accept (how much it needs someone to take charge and set directions), and determining how to move the group toward a greater capacity for handling tasks and relationships independently.

Attribution Models

Social psychologists have developed a body of theory about how people make attributions about or attribute characteristics to one another. Some leadership researchers have applied this perspective to leadership and produced useful insights. They look at how leaders draw conclusions about how and why their subordinates are behaving and performing as they are and how subordinates form impressions about leaders. As leaders decide how to respond, they interpret the apparent causes of subordinate behavior and performance. They take into account the uniqueness of the particular task to the performance, the consistency of the behaviors, and how the behaviors compare to those of other subordinates. Some of the research shows that when a subordinate performs poorly, leaders tend to attribute the problem to the subordinate if he or she has a bad record. If the person has a good record of past performance, however, leaders often conclude that the problem results from the situation surrounding the person and is not his or her fault. For their part, subordinates often attribute the lion's share of credit or blame for the group's performance and characteristics to the group's leader. If the group has performed well in the past, they tend more readily to give the leader credit for current successes, even rating him or her higher on certain leader behaviors and interpreting these as causes.

Attribution theories obviously offer a partial approach that does not cover the full topic of leadership, but they clearly point to important processes for leaders to keep in mind. Leaders always face the challenge of managing others' impressions of them and of trying to form valid impressions of their colleagues and subordinates. These attribution processes pertain especially to problems in public management, in which political appointees come in at the top of agencies and must establish relations with career civil servants. Frequently the political appointees anticipate resistance and poor performance from the careerists, and the careerists anticipate amateurishness from the political appointee. When problems come up, the two types tend to interpret them according to their preconceptions about each other, aggravating the problem of developing effective working relationships. The careerists and appointees often come to respect each other, but attribution processes often slow this process (Golden, 2000; Heclo, 1978; Ingraham, 1988; Light, 1987).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership concentrates on the dyadic relationships between a leader and individual subordinates, and on the development of low-exchange and high-exchange relationships (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975). Low-exchange relationships involve little mutual influence between the leader and subordinate, and the subordinate generally follows formal role requirements and receives standard benefits such as salary. According to the theory, leaders tend to establish high-exchange relationships with a small set of trusted subordinates, with whom they engage in mutually influential relations. These subordinates usually receive benefits in the form of more interesting assignments and participation in important decisions, but they incur more obligations, such as meeting the leader's expectations of harder work, more loyalty, and more responsibility than is expected of those not included in the group. The leader, of course, incurs corresponding forms of obligation and benefit in these high-exchange relationships. Scholars developing this theory have devoted attention to measuring the existence of such relationships with questionnaires, analyzing the determinants of such relationships, and theorizing about how the relationships develop and mature over time. LMX theory has received more recent attention than a number of the other theories described previously and later in this chapter, but like all of them, it has sparked debate and criticism (Schriesheim, Castro, and Cogliser, 1999; Yukl, 2001, pp. 116–121). Researchers have used different definitions and measures, leaving a lot of unresolved questions about the definition and nature of the exchange relations—that is, about how the relations develop and relate to group and individual performance. As with the other theories, however, LMX theory adds interesting suggestions about matters for leaders to consider in the leadership of individuals and groups.

Operant Conditioning and Social Learning Theory Models

The operant conditioning and behavior modification perspectives described in Chapter Nine have found their way into the search for leadership theories. Some early behavior modification approaches emphasized reinforcement of outcomes over concern with internal mental states. Proponents argued that these approaches offered significant improvements for leadership techniques, for several reasons. They stressed observations of behavior rather than dubious inferences about what happens in a person's head. For example, they said that managers should look at behaviors and performance outcomes rather than at whether a person has a "good attitude." They called for close attention to the consequences of behavior, saying that leaders must attend to the behaviors they reinforce or extinguish by associating consequences with those behaviors. They emphasized positive reinforcement as the most effective approach.

Later approaches began to take into account developments in social learning theory. Albert Bandura (1978, 1997) and other psychologists demonstrated that operant conditioning models needed to expand to include forms of learning and behavioral change that are not tightly tied to some reinforcement. People learn by watching others, through modeling and vicarious learning. They use mental symbols, rehearsal, and memorization techniques to develop their behaviors. Taking these insights into account, social learning theory models of leadership have added analysis of internal mental states and social learning to their assessments of leadership (Kreitner and Luthans, 1987). This has led to additional suggestions about leadership practices. Because internal mental states and social learning (in addition to feedback and after-the-fact reinforcement) also affect behavior, leaders can use feed-forward techniques to influence behavior. They can anticipate problems and actively avoid them by clarifying goals. They can enhance employees' acceptance of goals by having them participate in their development, and through social cues (by acting as a good role model). They can also emphasize the development of self-efficacy and self-management, both for themselves and for their subordinates. This involves managing one's own environment by recognizing how environmental factors influence one's behavior, and through personal goal setting, rehearsal, self-instruction, and self-rewards (see, for example, Sims and Lorenzi, 1992).

Cognitive Resource Utilization Theory

Researchers continue to work on additional theories. Among recent ones, Fiedler's cognitive resource utilization theory has received the most validation from supporting studies (Fiedler and Garcia, 1987). It extends the Fiedler contingency theory, specifying when directive (low-LPC) behaviors affect group performance, but also drawing in the effects of the leader's intelligence, competence, and stress level. Fiedler and Garcia reported the unexpected finding that considerate (high-LPC) leader behavior has little effect on group performance. If the group supports such a leader and the task requires cognitive abilities, then the cognitive abilities of the group determine its performance. If the group does not support the leader, then external factors, such as task difficulty, determine performance.

For directive leaders with much control over the situation, performance depends on whether the leader is free of stress, whether the task requires cognitive abilities, and whether the group supports the leader. If these conditions hold, the leader's intelligence strongly predicts performance. If the leader is under stress, however, the leader's experience becomes the best predictor of performance, because stress prevents the effective use of intelligence and brings experience more strongly into play. Also, if the task does not require cognitive skill or the group does not support the leader, then the leader's intelligence has little or no effect on performance. As the authors state, their theory and research suggest the "not surprising conclusion that directive leaders who are stupid give stupid directions, and if the group follows these directions, the consequences will be bad" (Fiedler and Garcia, 1987, p. 199). Directive leader behaviors result in good performance only if coupled with high leader intelligence and a supportive, stress-free setting. The theory offers useful new insights into such leadership process variables as stress, which leaders can strive to manage (House and Singh, 1987).

Scholars in organizational behavior and organizational psychology have developed other, less-prominent theories that this review does not cover (see Yukl, 2001). Yet arguably the most striking departure in leadership research in recent decades addresses transformational and charismatic leadership, and that body of research and theory needs attention. Before covering this approach, however, it is useful to review a body of research on managerial roles and behaviors to which the transformational leadership research reacts, and then to cover transformational and charismatic leadership, which have important linkages to the discussion of organizational culture that follows.

The Nature of Managerial Work and Roles

As the research on leadership developed, there also emerged a body of work on the characteristics of managerial work, roles, and skills. This literature actually involves something of a trait approach. It seeks to develop general conceptions of managerial activities and competencies. Ever since the classical theorists began trying to define the role of the administrator, the approach of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (POSDCORB) (described in Chapter Two), or some variant of it, has served as a guiding conception of what managers must do. Often coupled with this view is the constantly repeated notion that managers in all settings must do pretty much the same general types of work. Allison (1983) illustrated the prevalence of the POSDCORB conception of managerial responsibilities when he used a form of it in one of the most widely reprinted and circulated articles ever written on public management (see Exhibit 11.1).

EXHIBIT 11.1
Managerial Roles and Skills

ALLISON (1983): FUNCTIONS OF GENERAL MANAGEMENT

Strategy

- Establishing objectives and priorities
- Devising operational plans

Managing internal components

- Organizing and staffing
- Directing personnel and the personnel management system
- Controlling performance

Managing external constituencies

- Dealing with external units subject to some common authority
- Dealing with independent organizations
- Dealing with the press and the public

MINTZBERG (1972): EXECUTIVE ROLES

Interpersonal	*Informational*	*Decisional*
Figurehead	Monitor	Entrepreneur
Leader	Disseminator	Disturbance handler
Liaison	Spokesperson	Resource allocator
		Negotiator

WHETTEN AND CAMERON (2002): MANAGEMENT SKILL TOPICS

Self-awareness	Effective delegation and joint decision making
Managing personal stress	Gaining power and influence
Creative problem solving	Establishing supportive communication
Managing conflict	Improving group decision making
Improving employee performance, motivating others	

(continued)

EXHIBIT 11.1 (*Continued*)

MCCAULEY, LOMBARDO, AND USHER (1989): THE BENCHMARKS SCALES

1a. Resourcefulness
1b. Doing whatever it takes
1c. Being a quick study
2a. Building and mending relationships
2b. Leading subordinates
2c. Compassion and sensitivity
3. Straightforwardness and composure
4. Setting a developmental climate
5. Confronting problem subordinates
6. Team orientation
7. Balance between personal life and work
8. Decisiveness
9. Self-awareness
10. Hiring talented staff
11. Putting people at ease
12. Acting with flexibility

Not so preoccupied with what managers must do as with what they actually do, Mintzberg (1972) produced *The Nature of Managerial Work*, which now stands as a classic in the field. He did something that, remarkably, was considered quite original at the time. He closely observed the work of five managers who headed organizations by following them around and having them keep notebooks. He concluded that their work falls into the set of roles listed in Exhibit 11.1.

Mintzberg also reported that when one actually watches what managers do, one sees the inaccuracy of some popular beliefs about their work. Managers do not play the role of systematic, rational planners but rather emphasize action over reflection. Their activities are characterized by brevity, variety, and discontinuity. Although top-level managers are often told to plan and delegate and avoid regular duties, in reality they handle regular duties such as ceremonies, negotiations, and relations with the environment, such as meeting visitors and getting information from outside sources (to which they have the best access of anyone in the organization). They meet visiting dignitaries, talk with managers and officials from outside the organization, hobnob at charitable events, and preside over the

annual banquet. Although managers are sometimes told that they need aggregate, systematically analyzed information, they actually favor direct and interactive sources, such as telephone calls and face-to-face talks and meetings. And though management increasingly has access to scientific supports and processes, managers still rely a great deal on intuition and judgment. Research has supported Mintzberg's observations about management and his typology of managerial roles (Kurke and Aldrich, 1983). Generally, the research finds his typology widely applicable to managers in many settings. Yet Mintzberg also found some characteristics unique to the public sector setting, and these too have been supported in recent research, as discussed later.

Transformational Leadership

During the 1970s, researchers in the field expressed increasing concern about the inadequacy of their theories. Leadership theorists began to argue that research had concentrated too narrowly on the exchanges between leaders and their subordinates in task situations and on highly quantified models and analyses. Some researchers called for more attention to larger issues and other sources of leadership thought, such as political and historical analyses, and more qualitative research using interviews and case studies.

Political scientist James MacGregor Burns (1978) exerted a seminal influence on leadership thought in the management field. Concerned with major political and social leaders such as presidents and prime figures in social movements, he distinguished between *transactional leadership* and *transformational leadership*. Transactional leaders motivate followers by recognizing their needs and providing rewards to fulfill those needs in exchange for their performance and support. Transformational leaders raise followers' goals to higher planes, to a focus on transcendental, higher-level goals akin to the self-actualization needs defined by Maslow. In addition, they motivate followers to transcend their own narrow self-interest in pursuit of these goals, for the benefit of the community or the nation. Martin Luther King Jr. provides an example of a leader who did not simply offer to exchange benefits for support but also called for a new order of existence—a society of greater justice—and inspired many people to work for this vision. Many others refrained from opposing it because of its moral rightness.

Bass (1985, 1998; see also Bass and Avolio, 2002) presented a more systematic analysis of transformational leadership. Like Burns, however, he sharply distinguished transactional from transformational leadership. He saw transformational leadership as uplifting. It shifts followers' focus from lower- to higher-order needs. It motivates them to sacrifice their own self-interest by showing followers that their self-interests are fulfilled or linked to community or higher-order needs. Bass agreed that there must be a shift in needs, but he pointed out that major leaders—Hitler, for instance—can have a transforming influence through a negative shift. Bass argued that the wrong kind of transformational leadership can damage followers and other groups.

Bass's analysis of transformational leadership points out that this form of leadership has an emotional and intellectual component. The emotional component involves charisma, an inspiring influence on followers. The intellectual component involves careful attention to individual followers, often of a benevolent, developmental, mentoring nature, as well as intellectual stimulation. The intellectual aspects can take various forms, such as manipulating symbols, using rational discourse, or evoking ideals, and can involve cognitive stimulation as much as intellectual teaching. Bass emphasized that leadership research has often underrated the importance of leaders' technical competence to their influence and effectiveness. Followers often admire and follow leaders primarily because leaders are very good at what they do. Bass and colleagues (Bass, 1985, 1998) have developed a questionnaire instrument to analyze the component behaviors of transformational leadership, which, according to this perspective, include both transformational and transactional behaviors, as follows:

Transformational Behaviors

Idealized influence: Arouses followers' emotional attachment to the leader and identification with him or her

Intellectual stimulation: Engages followers in recognizing and confronting challenges and in viewing challenges from new perspectives

Individualized consideration: Provides support, encouragement, and coaching

Inspirational motivation: Communicates an appealing vision, using symbols to focus efforts, and modeling appropriate behaviors

Transactional Behaviors

Contingent reward: Clarifying the work required for rewards, and ensuring that rewards are contingent on appropriate behaviors

Passive management by exception: Punishments or other corrective actions in response to obvious deviations from acceptable standards

Active management by exception: Looking for mistakes and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes

Whereas Burns treated transactional and transformational leadership as two polar extremes, Bass argued that transformational leaders also engage in varying degrees of transactional interaction with followers. They have to provide rewards and reasonably clear goals and directions. But overemphasis on exchanges with followers, especially negative or punishing ones, can be harmful. The significance of transformational leadership derives from its capacity to lift and expand the goals of individuals, not by overemphasizing direct, extrinsic satisfaction of self-interest, but rather by inspiring new, higher aspirations. Hence comes the emphasis on relatively intangible, idealized influences through vision, empowerment, charisma, inspiration, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Transformational leaders do not directly control their subordinates but rather seek to influence the climate in which they work. Thus this view of leadership has connections with another recent trend: the emphasis on managing organizational culture.

Charismatic Leadership

As part of the same trend that produced ideas about transformational leadership over the past several decades, leadership researchers have also developed theories of charismatic leadership that have similarities and overlaps with the concept of transformational leadership (Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, and Popper, 1998; Yukl, 2001, pp. 240–253). They have drawn on ideas from Max Weber's work (described in Chapter Two) on how leaders sometimes influence followers not just through traditional or formal authority, but also through exceptional personal qualities that invoke strong confidence, loyalty, and commitment from followers. Those interested in this phenomenon have developed a number of different perspectives on it; two of the more prominent of these are an attributional theory or perspective and a self-concept theory.

The attributional theory of charismatic leadership treats charisma as primarily a matter of the characteristics that followers attribute to their leader. When they attribute these qualities, they come to identify personally with the leader and to internalize values and beliefs that the leader espouses. They want to please and imitate the leader. According to this view of charismatic leadership, followers are more likely to react this way when the leader displays certain behaviors and skills, such as when the leader does the following:

- Advocates a vision that is different from the status quo, but still acceptable to followers
- Acts in unconventional ways in pursuit of the vision
- Engages in self-sacrifice and risk taking in pursuit of the vision
- Displays confidence in the leader's ideas and proposals
- Uses visioning and persuasive appeals to influence followers, rather than relying mainly on formal authority
- Uses the capacity to assess context and locate opportunities for novel strategies

Such leaders are most likely to emerge during a crisis or in situations in which the leader's exceptional behaviors and skills are a good match with a particular context.

The self-concept theory of charismatic leadership actually comes to some very similar conclusions, but it emphasizes more observable characteristics of the leader and followers. It also proceeds more from assumptions about the tendency of individuals to maintain their conception of themselves, including their social identities and their self-esteem, and the effects the leader has on such processes. Leaders have charismatic effects on followers when the followers (1) feel that the leader's beliefs are correct, (2) willingly obey the leader and feel affection for him or her, (3) accept high performance goals for themselves, (4) become emotionally involved in the mission of the group and feel that they contribute to it, and (5) regard the leader as having extraordinary abilities. Charismatic leaders invoke such responses by articulating an appealing vision and using strong, imaginative forms of communication to express it. They take risks and engage in self-sacrifice to attain the vision. They express confidence in followers, set high expectations of them, and empower them. They build identification with the group or organization and carefully manage followers' impressions of them. When these behaviors invoke in followers the responses just described, the followers come to identify with the leader, to internalize the leader's beliefs and values, and to feel motivated to achieve tasks and goals that the leader espouses.

Charismatic leadership drew researchers' attention in part because of important examples of leaders in government, business, and nonprofit organizations who displayed such behaviors and such influences on followers, at least to some extent. For example, during his service as commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, Charles Rossotti, regardless of whether he should be considered a charismatic leader, had a profound effect on the people who worked with him. In interviews, other executives in the IRS and in organizations such as unions and consulting firms that worked with the IRS would use terms such as *superhuman* to describe Rossotti's energy and acuity. These characterizations were all the more interesting because Rossotti is not a person of large stature or imposing physical presence (Thompson and Rainey, 2003).

Charismatic leadership obviously raises a lot of important questions about the nature and appropriateness of such forms of leadership. For example, if an organization becomes highly dependent on the special qualities of an individual leader, this can bring challenges when the leader departs. Also, researchers on this topic have pointed out that there can be a dark side to charismatic leadership, and that there is a difference between *positive charismatics* and *negative charismatics*. Positive charismatics can exert the beneficial forms of influence implied in the perspectives just described. Hitler, however, immediately brings to mind a lot of the obvious problems of negative forms of charisma, such as excessive loyalty to evil and destructive ends. Researchers have noted that one does observe negative charismatics in organizations in the government and in the private sector. Although not as heinous as Hitler, one hopes, such leaders can become self-absorbed, dependent on adulation, and excessively self-confident. They may take excessive risks and inhibit followers from suggesting improvements or pointing out problems.

As with the other theories, the research and thinking about transformational and charismatic leadership has raised controversies and criticisms about the adequacy of the theories and the research supporting them. Among many other issues, theorists dispute whether transformational and charismatic leadership are distinct or overlapping and related phenomena. Nevertheless, these streams of research and thought, besides being very interesting, raise for anyone in a leadership position some challenging considerations about a number of matters (see, for example, Yukl, 2001, pp. 263–266), such as articulating a clear and appealing vision and showing how to attain it; displaying optimism and confidence in oneself and one's followers; using dramatic actions to emphasize key values; setting an example; and empowering people.

Leadership and Organizational Culture

Transformational leaders avoid closely managing their subordinates and organizations. Rather, they exert their influence through *social architecture,* by working with the basic symbols and core values, or culture, of their organization. Writers on organizational culture have described the key roles that leaders play in forming, maintaining, and changing that culture (Khademian, 2002, pp. 15–42; Schein, 1992). Organizational analysts have been interested in similar themes for a long time, as suggested by the work of Chester Barnard and Philip Selznick described in Chapter Two. The topic really came alive in the management literature, however, when management experts began to find that leaders in excellent corporations in the United States and other nations placed heavy emphasis on managing the cultural dimensions of their firms (Collins and Porras, 1997; Ouchi, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982). In addition, researchers who study organizational cultures often use methods similar to those used by anthropologists to study the cultures of different societies. They argue that these methods provide deeper, more sensitive understanding of the realities of organizational life than do methods used by other researchers (Ott, 1989; Schein, 1992). They have proposed various definitions of culture and undertaken studies of basic values, symbols, myths, norms of behavior, and other elements of culture in organizations.

Some of these studies have focused on public organizations, and certainly the topic applies to them (see, for example, Lurie and Riccucci, 2003). Maynard-Moody, Stull, and Mitchell (1986) provided a rich description of the development and transformation of culture in the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. Early in the twentieth century, an influential secretary of the department instituted a culture that emphasized the use of professional expertise in the defense of public health, relative autonomy from political intrusion, strict rules, and adherence to the budget. Through slogans, pamphlets, symbolic political actions, and publicity campaigns, the secretary led the development of a well-established culture that predominated for decades. Much later, the governor and legislators, to bring the department under stronger political control, brought in an outsider as secretary. He and his followers led a reorganization that

reduced the status of the adherents of the old culture and their beliefs and values, in part through constant denunciations of the old ways of doing things. The new culture, which emphasized different basic beliefs—such as the importance of political responsiveness and adherence to strict operating procedures—clashed with and eventually supplanted the older culture.

Previous chapters and later ones provide other illustrations of organizational culture in public organizations. The development of strategies and mission statements often draws on ideas about culture, and it in turn seeks to shape culture. Chapter Seven described the efforts of an executive trying to manage aspects of the culture of a law enforcement agency, including its basic assumptions about communicative leadership and decision making. Chapters Thirteen and Fourteen provide further examples of leaders' efforts to influence culture in changing, revitalizing, and building excellence in public and private organizations. These examples force the question of what we mean by *culture.* Scholars use the term in diffuse ways, and journalists and managers often use it very loosely. If very careful, long-term observations are required for researchers to understand *culture,* will it not also be difficult for managers to understand it? If culture is a strong determinant of what happens in organizations, will it not be hard to change?

The literature provides guidance for confronting these challenges. One succinct definition, for example, says that organizational culture is the pattern of shared meaning in an organization (Trice and Beyer, 1993). In what sense, however, do shared meanings exist? Schein's conception of culture (1992), illustrated in Exhibit 11.2, provides some clarification. Schein contended that culture exists on various levels. The most basic and least observable level, often overlooked in other conceptions of culture, includes the basic assumptions on which the organization operates. Often invisible and unconscious, these assumptions are about the organization's relationship with its environment; about the nature of reality, time, and space; and about the nature of humans and their activities and relationships. The next level of culture involves more overtly expressed values about how things ought to be and how one ought to respond in general. Finally, the most observable level includes artifacts and creations, such as actual technological processes (purposely designed work processes and administrative procedures and instructions), art (symbols, logos, and creations), and behaviors (words used, communication patterns, significant outbursts, and rituals and ceremonies).

EXHIBIT 11.2
Conceptions and Dimensions of Culture

LEVELS AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE (SCHEIN, 1992)

Levels of Organizational Culture

1. Artifacts and creations (the most observable level). *Examples:* the design of work processes and administrative procedures, art (logos and symbols), overt behaviors (words used, rituals, ceremonies, significant outbursts—such as something a top executive gets openly mad or happy about).
2. Basic values (a less observable level). *Examples:* values about how things ought to be and how one ought to respond and behave in general (for example, always help younger employees develop their skills and careers, always have strong relationships with key officials in the legislative branch).
3. Basic assumptions (the most basic, least observable level). *Examples:* basic assumptions on which people in the organization operate (for example, decisions should be made by people with the best brains, not the highest rank).

Key Dimensions of the Basic Assumptions

1. The organization's relation to its environment. *Example:* whether members see the organization as dominant or dominated.
2. The nature of reality and truth, and the basis for decisions. *Example:* whether decisions are based on tradition or on a scientific test. Subdimensions: the nature of time (for example, the length of cycles) and space (for example, perceived availability or constraints).
3. The nature of human nature. *Examples:* humans as bad or good, mutable or fixed.
4. The nature of human activity. *Example:* being proactive versus being reactive.

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE (HOFSTEDE, NEUIJEN, OHAYV, AND SANDERS, 1990)

Member identity: The degree to which individuals identify with the organization as a whole rather than some subgroup or specialization.

Group emphasis: The degree to which work is organized around groups rather than individuals.

People focus: The extent to which management considers the effects of their decisions on people in the organization.

Unit integration: The amount of encouragement of coordinated, interdependent activity among units.

Control: The degree to which rules and supervision are used to control employees.

Risk tolerance: The encouragement of risk and innovation.

Reward criteria: The extent to which rewards are based on performance rather than seniority or favoritism.

Conflict tolerance: The degree to which open airing of conflict is encouraged.

Means-ends orientation: The extent of managerial focus on outcomes and results rather than processes.

Open-systems focus: The amount of monitoring of external developments.

A policy about uniforms in a military unit illustrates Schein's three levels (Lewis, 1987). Admiral Hyman Rickover discouraged the wearing of uniforms in the project teams working in the U.S. Navy's nuclear program. Lower-ranking officers with more recent training often had the best knowledge. Uniforms carry symbols of hierarchical rank and authority (representing the first, most observable level of organizational culture). The absence of uniforms reduces the value of hierarchical rank and promotes the value of individuals' technical knowledge (the second level). At the third, most basic level, the underlying assumption is that those with the "best brains, not the highest rank" make the best decisions (Lewis, 1987, p. 107).

Other researchers have developed more elaborate sets of dimensions of organizational culture. Exhibit 11.2 summarizes the dimensions of organizational culture that Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) used in their study of twenty organizations. Leaders and teams working on the development of organizational culture can make pragmatic use of such dimensions, as well as of the measures of them described shortly. Researchers can work on further developing and confirming the role of such dimensions in public organizations.

Variations Among Cultures

Analysts also emphasize variations among cultures. One such distinction points out that organizational cultures can vary from strong to weak. In organizations with strong cultures, the members share and strongly adhere to the organization's basic values and assumptions. In weak cultures, members feel little consensus and commitment. DiIulio (1994) described how some employees of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons feel a very strong commitment to the mission and values of the bureau, to the point that some retirees will rush to the scene of a crisis in the prison system to volunteer their services.

There may be multiple cultures and subcultures within an organization (Trice and Beyer, 1993, chaps. 5 and 6). Subcultures can form around ations, subunits or locations, hierarchical levels, intercultural groups such as rebellious units. Public a single dominant occupational or professional special- , [1968] 1982; Warwick, 1975). Strong differences between ocultures obviously complicate the challenge of forging con- ultural changes and priorities.

her source of variation is the role of external societal cultures and influences on an organization. During the 1980s, for example, inter- in the successes of Japanese management led to analyses of their more onsensual decision-making processes, their group-oriented norms, and other characteristics of Japanese corporations that reflect their distinctive external societal culture (Ouchi, 1981).

Assessing the Culture

As suggested earlier, the task of developing an understanding of an organization's culture imposes a major challenge on managers and researchers alike. The concepts and dimensions listed in Exhibit 11.2 can serve as focal points for such an assessment. Researchers use elaborate procedures for measuring and assessing culture. Exhibit 11.3 suggests references and sources for this undertaking.

EXHIBIT 11.3
Background References for Assessing Organizational Culture

Schein (1992, chap. 5). Procedures and interview questions for assessing culture, including the dimensions of culture that his analysis emphasizes. *Methods:* interviews focusing on surprises and critical incidents, and group interviews about the basic dimensions.

Wilkins (1990). Suggestions and interview questions for assessing "corporate character." Corporate character emphasizes "motivational faith" along two dimensions, fairness and ability. *Methods:* interview and self-assessment questions for use in assessing faith in leaders' and their own fairness and in the organization's and their own abilities.

Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990). Description of the measures of the cultural dimensions described in Exhibit 11.1. *Method:* survey research questionnaires.

Kotter and Heskett (1992). Survey instrument and interview questions used in their study of the relations between corporate culture and performance in numerous business firms. *Method:* organizational questionnaire survey and interviews.

Ott (1989, chap. 5). General review of methods of studying organizational culture.

Khademian (2002, pp. 42–47) proposes a *cultural roots framework* for analysis of public organizations. The cultural roots are three basic elements of every public agency or program: the public task to be done, the resources available to do it, and the environment in which the agency or program has to operate. These three elements become integrated in ways that produce commitments, or rules about how the job gets done. To influence the organization's culture, Khademian argues, public managers must concentrate on influencing the ways in which these basic elements or roots are integrated, using strategies described later.

The Communication of Culture

Various forms that transmit an organization's culture serve as sense-making mechanisms for people in the organization as they interpret what goes on around them (Trice and Beyer, 1993, p. 80). The forms transmit information about the organization's basic values and assumptions. In analyzing their organization's culture, leaders and teams must determine the current roles of these forms and the ways they need to be transformed.

Symbols. Physical objects, settings, and certain roles within an organization convey information about its values and basic assumptions. The uniforms in the example about Rickover are one example. Goodsell (1977) studied 122 government agencies and found various physical conditions that symbolized either authority or service to clients. For example, flags, official seals, and physical distance between employees and clients symbolized authority. Symbols of a client service orientation included comfortable furniture and descriptions of services available.

Employees use symbols, too. In a large service center of the Social Security Administration, members of a problem-ridden subunit held a funeral for the subunit, complete with black balloons, a small black coffin, and the singing of hymns. Later, when the director had effectively resolved their concerns, the members gave him the coffin with the balloons deflated inside it, as a symbol that the problems were over.

Physical settings can have potent symbolic effects. Zalesny and Farace (1987), in a study of a public agency in a Midwestern state, found that a change to a more open office design—with no interior walls or partitions—had significant psychological effects on employees. Lower-level employees saw the change as promoting more democratic values. Managers felt they had lost status.

Language. Slang, songs, slogans, jargon, and jokes can all carry the messages of a culture. Maynard-Moody, Stull, and Mitchell (1986) described the transformation of the culture of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. One way that cultural changes were instituted was through derogatory references to "the old way of doing things" that debunked the assumptions and values of the former culture.

Narratives. The people in an organization often repeat stories, legends, sagas, and myths that convey information about the organization's history and practices. Bennis and Nanus (1985) reported that in a large computer company, a manager lost a lot of money on an aggressive project. When he offered his resignation, his superior asked, "How can we fire you when we have just spent ten million dollars educating you?" Repeated around the organization, such a story can send a powerful message about the organization's support of reasonable risk taking and aggressiveness.

Practices and Events. Repeated practices and special events, including recurrent or memorable one-time incidents, can transmit important assumptions and values. These events may include rites and ceremonies such as graduation ceremonies, induction and initiation ceremonies, annual meetings, annual banquets or holiday parties, and homecomings. Rites promote changes and goals such as passage, renewal, elevation or degradation of individuals, conflict reduction, and integration of the group. Leaders' actions at times of crisis, memorable and widely noted speeches, and outbursts can all have such influences. Organizations have taken particular steps to support employees or customers during times of crisis or hardship, leading to legends and stories that symbolize and communicate organizational values.

Leading Cultural Development

Experts on organizational culture heavily emphasize the crucial role of leadership in creating and upholding culture (Khademian, 2002; Schein, 1992; Trice and Beyer, 1993). Leaders create culture in new organizations and embody and transmit it in existing organizations. They can also integrate cultures in organizations that have multiple cultures by forging consensus. These different roles are important, because different types of leaders may play them. A long-term member of the organization, for example, often plays the strongest role in embodying and transmitting

existing cultures. Nevertheless, leaders of high-performance organizations typically strive for an improved culture, even if the organization performs well already (Kotter and Heskett, 1992).

The concepts and points discussed earlier present challenges for leadership. Enhancing culture involves understanding its nature, assessing the particular culture of one's organization, dealing with multiple subcultures as necessary, understanding the different cultural forms in the organization, and using those forms to facilitate change. Leaders and leadership teams can use a variety of methods and strategies to lead the development of effective culture:

1. *Make clear what leaders will monitor, ignore, measure, or control.* For example, a leadership team can announce that a significant proportion of each manager's evaluation and bonus will be based on an assessment of how well the manager performed in developing subordinates' skills.

2. *React to critical incidents and organizational crises in ways that send appropriate cultural messages.* Crises provide opportunities for leaders to demonstrate fortitude, commitment to organizational members, and other values and basic assumptions. The computer firm manager who got the expensive "education," described earlier, provides an example. The Social Security Administration center director, also described earlier, when confronted with the funeral in the troubled subunit, reacted not punitively but communicatively. He thus sent a message about the value he placed on communication and participation.

3. *Practice deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching.* Leaders can show, tell, and encourage values and behaviors they want employees to adopt.

4. *Establish effective criteria for granting rewards and status, for selection and promotion of employees, and for dismissal or punishment.* The earlier example about introducing the development of subordinates as a criterion for managers' performance evaluations and bonuses shows that what an organization rewards its members for sends a powerful message about values and basic assumptions. Punishments send equally strong messages.

5. *Coordinate organizational designs and structures with cultural messages.* Without appropriate structural redesign, a leader's modeling and coaching about new approaches and values can evaporate into empty rhetoric and posturing (Golembiewski, 1985). If the leader's criteria for rewards conflict with features of the organization that impede the behaviors the leader wants to reward, role conflict and stress for members will surely result. Chapter Thirteen describes how, in the 1970s, large Social Security

·ir structures and work pro-
·of specialists who worked
· made up of different
The change embod-
communication,

cultural messages.
.ns, routine report-
up meetings—provide
. basic beliefs. Bourgault,
ormance appraisal system for
-building effect, in part because
studies of pay-for-performance sys-
anagement and Recognition System
deral government (discussed in Chapter
systems fail to communicate useful informa-
(Perry, 1986; Perry, Petrakis, and Miller, 1989).

aces, including facades and buildings, to communicate
, by Goodsell (1977), described earlier, suggests some
physical setting and space that can communicate cultural
bout public agencies.

ploy stories about events and people. Leaders can also make use of
and accounts of past events and people as a way of promoting val-
and assumptions. Cooper (1987) described Gifford Pinchot's effective
efforts to build support for the Forest Service and strong commitment among forest rangers by, in part, taking wilderness treks with foresters. These outings served to build his image as a person committed to his mission and richly appreciative of forest resources.

9. *Develop formal statements of the organizational philosophy or creed.* Formal credos and value statements promote an organization's principles and values, and generally commit the organization to them. Denhardt (2000) provides numerous examples of such statements in public agencies in several different nations. The Social Security Administration provides such statements in the agency's strategic plan, that one can view on the agency's Web site (U.S. Social Security Administration, 2013, p. 4).

10. *Approach cultural leadership as comprehensive organizational change.* Leadership teams must approach the development of an effective

organizational culture as they would any major, influential initiative. Chapter Thirteen covers successful organizational change, discussing how leadership teams can marshal resources, commitment, and consensus in a sustained, comprehensive fashion.

Khademian (2002) has contributed a somewhat different perspective on leading and managing culture, in which she proposes that public managers influence culture by concentrating on the basic elements, or roots, of culture—environment, resources, and task—and how their integration has developed commitments that form the culture. She proposes that managers follow a set of strategies for examining and influencing these commitments and their connections to the roots. These strategies include, for example, identifying the commitments that form the culture and their connections to the roots of culture, identifying and articulating what needs to change, practicing and demonstrating the desired changes, and approaching the changes as an inward, outward, and shared responsibility that involves internal management as well as management of environmental elements and the participation of organizational members and numerous external stakeholders.

As indicated earlier, Chapter Fourteen includes further examples of the importance of effective culture in public organizations. As suggested by Khademian's proposed strategies and at many points in earlier chapters, a major issue for public managers and researchers is the context of leadership in the public sector and how leaders have to work with it in developing culture and carrying out other management responsibilities.

Leadership and Management in Public Organizations

A review of the management literature shows that researchers have treated leadership and management in the public sector as essentially the same as in other settings, including business. Many major contributions to the field, such as the Ohio State leadership studies and Fiedler's theories, were developed in part from research on military officers or government managers. Mintzberg's study (1972) included a public manager (a school system superintendent) and a quasi-public manager (a hospital administrator). Additional studies have found that Mintzberg's role categories apply to managers in government agencies (Lau, Pavett, and Newman, 1980). Although Mintzberg and later researchers (Kurke and Aldrich, 1983) noted some special features of public managers' work, still others found that even these few distinctions do not always hold for all types of public managers (Ammons and Newell, 1989). Small wonder that leadership researchers typically regard a public-versus-private distinction as rather inconsequential. Leaders in all settings face the challenges and general tasks suggested by the theories we have reviewed.

Generalizations About the Distinctive Context of Public Service

Although virtually everyone accepts the premise that all executives and managers face very similar tasks and challenges, a strong and growing body of evidence suggests that public managers operate within contexts that require rather distinctive skills and knowledge. For years, political scientists writing about public bureaucracies argued that the political processes and government institutions in which government managers work make their jobs very different from those of business executives. Those writers did not, however, do as much empirical research on leadership as the organizational behavior and management researchers did. Clear evidence of differences remained rather scarce, and many management scholars noted the evidence of similarities among all managerial roles and rejected such notions as crude stereotypes.

More recently, however, greater attention to the topic of public management has produced additional evidence concerning its distinctive nature. Some of this evidence comes from executives who have served in both business and government and have written about the differences they have seen between the two roles (Allison, 1983; Blumenthal, 1983; Chase and Reveal, 1983; Hunt, 1999; IBM Endowment for the Business of Government, 2002; Rumsfeld, 1983). Although their experiences and opinions have been diverse, they have agreed that the constraints, controls, and political and administrative processes in public organizations weighed heavily on their managerial behaviors. Though these elements of the context of leadership in the public sector have been discussed in earlier chapters, it may be useful here to review a number of them:

- Jurisdiction-wide rules for personnel, purchasing, budgeting, and other administrative functions, usually with an oversight agency administering them, which limit executive authority
- Legislative and interest-group alliances with subgroups and individuals within the organization, which dilute executives' authority over those groups or individuals

- Control by legislatures, chief executives, and oversight agencies over resource and policy decisions, and strong demands for accountability on the part of the agency head for all matters pertaining to the agency
- The influence of the press and the imperative that executives concern themselves with media coverage
- The short tenure of many top executives, which limits their time to accomplish goals and weakens their influence over careerists
- The absence of clear and accepted performance measures for their organizations and the activities within them, and the need to take a particularly broad range of interests and issues into account in decision making

Federal executives report from a very special perspective, of course. There are more than a dozen such reports (Hunt, 1999; IBM Endowment for the Business of Government, 2002; Perry and Kraemer, 1983; Shalala, 1998). Yet more structured academic research paints a similar picture. Various studies of public managers show a general tendency for their roles to reflect the context of political interventions and administrative constraints.

Much of this evidence comes not from studies of leadership practices but from analyses of managerial roles. In his seminal study, Mintzberg (1972) found that the work of all the managers fell into his now well-known role categories. Yet the public manager in the sample (a school administrator) and the quasi-public manager (a hospital administrator) spent more time in contacts and formal meetings with external interest groups and governing boards and received more external status requests than did the private managers. Later, Kurke and Aldrich (1983) replicated the study, including its findings about public management; they pointed to public-versus-private comparisons as an important direction for future research on managerial roles. Lau, Pavett, and Newman (1980), also using a technique based on Mintzberg's, found the roles of civilian managers in the U.S. Navy comparable to those of private manufacturing and service firm managers. Yet they also added the role of technical expert to the role categories for the navy managers and noted that these managers spend more time in crisis management and "fire drills" than private managers. Ammons and Newell (1989), conversely, conducted a survey of mayors and city managers using Mintzberg's categories and found somewhat different results. Comparing the sample of mayors and city managers to private sector samples from previous studies, Ammons and Newell found that these city officials spent no more time in formally scheduled meetings than did the private sector managers. This contradicts the findings of Mintzberg and of Kurke and Aldrich. Yet a closer look shows that the mayors and city managers did spend more time making phone calls and conducting tours than did the private sector managers. Ammons and Newell noted that they could not really say what the phone calls involved, and that they may well represent contacts with external groups and political actors.

A study by Porter and Van Maanen (1983) supported this interpretation. They compared city government administrators to industrial managers and found that the city administrators felt less control over how they allocated their own time, felt more pressed for time, and regarded demands from people outside the organization as a much stronger influence on how they managed their time. At the level of state government, Weinberg (1977) reported on a case study of the management of New Jersey state agencies by the governor, concluding that "crisis management" plays a central role in shaping public executives' decisions and priorities.

In an observational study of six bureau chiefs of large federal bureaus, Herbert Kaufman (1979) found that they spent much of their time in classic, generic management functions such as motivating employees, communicating, and decision making. The political environment figured crucially in their roles, however. Relations with Congress outweighed relations with the higher executives of their departments. Clearly, they operated within a web of institutional constraints on organizational structure, personnel administration, and other matters. Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman's study of legislators and administrators in six countries (1981), described in Chapter Five, supports this depiction of congressional influence as stronger than that of agency heads.

Boyatzis (1982) conducted a study of managerial competencies that compared managers in four federal agencies and twelve large firms. He found that private managers were higher on "goal and action" competencies; he attributed this to clearer performance measures, such as profits, in the private sector (see Hooijberg and Choi, 2001, for a similar finding). The private managers also scored higher on competencies in "conceptualization" and "use of oral presentations." Boyatzis suggested that more strategic decision making in the private firms and more openness and standard procedures in the public sector account for this. Interestingly, Boyatzis's findings correspond to those of earlier studies. Like Guyot (1960), he found that public managers show higher levels of need for achievement and power. Yet their lower scores on goal and action competencies reflected less ability to fulfill such needs. Boyatzis's interpretation agreed with that of Buchanan (1975). They both regarded their findings as evidence that fairly

ambitious and idealistic people come to managerial work in government but appear to experience constraints within complex government agencies and policymaking processes.

Chase and Reveal (1983) discussed the challenges of public management on the basis of Chase's extensive experience in government, especially in large urban agencies. Their depiction of the key challenges in managing a public agency concentrated on those challenges posed by the external political and institutional environment—dealing with elected chief executives who have shorter-term, more election-oriented priorities competing for a place on their agenda; coping with overhead agencies such as civil service commissions, budget bureaus, and general service agencies (for travel, purchasing, space allocation); dealing with legislators (including city councils); and managing relations with special-interest groups and the media.

Although these studies differ in their findings and types of managers studied and in other important ways, they confirm the general observation that public managers carry out their work under conditions marked by constraints and interventions from the political and administrative environment. The form of influence or constraint may vary between mayors, public school superintendents, governors, and middle managers in federal agencies, but it shows up consistently in one form or another. Formal meetings with controlling groups; fire drills; crisis management; phone calls; external demands on time and priorities; and the power of legislators, media, and interest groups—all are indications of the exposure of the public sector manager to the political process and to the administrative structures of government.

Does Context Affect Performance and Behavior?

Clearly, the executives who reported on their experiences in both sectors in the studies just mentioned did not regard themselves as inferior managers. Yet sharper critiques raise crucial questions about whether the public sector context penalizes excellence in leadership or actually prevents it. From his case study of the U.S. State Department, Warwick (1975) concluded that federal executives and middle managers face strict constraints on their authority. Goals are vague. Congress and other elements of the federal system—including many politically appointed executives themselves—adhere to an administrative orthodoxy akin to the old principles of administration. They hold top executives accountable for all that happens in their

show clear lines of authority and accoun-
'e managers have little control over career
pressure to control them to avoid bad
of vague performance criteria, they
outcomes through a profusion of rules
adoxically, this approach fails to exert real
and further complicates the bureaucratic sys-
this drawing upward of authority as "escalation
at an "abdication at the bottom" mirrors it at lower
crats emphasize security and accept the rules. When they
simply "wait out" the executives' short tenure. Top executives
occupy themselves with external politics and public policy issues,
ing any role in developing human resources or organizational sup-
rt systems and processes, and otherwise developing the organization
itself. Warwick cited Downs (1967) pointedly, and his view accords with Downs's and Niskanen's views described in Chapter Ten.

Lynn (1981) and Allison (1983) displayed much less pessimism but nevertheless expressed a similar concern about a performance deficit. Lynn lamented the tendency of many federal executives to emphasize political showmanship over substantive management. He referred to the problem of "inevitable bureaucracy," in which higher levels try to control lower levels by disseminating new rules and directives, which simply add to the existing array of rules without exerting any real influence. Similarly, the report of the National Academy of Public Administration (1986) lamented the complex web of controls and rules over managerial decisions in federal agencies and their adverse effect on federal managers' capacity and motivation to manage.

In addition, the Volcker Commission (1989) reported a quiet crisis at the higher levels of the career federal service. The poor image of the federal service, pay constraints compared with higher pay levels in the private sector, and pressures from political executives and appointees have damaged morale among these executives and increased their likelihood of leaving the federal service. Recruitment to replace them is hampered by the same factors that discourage these individuals. The demoralization and subsequent loss of experienced executives and the difficulties in finding high-quality replacements will likely diminish effective leadership practices in the future.

Surveys of Leadership Practices

A number of studies by government agencies and surveys of government employees that included their ratings of their supervisors have provided

mixed evidence about the quality of leadership in government organizations (National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, 1978; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1979, 2000, 2003). These surveys and studies tend to find that, in general, public sector employees and managers express favorable impressions of the leadership practices in their agencies. Yet the evidence also indicates some public sector problems and a degree of private sector superiority in developing leaders, participativeness of leaders, and some other leadership practices and conditions. For example, the survey reports sometimes compare government employees' responses to comparable responses to surveys of private employees, and a couple of them have found that about 10 to 15 percent more of the private employees give favorable ratings of the supervisors and leadership in their organizations (National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, 1978; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2003). These results coincide generally with some of the concerns about constraints on leadership in government expressed by the authors cited earlier. Yet they also place those concerns in perspective by showing the inaccuracy of overstatements of the problem. Although governments probably do face constraints in encouraging and developing excellent leadership practices, many excellent leaders and managers serve in government.

Attention to Management and Leadership

Although many observers claim that public managers pay insufficient attention to leading and managing their organizations, the evidence clearly shows otherwise, at least in many specific cases. Critics say that public managers show too little attention to long-range objectives and internal development of their organization and human resources. But critics of business management, especially in recent years, complain that similar problems plague industry in the United States and that firms place too much emphasis on short-term profit. Critics also accuse business leaders of concentrating on achieving huge financial returns for themselves, even when the firm's performance lags. These criticisms of businesses and executives make it hard to depict government as inferior.

Moreover, abundant evidence shows that many government managers work very hard. Ammons and Newell (1989) reported that mayors, city managers, and their immediate executive assistants say they work about sixty to sixty-six hours per week. Executives from the private sector who have served in Washington regularly report their impressions of how hard the staff members and executives in the federal government work (Volcker Commission, 1989).

Do they spend much of this time on political gamesmanship, as some critics of federal executives suggest? Consider the city level: several surveys have asked city officials to report on the time they spend in managerial roles (staffing, budgeting, evaluating, directing, and so on), policymaking roles (forming policy about the future of the city, meeting with other city officials, and so on), and political roles (dealing with external political groups and authorities, such as state and federal officials and active community groups, and engaging in public relations activities such as speeches and ceremonies). Ammons and Newell (1989) found that the mayors, city managers, and executive assistants in their survey reported, on average, devoting 55 percent of their time to managerial roles, 28 percent to policy roles, and 17 percent to political roles. As might be expected, mayors ranged above these averages in their concentration on political activities, and assistants paid more attention to management tasks.

Ammons and Newell asked questions about the importance of the various roles to the officials' success. Most mayors placed the greatest importance on the political role, although 23 percent emphasized the managerial role as most important. The city managers emphasized the policy role more frequently than other roles, but they also heavily emphasized management; about 40 percent rated the managerial role as most important. The executive assistants overwhelmingly rated the managerial role as most important. In sum, city officials see themselves as devoting substantial amounts of time to managerial roles.

Similarly, the small sample of federal bureau chiefs in the Kaufman (1979) study noted earlier indicated that they spent much of their time in typical managerial activities, such as motivating the people in their bureaus. This orientation does not square with the complaints that public managers do not manage conscientiously. What explains this distance between various observers and researchers on a key point such as this?

Contingencies and Variations

Obviously, many variations in context and in the individual officials surveyed account for the different views revealed in the preceding section. The bureau chiefs that Kaufman studied tended to be longer-term career civil servants, at levels lower than the short-tenure political appointees who commonly head government agencies. The level of the manager and the institutional context make a lot of difference. As pointed out earlier,

officials vary by elected versus appointed status, level in the agency hierarchy, distance from the political center (such as Washington, D.C., versus a district office, or the state capitol versus a state district office), political and institutional setting of the agency (such as executive and legislative authority in the jurisdiction; weak-mayor, strong-mayor, and council-manager structures at the local level), level of government, and other factors. These variations have great significance. At virtually all levels and in virtually all settings, public managers must to some degree balance managerial tasks with policymaking and with handling the political and institutional environment (oversight agencies, legislative and other executive authorities, clients and constituents, and the media). Yet some managers in public agencies (and in many private nonprofit agencies) face intense challenges of the latter sort, whereas others operate in virtual isolation from political intrusions.

Meyer (1979) provided one of many examples of the effects of the variations and contingencies in the contexts of public managers. He concluded from a large study of heads of state and local finance agencies that those in stronger positions politically—those who are elected or who are career civil servants rather than political appointees—show more ability to defend their agency against pressures for change in structure and against the loss of units to other agencies, apparently because of their greater ability to draw on support from political networks. As another example, Kotter and Lawrence (1974) reported an analysis of the variations in the contexts and behaviors of mayors. They concluded that effective mayors must "coalign" major components of their context. These include the mayors' own personal characteristics (cognitive and interpersonal skills, needs, and values), their agendas (tasks and objectives in the short and long runs), their networks (the resources and expectations of city government members and their relationship to the mayor), and characteristics of the cities themselves (such as size and rate of change). For example, they argue that the mayor's cognitive style must align with the variety and variability of information about the city that must be processed. A technician orientation, emphasizing the analysis of discrete amounts of information, best aligns with a small, homogeneous, stable city, where information varies little and can be analyzed relatively easily. A professional orientation fits a large, heterogeneous city with unstable, hard-to-analyze information. The professional mayor emphasizes using his or her professional judgment and applying professional guidelines and knowledge. Between these extremes, an engineering mayor works best in a large, diverse, stable city where information is highly varied but analyzable. A craftsman most effectively deals with the less varied but less analyzable information in a small but unstable city. This typology draws on Perrow's ideas (1973) about information contingencies of tasks (see Chapter Eight).

Anderson, Newland, and Stillman (1983) also proposed a typology, one based more on a framework akin to Blake and Mouton's managerial grid (1984), described earlier in this chapter. They argued that cities have varied levels of demand for their officials to display either a people orientation or a technical orientation. Growth communities create high demand both for orientations and for a chief-executive-type manager who works for change within regular organizational structures. Caretaker communities demand maintenance of existing services and an administrative caretaker, a leader with a technical orientation. Arbiter communities require much conflict resolution and therefore more of a people orientation than a technical one; a community leader mode of management best satisfies these requirements. A consumption community demands the most public services for the least cost and hence needs an administrative innovator who will follow the direction set by elected council members and seek innovations for the sake of efficiency and service delivery (that is, less emphasis on people, more on technical skill).

Effective Leadership in Government

A growing body of research on effective and innovative leaders in government also breaks away from overgeneralizations about ineffectual managers struggling with an overwhelming political and administrative system. As mentioned in Chapter One, this stream of work has now developed into a genre in its own right. These studies provide numerous examples of innovative, influential, entrepreneurial leaders in government agencies and programs. For example, Lewis (1980) studied Hyman Rickover's development of the nuclear power program in the U.S. Navy, J. Edgar Hoover's impact on the FBI, and Robert Moses's transformation of the New York Port Authority. In each case, Lewis found an organization that was ineffective at achieving the major goals for which it presumably existed until it experienced a process of mentoring by an effective superior. In this process, the superiors developed appropriate goals and learned how to get things done. They then engaged in an "entrepreneurial leap" that changed the organization and its resource allocation in unforeseen ways, and they created an "apolitical shield" that defended their work from political intervention by casting it as nonpolitical and

objectively necessary. Later phases involved struggling for autonomy, reducing environmental uncertainty, expanding the organization's domain, and fully institutionalizing the new organization (with consequent problems of "ultrastability"). Lewis's subjects stand as controversial titans who, through exceptional ambition, energy, and political and technical skill, took advantage of key political and technological developments to build effective organizations.

Other writers have described executives who played major roles in the development of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, major Department of Defense policies, the Social Security Administration, and the Forest Service. Doig and Hargrove (1987) concluded from a set of such studies that the innovative leaders in the public sector displayed similar general patterns. They identified new missions and programs for their agencies. They developed external and internal constituencies for these new initiatives, identified areas of vulnerability, and neutralized opposition. For their new missions, they enhanced the technical expertise of the agency and provided motivation and training for organizational members. The leaders followed a mixture of rhetorical strategy, involving evocative symbols and language, and coalition-building strategy, emphasizing the development of political support from many groups. Some leaders relied on both strategies; some primarily emphasized one over the other.

External conditions set the stage for these activities, according to Doig and Hargrove. The entrepreneurs actually took advantage of the diverse and fragmented governance structures often cited as reasons why public managers accomplish little. The difficulties of strong central control in such a system provided these leaders with opportunities to forge their own direction. They also took advantage of patterns of potential public support (for example, changing public attitudes during the 1930s supported a more active role for the federal government) and new technologies and alliances with elected political officials.

In their personalities and skills, the leaders displayed an "uncommon rationality"—a remarkable ability to perceive effective means to ends. They were able to see the political logic in an emerging historical situation and link their initiatives to broader political and social trends. Doig and Hargrove also stressed the individual's motivation to make a difference, coupled with a sustained determination and optimism. Success depends, however, on the association of personal skills with organizational tasks and with favorable historical conditions, such as public and political support and timely technological possibilities.

Similarly, Riccucci (1995) profiled federal executives who fought heroically against corruption or on behalf of some program or policy to which they were dedicated, often using effective political tactics such as skillful use of the media and expert coalition-building, as well as effective organizational management techniques. Hargrove and Glidewell (1990) brought together authors who have provided biographical descriptions of determined and talented governmental executives struggling with jobs that are, in important senses, impossible. Another important point about the ability of public managers to influence important developments is revealed in studies of policy entrepreneurs (Roberts and King, 1996). This conception of entrepreneurship focuses on people who influence policy, often from outside formal positions, by pressing for innovations in policies and programs. Some develop public support for the innovations, press legislators and administrators for support, and otherwise move the system by taking on a sustained role as a policy champion. Others may play the role of "policy intellectual," providing innovative ideas. As described earlier, public executives and managers can play such roles, but they sometimes face constraints on their independence to do so. They can also act as catalysts and sponsors, providing support, listening, and responding when policy champions with good ideas press for a hearing.

All these studies of entrepreneurship suggest ways we might reconcile the broad observations about indifferent public management with the evidence that many public managers have hammered out significant change. Marmor and Fellman (1986; see also Marmor, 1987), for example, offered a typology of public executives that concentrates more directly on the issue of internal program management and program accomplishment, and suggests key distinctions in leaders' motivation and objectives. They argued that public executives vary in managerial skills and commitment to program goals. Among those with low managerial skills are the *administrative survivors*, who also have low commitment to program goals and provide little effective leadership. *Program zealots* have high programmatic commitments but weak skills and also tend to be unsuccessful administrators. As for those with high managerial skills, *generalist managers* show low commitment to program goals. *Program loyalists*—highly skilled managers with strong programmatic commitments—serve as the most likely candidates for having entrepreneurial impact. Whether or not it is valid and complete, such a typology makes the important point, which should be obvious, that executives and managers in government vary widely in their motivations, energies, skills, and orientations. Such variations explain the success of some and the mediocrity of others, and should constantly remind us of the dangers of overgeneralizing about any category of human being.

Modeling and Measuring Public Management

A very interesting and original recent approach to analyzing public sector leadership and management and variations related to it involves the development of a formal model and efforts to test the model with empirical data. Kenneth Meier and Laurence O'Toole (O'Toole and Meier, 1999, 2011) have developed and tested a model of the impact of public management on organizational performance. One of their focal questions—namely whether or not "management matters"—has been a difficult issue in all management settings for a long time. Some of the major theories of organization, such as population-ecology theory (see Chapter Four), have in some ways implied that it does not matter what managers do. Events out of managers' control may determine organizational success and survival. As for the public sector, many observers have argued that the multiple constraints on managers described in Chapter Three and in this chapter diminish the importance of managers even more than in the private sector. Doig and Hargrove (1990, p. 2), for example, pointed out that Kaufman (1979), in an important study of federal executives, observed that "they make their mark in inches and not in miles" and achieve "modest, incremental accomplishments." Doig and Hargrove illustrate the controversy over this conclusion by presenting a set of biographies of influential, entrepreneurial leaders in government.

O'Toole and Meier (1999, 2011) add to this debate the first explicit and formal model of the influence of public management, and they test it with data from surveys of school district superintendents in Texas. Although not easily summarized and possibly difficult for some readers, the model represents an unprecedented effort to develop such a model and test it with empirical evidence. This model needs attention from people seriously interested in public management.

The model employs concepts and initial assumptions about stabilizing factors and networks in the contexts of public managers:

- The authors posit the presence of stabilizing factors such as hierarchy and formal authority that provide stability, act as a buffer against external shocks, and help to coordinate the efforts of many actors to achieve a common purpose, although stability itself may or may not be related to performance.
- They also posit that public managers must deal with networks of other authorities and groups, particularly those in formation or in flux, which increase complexity and instability in the managerial environment.

- The model treats stabilizing factors (which increase certainty in managerial relations) and networks (that increase structural fluidity and resulting uncertainty) as poles on a continuum.
- *Management* refers to "the set of conscious efforts to connect actors and resources to carry out established collective purposes" (O'Toole and Meier, 1999, p. 510). It involves motivating, coordinating, and providing stability, but also changing structure and exploiting opportunities in the environment in order to improve performance. Multiple actors can share the management task, so management includes the sum of all managerial efforts.

The authors then specify their model of management's impact on public program performance. They begin with a basic system:

$$O_t = \beta_0 O_{t-1} + \epsilon$$

where current performance (O_t) is the result of past performance (O_{t-1}) weighted by a rate of stability (β_0) and a series of shocks to the system (ϵ). Shocks (ϵ) can come from either inside or outside the system. β_0 can range from 0 to 1. A set of stabilizing features, S, such as hierarchical structure, can be distinguished from other sources of stability in B_0, so that B_0 becomes B_1 and the equation becomes

$$O_t = \beta_1 S O_{t-1} + \epsilon$$

The authors also point out that a shock (symbolized by X_t) can get through the organization's buffering system:

$$O_t = \beta_0 O_{t-1} + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t$$

Thus the authors divide ϵ into some shock (X_t) that gets through the organization's buffering system with initial impact (β_2) and a random component (ϵ_t).

They treat management as another input to the system:

$$O_t = \beta_0 O_{t-1} + \beta_2 X_t + \beta_3 M + \epsilon_t$$

with M representing management and β_3 its impact. A management coefficient (β_3) significantly greater than zero would indicate that management matters. In other words, organizational performance at a given time is a

function of performance at an earlier point multiplied by a stability factor, plus a shock to the system multiplied by a factor representing its influence, plus management times its impact, plus the random set of shocks around the system.

O'Toole and Meier then elaborate the model in various ways. For example, management can adopt a strategy of buffering the system by adding to stabilizing features by setting goals, establishing incentives, buttressing the structure, and negotiating contributions from members. Management can also actively exploit the environment for the benefit of the system. If the decision is to buffer the system from the environment, management interacts with the buffering process so that

$$O_t = \beta_1 (S + M_1) O_{t-1} + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t$$

where M_1 is a maintenance function of management—the manager's efforts to add to stabilizing factors. M_2 is the management strategy for interacting with the environment. S is the extent of hierarchical stability. Organizational performance depends on previous performance and the degree to which stabilizing factors such as hierarchy, and the manager's maintenance behaviors, affect performance.

Alternatively, if the manager's strategy is to exploit the environment (that is, not to buffer the system but to try to magnify some of the environmental influences), then

$$O_t = \beta_1 (S + M_1) O_{t-1} + \beta_2 X_t (M_2 / S) + \epsilon_t$$

The first element in this equation, as in the previous one, means that as stabilizing features and the manager's system maintenance actions increase, organizational performance tends to be consistent over time. M_2 is the management strategy for interacting with the environment. When M_2 increases, the amount that is multiplied by the shock factor $\beta_2 X_t$ increases, meaning that the manager's efforts to exploit the shock have increased its influence on organizational performance. So more stabilizing factors and more managerial efforts to maintain the system can enhance performance, and more managerial efforts to exploit an external shock to the system cause that shock to have increased impact on performance.

The Meier and O'Toole model appears quite abstract, and some of us may have difficulty following it. It actually emphasizes some very important roles and responsibilities that managers must consider. Just as important, it leads to empirical findings about the role and importance of public management. Meier and O'Toole (2001) conducted a survey of superintendents of Texas school districts, as noted earlier, and asked them, among other things, about their frequency of contact with school board administrators, business leaders, other superintendents, state legislators, and the Texas education agency. Meier and O'Toole regarded this measure of contact with important stakeholders and authorities as an indication of the superintendents' efforts at managing external networks, which in turn represents M_2 in the model just described, or the managers' efforts to exploit environmental opportunities and buffer the system from environmental shocks. With a variety of statistical tests, they found that this measure of network management showed a strong positive relationship to a measure of organizational performance—the pass rates for the districts on standardized tests that the state of Texas administers to all high school students each year. The statistical analysis included controls for important variables such as resources (for instance, teacher salaries and class size) and constraints (such as low-income students and ethnic minority students). Meier and O'Toole further found that higher levels of networking were associated with increasing impacts of resources on performance and decreasing impacts of constraints. They interpreted these results as evidence that the managers who engaged in more external network management were better able to exploit resources and mitigate constraints. While acknowledging limitations of the measures of the variables, Meier and O'Toole presented these results as a successful effort to analyze systematically the relation between management activities and organizational performance, and to demonstrate that the relationship is positive and that public management does matter.

In still another analysis, Meier and O'Toole (2002, 2008) developed a measure of managerial quality (on the part of the district superintendents) and showed that it positively relates to ten different measures of educational performance. The managerial quality measure is the amount of a superintendent's salary that is not accounted for by a set of variables that tend to influence salary, such as district size, personal characteristics such as education, and others (that is, the quality indicator is the residual of the regression of salary on the set of variables). Again, the results indicate that public management influences organizational performance, and they strengthen the evidence that high-quality public management has a positive influence on performance.

As indicated in the description of the models just presented, Meier and O'Toole predict that stability and managers' maintenance behaviors will enhance organizational performance. This prediction goes

against the grain of much contemporary thought in organization theory and management thought. As described in Chapter Two, the trend has moved strongly toward emphasis on flexibility and adaptiveness in organizations, rather than toward stability. Meier and O'Toole (2006) and O'Toole and Meier (2003, 2011) suggest, however, that stability can have important positive influences on organizational performance, through avoidance of turnover and disruptions, enhancement of valuable experience, and other ways. They provide evidence to support this view by using two measures of personnel stability (the tenure of the superintendent and the retention of teachers) to represent the stability variable in their model. They find that these variables relate positively to organizational performance as represented by pass rates on the Texas standardized tests and by other indicators of educational performance of the school districts.

Practical Lessons for Public Managers

O'Toole and Meier's (2011, p. 276) model and research findings lead them to suggestions about the roles and responsibilities of public managers. Some examples (altered from the originals) follow.

Managers (school district administrators) engage in networking with external stakeholders, such as school board members, local business leaders, state legislators, other district administrators, and the state education agency. The more they engage in such networking, the higher the performance scores for their districts.

The networking can provide benefits through gains in technical knowledge or through enhanced political and public support.

On the other hand, networking has diminishing marginal returns. That is, more and more networking can lead to smaller amounts of gain. Managers need to recognize that at some point, more networking is not necessarily a good thing. This makes sense, because the model reminds us that managers have to manage inward and downward, as well as upward and outward. If a manager spends too much time talking to people outside the organization, it can cut into time needed for taking care of the people and conditions inside it.

Demands from members of the manager's network often come from members who are better established and better endowed. Managerial networking can tend to benefit advantaged clientele more than disadvantaged clientele, so managers need to be sensitive to this tendency.

Managerial capacity, in the form of appropriate and even extra levels of staff resources, can enhance the benefits of networking, and can make the organization better able to deal with external shocks and unexpected problems that come from outside the organization. Building managerial capacity involves trade-offs, however, because investing in it can limit current levels of production.

Stability of front-line workers enhances productivity, especially for programs that affect disadvantaged clientele. Stability of management also enhances performance. As the model suggests, managers face challenges in trying to balance flexibility with stability, but must do so in a way that creates conditions with sufficient stability to support the managers and the members of the organization in getting their work done.

Some of the biggest payoffs for performance come from the development of human capital, or the skills, abilities, and effective attitudes and behaviors of the people in the organizations. Leaders and managers need to find ways to invest in human capital by getting the right people in place and supporting their development.

Some limitations of Meier and O'Toole's model are evident. Their findings represent school superintendents and school districts, which may differ from other public managers and public management settings. There have, however, been successful applications of the model with other populations, such as law enforcement administrators (Nicholson-Crotty and O'Toole, 2004). The measures of the variables have various limitations. For example, do pass rates on standardized tests adequately measure organizational performance? Nevertheless, the explicitness of the O'Toole-Meier model and their empirical tests sharpen these questions and make them salient for further research. Their stream of analyses represents an original pattern of sustained, explicit, systematic analysis of major issues in public management, and in particular of whether public management "matters." Their research provides strong evidence that it does matter and provides evidence of why and how.

Even with all its descriptions and references, this chapter does not fully cover all the research and examples of effective public sector leadership and management. Chapters Thirteen and Fourteen provide more discussion of the leadership of change and of high-performance public organizations. Still, the theories and studies reviewed here provide valuable contributions to the analysis of organizational leadership and to the long-term challenge of developing a conception of public management that recognizes the skills and practices of the many effective managers of public organizations.

Instructor's Guide Resources for Chapter Eleven

- Key terms
- Discussion questions
- Topics for writing assignments or reports
- Class Exercise 5: Considering Fiedler's Theory of Leadership
- Class Exercise 6: Considering the Path-Goal Model of Leadership
- Case Discussion: The Case of the Vanishing Volunteers
- Case Discussion: The Case of Joe the Jerk (Or, Joe the Very Capable Jerk)
- Case Discussion: A Funeral in the Public Service Center

Available at www.wiley.com/college/rainey.


STUDYDADDY
Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor
Get Help