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Acknowledgments and Introduction

This *Public Service Leadership Handbook* is the gradual culmination of what the authors have learned over the last 30 years of doing leadership training, consulting and offering courses for experienced career practitioners. It continues to be a “work in progress”, with sections that are still in the process of completion or revision. But the *Handbook* represents a good starting point for those seeking to develop an understanding of what is unique about senior leadership in the public and nonprofit sectors. For those who have extensive experience, the *Handbook* may serve as a review of what they already know and assist in integrating this knowledge into a more consistent whole.

The *Handbook* is dedicated to the thousands of public servants, citizens and elected officials who have taken the initiative to make their communities better. All acts of leadership do not produce results or results that are good, but without initiative there is no collective action and without collective action, democratic governance is not possible. Effective and vibrant democratic communities require thousands of daily acts of leadership at all levels of the community, both at the formal organizational level and outside organizations in the less formal relationships among citizens. While this *Handbook* focuses on leadership exercised by public servants in the government and nonprofit sectors, much of what is written is equally applicable to leadership in all sectors and throughout all segments of the community.
Chapter I
The Basics of Public Service Leadership

What is Leadership?

Leadership is not something that comes naturally to most of us. This is especially the case in a profession like public service where it is assumed that taking the lead from elected officials, citizens and the hierarchy of accountability is what makes our actions legitimate. But there are other reasons why the mantle of leadership is reluctantly assumed.

At a personal level, leadership requires putting ourselves out front when we may not be confident of what we know, where we are, or with the future direction of events that may unfold. But that is exactly what makes leadership different from followership. Leaders initiate action in the face of uncertainty, ambiguity and potential conflict. They are inspired by a passion for service, possess a vision of the future and are willing to work collaboratively with others to make their vision a reality. Public service leaders at their best inspire others to join a cause larger than themselves and work to transform this cause into a legacy that can be maintained by organizations and institutions long after they have left the scene. They are humble, selfless and wish no personal glory. They seek to make others better than they are by elevating the personal sights of followers from self-serving goals to aspirations that are shared by their fellow citizens.

The burden of this Handbook is to persuade each reader, regardless of formal role responsibility, that the quality of public service requires taking initiative, fostering a shared vision, and having the courage to step forward to enlist the support of those inside and outside the organization to participate in the creation and maintenance of this shared vision. To take
leadership initiative requires an understanding of the multiple leadership possibilities that surround us on a daily basis in our public service work.

**Kinds and Levels of Leadership Opportunities**

Leadership is not reducible to a single set of qualities or sensibilities. In fact, it is more useful to think about the various roles that provide opportunities for leadership to be exercised. For example, at an individual level leadership can be exercised at an interpersonal level when interacting with others. It can also be exercised in one's role as a member of a group or team. While interpersonal relationships are important for successful group and team-work, there is additional knowledge, skills, competencies that come into play when operating in one's role as a member of a team. The same is true when shifting one's focus from a group to the larger organization. In one's organizational role, additional knowledge, skills and competencies are necessary to successfully play a leadership role within an organizational setting. Finally, as one moves to the strategic apex of an organization, the leader becomes responsible for the strategic positioning of the organization within the larger forces at work in the external community. Success over time is dictated by the ability to successfully read the winds of change, to see around the corner, so that the organization is well positioned to deal with the forces of change just over the horizon. When asked upon his retirement what made him so successful as a hockey player, the great Wayne Gretzky replied, “I just tried to skate to where the puck was going to go”. That is precisely what leadership requires, especially at the upper reaches of the organization or within the community. Leadership is the synthetic capacity to size everything up at once and to move in the right direction before knowing for certain that the direction is the correct one.
Individual Leadership – We often hear people say that “leaders are born”, not made. While it is true that some individuals possess the sensibilities necessary for public service leadership (high commitment to service, willingness to take risks, capacity to tolerate conflict and ambiguity, ability to act in the face of uncertainty), it is also true that leadership can be learned. That is why we pay attention to leadership assessments, leadership training, mentoring, and coaching. These activities help us “learn who we are”, but they also help us understand areas we need and are willing to develop. If we are unable or unwilling to develop some capacities for public service leadership, at least we can surround ourselves with the kinds of people and place ourselves in the kinds of settings that are most likely to build on our strengths rather than our weaknesses.

Group/Team Leadership – Increasingly organizations have come to appreciate the value of working in teams and groups to solve a targeted problem. In fact, matrix management is a technique specifically designed to bring the right kind of competencies and sensibilities together to accomplish a given task. Once accomplished, members of the group return to their assigned work units. The success of group/team leadership depends on learning how to use the distinct qualities that each individual brings to the task and to integrate these qualities into a smooth functioning unit that is able to accomplish both the task and social goals necessary to deliver a product on time and on budget.

Organizational Leadership – Successful leadership at an individual or group/team level does not mean that you will be successful at the organizational level. The reasons are probably fairly intuitive to almost everyone. What it takes to move an organization to accomplish its mission requires a different knowledge and skill set than what it takes to motivate at an interpersonal or group/team level. Organizations have to be wired in the right way and staffed with the kinds of
individuals who can accomplish the unique mission of the enterprise. A public health organization posses a different organizational leadership challenge than a Human Resources Unit. What counts for success in terms of organizational structure and staffing are quite different. Being good at one does not insure that someone will be good at the other and neither kind of organizational leadership may have that much bearing on being a good leader at an individual or group/team level. For this reason, leadership requires paying close attention to the kinds of leadership knowledge, skills and competencies we are interested in developing.

**Community/Political Leadership** - Public service leadership at the local level requires some understanding of the larger community context within which one operates. This is true whether you are a first line supervisor of a road crew or the manger of a major department. The difference between the two is that the department manager will be required to participate at a community level in defining, redefining and legitimating the work of the organization. To the extent this is required, to that the extent the manger is exercising community and political leadership. The challenge for those exercising leadership at the higher levels of the organization is to carry out these responsibilities in ways that recognize the appropriate role and responsibility of others in this partnership, especially the County Administrator and elected officials. Acquiring the knowledge, skills and competencies to carry out this shared governance responsibility is the key to success of those who are in a position to exercise community and political leadership.

**Why Public Service Leadership Matters More Than Ever**

The creation of a career public service at the close of the nineteenth reflected a growing recognition that the heavy lifting of democracy requires a stable, highly trained and committed cadre of public servants who can take initiatory leadership to anticipate problems, plan for the
future and bring the best technical competence they can muster to the decision making table in partnership with the elected officials, stakeholder groups and citizens at large. While most of us think of the creation of a professional career civil service as a solution to the problems of political corruption and cronyism, at a more fundamental level public servants were expected to play a central leadership role in the democratic governance process. As early as 1887 while still a graduate student former President Woodrow Wilson called for the establishment of a separate profession of public administration because, as he said, it was getting harder to run a constitution than to create one (Wilson, 1887).

In fact, at the close of the nineteenth century and in the first decade of the twentieth, most of what we associate with modern-day “good government” was put into place through the initiatory leadership of career administrators: professional city/county managers, research bureaus to ensure data driven decision-making, performance-based budgeting, greater accountability to the electorate, such as line item budgeting.

While much has changed over the last century when the profession of public administration was first created, the need for its leadership in the governance process has not. In fact, everywhere we turn, there is a renewed interest in leadership development at every level of society and in all parts of public and private sector organizations. After nearly a decade of emphasis on flattening organizations, we have come to realize that dispersing power and discretion throughout organizations is only as effective as the leadership capacity of the individuals empowered to act. As a result of this recognition books galore have appeared on leadership, probably more in the past few years than have been published in the entire previous decade. Major national foundations like Ford, Kellogg and Carnegie are putting large amounts
of money into leadership development initiatives. Why so much interest in leadership and why now?

The answer in part is that many of our traditional institutions (i.e., families, churches, schools) have lost much of their legitimacy and capacity to help moderate and temper discordant voices. Even formal civic institutions like the Elks Club, League of Women Voters, Chambers of Commerce and similar nonprofit service organizations are struggling to retain the vitality of their organizations (Putnam 2000). At a more formal political level, America’s institutions have equally lost much of their ability to build consensus across socio-economic, class, geographic, ethnic, gender and other divisive lines. The task of building a working consensus is made even more difficult by a globalized economy, a rapidly changing technology that allows us to create virtual realities and to live in gated communities, and, finally, a decline in economic growth. In the face of these conditions, leadership represents the opportunity to bring people together around a commonly shared vision of some larger community good. Within organizations the need for leadership is further fueled by a variety of common trends: structures are being flattened; missions are being re-examined in the light changes in the external environment; and there is increased need to build relationships with other organizations and jurisdictions to get good work done in partnership with others. In short, leadership is needed more than ever to build consensus on what should get done, how, with whom, by whom, and with whom. To better appreciate the leadership role of public servants that will be required in the future, it is important to understand the larger social forces at work that make this role possible and even necessary.

1. Decline in Government Legitimacy – Over the last several decades government and its officials have lost legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry. This decline has been reflected in the successful ballot initiatives in Oregon to restrict taxes, place limitations on land-use planning,
and demands for greater opportunity for citizen input into the decision making process at the front rather than the tail-end of the process. Increasingly, the leadership challenge is to build and sustain the necessary legitimacy so that the work of the organization can get done and be supported throughout the process of policy implementation. This differs from an older time when managers could assume that legitimacy was automatically an outcome of doing the work well. No longer can this simple formula be taken for granted.

2. Decline in the Capacity for Collective Decision Making - Over the last several decades there has been continuing erosion of the capacity of governing institutions to undertake collective decision-making. This loss begins with the emergence of single-issue interest groups, what some have described as “mail-order” groups. These are associations like the Environmental Defense Fund, The National Riffle Association, Greenpeace, the American Association of Retired Persons, and the National Abortion Rights Action League. They organize around a single issue or cause and rely on direct mail to generate financial and political support, both of which are more important than actual active membership or attendance at monthly meetings. These groups do not extract much participative effort.

These single-issue “mail order” groups have important consequences for public officials as well as for citizens. Before he was defeated in the 1980 election, Iowa Senator John Culver observed that “for each narrow, self-defined lobby...the worth of every public servant is measured by a single litmus test of ideological purity. Taken together, the tests are virtually impossible for any officeholder who hopes to keep both his conscience and his constituency” (Drew 1979, 45).

Another major factor that has contributed to the loss of government’s capacity for collective decision making is the plethora of reforms of legislative bodies, including term limits,
open meetings laws, restrictions on the number of support staff, and limitations on levels of staff 
expenditures. Together, these reforms have restricted the ability of legislative bodies to 
accomplish their work through a combination of added overhead costs of decision making and 
reduced capacity to support these more labor intensive processes. Witness the declining capacity 
of the Oregon legislature to act in a collegial and decisive fashion over the last several legislative 
sessions.

Another factor that has contributed to the decline in collective decision making is the 
increasing reliance on the use of the initiative and referendum processes. Initiatives allow the 
citizens to bypass representative government and take issues directly to the people at large 
through a petition process. Over the past thirty years, reliance on the initiative process at a 
national level has increased more than three-fold (Putnam, 2000, 163).

In contrast to initiatives, referendums provide an opportunity for legislative bodies to 
“duck” hard issues and refer them to the people at large for a vote in a general election. The 
cumulative result of both the initiative and referendum process is to reduce the capacity of 
governing institutions to rule - to mediate, to judge, and to choose among competing claims. If 
citizens and legislators can take issues like capital punishment, mandatory sentencing, welfare 
reform, tax and spending limitations and land use planning directly to the voters, it removes the 
need for anyone to make trade-off decisions between more prisons, and less money for early 
childhood health programs or K-12 schools. To take just one example of the consequences of 
the initiative process, consider the results of mandated sentencing requirements for criminals. In 
1994 the voters of California passed Initiative 184 by a 76% landslide margin. This voter-
initiated law required judges to impose a “three strikes and you are out” approach to the 
sentencing of criminals. This law, like others, resulted in significant decreases in funding for K-
12 and higher education and significant increases in funding for prison and related law enforcement. The National Institute of Justice estimated that the costs of mandatory sentencing in California would increase by $5.5 billion per year, on average, for a cumulative additional cost of $137.5 billion over a 25 year period (National Institute of Justice, 1997). This initiative has clearly contributed to California’s current financial crisis. Even if economic growth had continued on the path the state experienced in the last several decades, the dramatic increase in public safety costs would have required some major increases in taxes and/or budget cuts. The initiative and referendum process clearly lead to results that frequently produce unintended consequences and always limit the discretion of elected officials to balance trade-offs among competing claims and strategies for reducing crime, improving education and meeting the social welfare needs of the community.

As elected officials face greater difficulty in setting policy priorities, administrators are frequently left with the responsibility of deciding how to allocate scarce resources among legally required but conflicting legislative mandates. In the face of this challenge administrators must demonstrate the ability to deliver balanced and effective services. Without this demonstration, public trust in government further erodes.

3. Erosion of Mediating Social Structures - The decline in the capacity of America’s formal institutions of governance to undertake collective decision making has been further compounded by a deterioration in a variety of mediating social structures which the framers of the American constitutional order relied on to temper and soften some of the more abrasive dynamics at work in a large commercial republic. Schools, churches and the nuclear family were seen as important mediating influences that would help to transform the pursuit of raw self-interest into a broader and commonly shared longer-term interest in the community as a whole. There is a growing
body of evidence that documents a significant decline in the effectiveness of these mediating social structures. For example, parental involvement with their kid’s education has been eroding for decades. The Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), long the glue that has tied parents to schools, suffered a three-fold decline in membership beginning in the latter part of the 1960s (Putnam, 2000, 57).

The reasons for this dramatic decline are many and they are complicated. But the decline reflects major battles over school policies, including desegregation, local control over curriculum and teachers, and the measurement of performance. Instead of helping to facilitate compromise on intractable community issues, school meetings and associations have frequently served as a common gathering where the sharp edges of community differences are further exacerbated. This leaves administrators in the untenable position of having to make decisions without the kind of preparatory work that was provided in a previous era by mediating school organizations. When the PTA and parent groups can discuss issues, explore options and confront differences, participants get educated, learn how to listen and adjust to new information, and even change their views. Without this practice prior to final decisions by legally elected authorities, confrontation with administrators becomes the *modus operandi*.

The mediating role of churches shows a very similar pattern to that of American schools. Over the last two decades church attendance and involvement in religious activities has fallen by roughly 25-50 percent and church membership has fallen by 10 percent (Putnam 2000, 71).

In addition to the decline in church attendance, there is a growing schism among religious faiths and, especially between those who believe that faith should be at the center of public life and those who do not. The result is heightened ideological differences that get exploited by elected officials to serve their advantage. Whether it is debate over abortion, sexual identity, the
rights of the terminally ill, medical marijuana, or capital punishment, public administrators increasingly find themselves implementing laws that affect a bitterly divided public.

Families, like churches and schools, are also unable to perform the social capital-creating role they once served. This is largely because of the emergence of two-career and single parent families, which leaves less time to engage in neighborhood and community-building activities. “The fraction of women who work outside the home doubled from fewer than one in three in the 1950s to nearly two in three in the 1990s” (Putnam 2000, 194). This has been a contributing factor to the overall decline in civic engagement that has been occurring since the 1970s.

4. Decline in Civic Engagement - The decline in America’s institutional capacity for collective decision-making and the erosion of mediating social structures is accompanied by a large-scale decline in civic engagement of all kinds. Americans today are less inclined to get involved in the affairs of their community than has been the case in the past. Robert Putnam, a student of these phenomena, has devoted the last decade to better understanding the nature and significance of this decline for democratic governance. The decline includes participation in classical political activities as well membership in traditional national organizations and associations. Even those who belong to organizations are less inclined to be active members than has been the case in the past. In the mid-1970s nearly two-thirds of all Americans attended social club meetings, but by the 1990s nearly two-thirds of Americans never do (Putnam 2000, 60). In 1975-1976 American men and women attended twelve club meetings on an average each year. By 1999 that figure had shrunk by a full 58% to five meetings per year (Putnam 2000, 61). Putnam identifies several reasons for this decline in civic engagement, including: 1) increased leisure time devoted to television viewing (20-25%); 2) changes in intergenerational values, with more emphasis placed
on money and personal happiness by those born in the boom years of the 1950s (40-50%); 3) the suburbanization of American cities, which cultivated a spirit of isolation (10%); 4) the need to spend more time and energy at work to maintain our desired standard of living (10%); and 5) a miscellaneous category of unidentifiable influences (10-15%) (Putnam 2000, 284).

What is partially at stake in the debate over civic participation is a question that has divided the country since the early days of America’s founding. Is democracy better off with elected representatives who make decisions on behalf of the citizens or is it better off with more direct and active participation by a constantly vigilant citizenry? Do American’s believe in representative government or do they prefer direct democracy? The answer often seems to be both. We will discuss the reasons for this divided and conflicting set of standards for measuring “good citizenship” in Section VII where we will review the debates between the Jeffersonian model of “civic republicanism” and the Madisonian model of “procedural republicanism”.

The causes for the decline in civic engagement are complex. Some causes stem from changing priorities in what counts for “good citizenship”, while others stem from the erosion of mediating social structures and a decreased capacity for collective decision-making. But the consequences for administrative leaders is the same: it makes their work more difficult. As Robert Putnam observes,

…social capital lowers transaction costs and eases dilemmas of collective action. Where people know one another, interact with one another each week at choir practice or sports matches, and trust one another to behave honorably, they have a model and a moral foundation upon which to base further cooperative enterprises. Light-touch government works more efficiently in the presence of social capital. Police close more cases when citizens monitor neighborhood comings and goings.
Child welfare departments do a better job of family preservation when neighbors and relatives provide social support to troubled patents. Public schools teach better when parents volunteer in the classrooms and ensure kinds do their homework. When community involvement is lacking the burdens on government employees – bureaucrats, social works, teachers, and so forth – are much greater and success that much more elusive (Putnam 2000, 346).

The social and political forces at work in American society over the last several decades clearly have made the work of career public servants more problematic: There is growing ideological dissensus among the population at large (Wildavsky 1988, 753); there is less ability and inclination on the part of the majority of citizens to pay attention to matters of community concern; the field of active citizenship has been abandoned to smaller and more narrowly focused groups of citizens who have very specific agendas; and public decision making bodies have less ability to coalesce around a working consensus. These strains operate against a historical backdrop of divided loyalty with respect to two irreconcilable models for measuring responsible governance. One model emphasizes direct democracy with priority on citizen participation and the other emphasizes an indirect system of representative government with priority on the leadership role of elected officials. In the face of these multiple challenges, public administrators are left with the responsibility of administering programs, planning for the future, and managing the day-to-day affairs of government with the resources available. While this backdrop cannot be changed or very much controlled, the premise of this Handbook is that administrative work can be made easier if public servants better understand their leadership role as agents of democratic governance in partnership with elected officials.
5. Increased Focus on Problems that Cut Across and Between Boundaries - Leadership increasingly requires senior managers in the public sector to spend considerable time and energy laying the groundwork for solutions to problems that cut across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries. An example of this complex process of defining inter-organizational accountability is provided by one of our local government’s efforts to preserve affordable housing in a high growth housing market.

As the jurisdiction continued to expand its major arterial street system, it aggressively acquired privately held parcels needed for widening and realignment projects. During and after construction the jurisdiction was left with parcels of land and houses that needed to be moved or demolished. Traditionally, these surplus properties had been offered to the highest bidder in a public auction. This process insured the taxpaying public the highest rate of return and provided the street fund with the greatest amount of revenue.

Faced with a growing demand for low cost housing, the jurisdiction’s new housing director approached other managers in the organization to generate some organization-wide support in helping the jurisdiction solve its growing affordable housing problem. The transportation director arrived at an obvious conclusion: move surplus houses to surplus land and turn the units over to the housing authority. However, this simple solution was difficult to implement. The transportation staff was known throughout the jurisdiction for its commitment to excellence, for its desire to preserve the integrity of transportation programs, and for its ability to stretch scarce transportation dollars to meet the county's growth needs. To succeed the director was required to broaden the source of staff accountability away from departmental loyalties to encompass a larger accountability for the overall socioeconomic well being of the community.
After several months of discussion led by senior managers, this re-framing of perspectives was successfully accomplished with middle managers and staff.

In addition to creating agreement across organizational boundaries, senior managers in most loosely coupled metropolitan regions are engaged in an almost continuous dialogue with other governmental entities. The objective of this dialogue is to make the local system of fragmented governance work more efficiently and effectively. Within a typical metropolitan region, cooperation and information sharing is essential to the success of local governments and their elected officials. Common examples include: regional transportation, metropolitan area land use planning, open space acquisition, law enforcement, sewer and water service coordination, taxation issues, etc. This level of cooperation and information sharing is not present within the private sector where competition for profit is the dominant paradigm. While some jurisdictions still function to a certain extent on the competitive model, scarce public resources is inspiring even greater levels of cooperation. The following case example illustrates our point.

In one of our local counties, The Board of Commissioners also serves as the governing board of a special sewer district, Clean Water, Inc. This special district is treated under state law as an entirely separate local government. A performance audit of the sewer district's operations recommended that consolidating with the county’s operation would result in better fleet management and maintenance for both entities. This recommendation presented a dilemma for both parties. First, serious customer service problems could arise if the consolidation occurred with the grudging reluctance of the staff. Second, the audit indicated that the savings from the consolidation would exclusively accrue to the special district. In short, the county staff had little to gain and, possibly, much to loose as a result of the consolidation. Without staff support on both sides, the consolidation was not likely to occur.
A critical role was played by the senior managers in both organizations in laying the groundwork for a successful consolidation. They redefined the issues governing consolidation away from narrow organizational efficiency and effectiveness questions of fleet operation to a greater accountability to the public taxpayers as a whole. Since most citizens do not easily make distinctions about what governmental entity is providing what service at a given cost, this kind of accountability to the taxpayers as a whole is an important element in building overall trust in government.

6. Rethinking the role of government: treating citizens as customers – Beginning in the 1970s a combination of developments dramatically changed the landscape for public administration and further exacerbated the problems of exercising administrative leadership. Growing scarcity of public resources, disaffection with government programs, unfunded federal mandates, and ideological shifts away from government and toward the private sector increased the pressures on administrators to justify and legitimate their role in government. Together these developments created what has come to be called the New Public Management Movement (Box, et. al. 1999; Terry 1998) or, less informally, the reinvention of government movement (Osborne and Gaebler 1992; U.S. Executive Office 1993). While it is difficult clearly to separate out the multiple strands of influence that make up this movement, it is important to understand the critical drivers of change that are likely to have an enduring impact on administrative leadership in the decades to come.

There are those who simply wish to free government from excessive bureaucratic red tape that undermines the efficient and effective operation of government programs. For these “anti-bureaucracy” critics (Osborne and Gaebler 1992), the private sector provides useful models for transforming public entities into more responsive organizations. The “antibureaucracy”
critics have relied on private market assumptions to create one stop shopping, to place greater emphasis on customer satisfaction, to push for more outsourcing and contracting-out, to increase internal rewards for high performance, and to develop system-level assessment programs to measure outcomes and performance.

A more far-reaching and fundamental goal of some of the advocates of New Public Management is to transform the relationship among the government, private market economy and the nonprofit sectors. These advocates seek to reduce the absolute size of government by using a combination of the nonprofit and private sectors to deliver service currently being provided directly by the government and by cutting back on the regulatory oversight of the private market economy. This movement began during the Reagan administration when large numbers of traditional blue-collar white voters shifted their political allegiance from the Democratic Party to the Republicans out of sense of disenfranchisement and frustration with large government programs. President Reagan and the Republican Party capitalized on this political shift to create a new focus for the role of government in American life.

There are at least two strands to this shift, both of which have important implications for the way in which we think about and exercise administrative leadership. One strand focuses on enhancing the private market sector by cutting back on the regulatory oversight of the market economy. The espoused goal of these “neocapitalism” proponents (Bellah 1990, 263-264) is to reenergize America’s commitment to private property rights and liberty from government regulation (Ostrom 1990). One of the major challenges of administrative leadership in this period of decreased regulations of the private market place is to find new ways to “encourage, cajole, discipline and exploit the acquisitive passions of the leaders of …industries” in ways that will promote the larger community interest (Rohr 1989, 245).
A second major challenge for administrative leadership that has been created by those who want the government to be run like a business is the preservation of some sense of the difference between citizens and customers. While good customer service is extremely important for building trust and legitimacy, it would be fatal for public service leaders to confuse citizens with customers. Citizens have public rights that need to be protected by laws and structures of authority. Citizens also have public duties that require patient reminders and edification on the part of leaders. While customers have legal rights and duties defined by commercial law, they are different than the rights and duties of citizens that emanate from our state and federal constitutions. In short, citizens are part of a larger governance process compared to customers who are part of a more limited commercial transaction process.

A second major factor that has contributed to rethinking the role of government in American life is the rise in stature of the nonprofit sector, particularly faith-based organizations. During the administration of President George W. Bush, there was a concerted effort to legitimate the right of religious-based nonprofit organizations to receive government funding and serve as a provider of public services. Supporters of this strategy sought to alter the traditional bright-line distinction between secular and religious-based service organizations. The challenge for administrative leadership in this period of renewed interest in nonprofit organizations is to find new ways of encouraging local communities to voluntarily solve complex problems in a manner that honors America’s cherished commitment to religious liberty and toleration.

What Counts for Success

Despite the growing challenges of public service that exist on the horizon, we need to briefly pause and remind ourselves of why renewing our commitment to public service leadership is not only important but worth doing.
**Making Democracy Work** – Leadership initiatives at every level of public organizations and throughout the community add up to visible differences that count. They can be seen and their impacts are frequently immediate. We should not forget that democratic governance began at the local level in the United States and will end at the local level. What happens in their own backyards matters more to the average citizen than what may be happening at the state and national level. In fact, local activities provide an opportunity for citizens to learn what democratic governance means in terms rights and responsibilities. Large countries around the world have recognized this fact and are turning to the United States local governments for guidance. Japan, Korea, Indonesia, and China have undertaken major initiatives to decentralize governance responsibility to local communities. These countries have learned, as the United States has long known, that vibrant democratic communities at the local level are what insures democracy writ large. Administrative leadership plays an indispensable role in making this vision a reality.

**Getting the Organization Right** - We have mentioned above in our discussion of organizational leadership the importance of understanding what makes an organization work, given the mission and the kinds of competencies necessary to carry out this mission. There is increasing pressures on all public organizations to deliver ever-higher levels of service with either the same or even declining resources. This expectation cannot be met without having the organization “wired right”. But what constitutes the “right wiring” is not something, like building a bridge, that can be treated in a formulaic engineering fashion. This is because organizations, unlike bridges, are socially constructed by individuals and members of the external community who have a history that cannot easily or quickly be rewired to get the circuitry needed to accomplish something different than what has been done in the past. For this reason, knowledge of best research and
organizational practices has to be tempered by the extenuating circumstances of “local knowledge and practices”. Knowing the history becomes as important in “getting the organization right” as in knowing the latest research on organizational design.

**Motivating Employees** - Motivating employees is a critical piece of successful leadership. But in the public sector this is complicated by the fact that a large percentage of those choosing careers in public service are motivated by a desire to serve. In short, they are motivated more by the intrinsic rewards of doing a good job than they are motivated by external rewards like better pay and working conditions. Although better pay and working conditions help to remove complaints, they are seldom sufficient to provide positive motivators. In the public sector intrinsic rewards work especially well. For example, research has shown that recognizing individuals within their workgroup for a job well done and doing so immediately does far more good than giving someone a plaque at the end of the year. This means that motivating employees is more a task of first line supervisors and work groups than it is a task for senior managers and department heads (Bright 2005; Perry and Wise 1990).

**Creating Authority in a Power-Shared World** - Increasingly, leadership in the public sector requires the exercise of informal rather than formal authority. This is because (as we discussed above in the section on “Why Public Service Leadership Matters”) too many problems fall through the cracks. Wetlands and watersheds can’t be preserved because they may not be controlled by the same entity. In addition, much of what is needed to promote the community good may be in the hands of civic organizations and the private sector. In short, power and resources needed to promote the public good are shared and problems can’t be easily fenced within the legal boundaries of a given entity. This condition places a premium on leadership that
reaches across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries to create partnerships that leverage resources and power (Morgan, et. al 2008, pp. 290-296, 303-305).

**Building Legitimacy**– Public service requires legitimacy in addition to high quality service at an affordable price. This means that the private sector model is insufficient for measuring the success of public sector leadership. In addition to the private sector standard of efficiency and effectiveness, citizens measure the success of their leaders by additional criteria that include responsiveness, protecting citizen rights, preserving expectations about fair and due process, and maintaining accountability. As a result, public sector leadership requires an understanding of the multiple and competing standards for measuring the legitimacy of government work and the capacity and willingness to educate the community on the need to balance these competing but equally important community values.

Legitimacy, as we argue in the next chapter, reflects the deeply embedded cultural and institutional values within which leaders undertake their work. In the United States we tend to associate legitimacy with one’s legal authority to act within authority delegated by the constitution, a statute, a rule or a court decision. While certainly necessary, this is frequently not sufficient. Many leaders armed with the power of the law have found themselves lacking legitimacy among those over whom they are exercising their leadership. This is because even in the United States, where “rule of law” is the preeminent criteria for legitimacy, we rely also upon a variety of other sources of legitimacy, including expertise, local traditions, cultural norms, and substantive agreement with what is being requested. Legitimacy is a complex mix of procedural and substantive considerations.
Facilitating Solutions to “Wicked Problems”

Wicked problems refer to specific kinds of problems that are distinguished by the following characteristics:

- **Complex** - difficult to analyze and understand all of the interrelated factors
- **Integrated** – the parts are connected and combined
- **Interdependent** – the parts are mutually dependent
- **Indeterminate** – problems and solutions are indefinite, vague, unclear
- **Unbounded** – the problem is not bounded, both physically and temporally
- **Polycentric** – problems do not have one clear causal center
- **Unpredictable** – problems are erratic, random, changeable
- **Intractable** – problems are difficult to deal with or solve
- **Discontinuous** – The factors making up the problem are broken, sporadic, irregular
- **Nonlinear** – Problems undergo change due to unpredictable influences of individual factors

Public sector leaders frequently find themselves dealing with problems with some or all of the above list of characteristics. The most common example of a wicked problem is the need to balance the social, economic and environmental needs to achieve sustainable development. For example, the effort to development new technologies for the generation of clean energy or more self-sustaining agriculture is always filled with uncertainties, unintended consequences, and complex interdependencies among only partially know factors. Problems with these characteristics require leaders who can not only manage complexity, ambiguity and conflict, but they need to be able to create processes where solutions are constantly emergent, never final, and where participants are willing to take part in a journey that does not have a road map and may well not have a final destination. This approach does not sit well for those accustomed to working within a rule of law system peopled by trained experts upon whom we rely for some
sense of finality, whether it is in the courtroom, the hospital, the planning department, or those responsible for hauling away and disposing of our garbage. Because we believe that “wicked problems” are likely to become more common in the future, we have reserved a separate chapter for further discussion of the leadership implications of these kinds of problems.
Chapter II – Public Sector Leadership Framework

The Uniqueness of Public Sector Leadership

Public sector leadership is “getting things done” on behalf of the res publicae. It is fundamentally about the practice of governing for the common good. But this is more easily said than done. Getting things done requires going beyond thinking and talking; it requires a commitment to action. When successful, public service leadership leaves some kind of legacy that is capable of being sustained when the founding leaders have passed from the scene and have left the “field of glory” to those who see “no distinction in adding story to story, upon the monuments of fame erected to the memory of others” (Lincoln, Lyceum Speech, 1838, p. 12). But successful public action – action that leaves a legacy - requires at least the following three distinct sets of activities, which together we call the Legacy Leadership Model: 1. A Process that cultivates engaged followers; 2. A worthy vision that enriches and ennobles shared public values and 3. Continuously legitimating the process and values. First, as a process, leadership must generate the support of followers. Second, the substantive values produced by this leader-follower process must be worthy of celebration. Without this element we may not easily be able to distinguish the leadership of Abraham Lincoln or Martin Luther King on the one hand, from the leadership of Atilla the Hun or Adolph Hitler on the other. Finally, the support of followers in the service of a noble shared set of values needs to be constantly renewed through legitimation. We label these three conditions the Process Dimension and the Substantive Values Dimension and the Legitimation Dimension, each of which is discussed more fully in the sections to follow.
Legacy Leadership I: The Process Dimension – To be successful leaders must be able to create a galvanizing vision, succeed in enlisting the support of ever-larger groups of stakeholders, and, finally, find an organizational or institutional repository to carry and renew the vision as it moves into an ever-changing and uncertain future. Normally, for most leaders this home is the organization or community in which and through which they devote their public service careers.

1. The Creation of a Vision – Creating a vision is not something you do by going into the desert or mountains and returning with a fully developed sense of direction. Vision is not an epiphany or like the Roman goddess of wisdom, Minerva, which arises in full flight like an owl at dawn. Doing the public’s work is a continuous process of engagement, which means that the creation of a vision is done in consort with others over time. The creation of a vision requires public sector leaders to pay close attention to what the community and members of the organization care about and then determining what is possible given the circumstances, the setting and the resources.

Some have likened this notion of vision to being the leader of a jazz band (Depree, 1992). While good jazz bands do not play from a musical script, they are in tune with one another and they make the greatest music when they all play from the same vision. It is the purpose of the jazz band leader to make explicit what is implicit. Under this notion of vision, leaders are “meaning makers”; they are interpreters; they are responsible for capturing and articulating the sense of purpose that is imbedded in what followers are thinking and doing. But in making explicit what may be implicit, leaders play a transformative role in elevating and redirecting the energies of followers to a higher shared sense of purpose.
It is important to remember that the model of envisioning we set forth here is not a one-time event. It is an iterative process that requires continuous testing in the larger community or organizational setting. This testing process shapes what followers think and do, but the reaction of followers provides an opportunity for the leader to reconsider the vision in ways that take into account what has been learned in the testing process. This envisioning model is similar to what courts do in interpreting case law. While the past serves as the basis for judging the present, the goal is to create meaning that will serve as a guide for the future.

2. The Generation of Support – Leadership in the public sector presupposes followership. Vision means little if it does not generate support. But it is important to think about support from a strategic point of view. A wise and experienced public sector leader, Fred Hanson, who served as an Assistant Secretary for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and returned to Portland to head TriMet, likened public service leadership to the captain of a very large oil tanker that needs to be turned 180 degrees to avoid crashing on the shoals. Under such circumstances, you want the majority of the crew to continue stoking the engines and keeping the ship running at its highest efficiency. You don’t want the 60% of the crew necessary to do this to spend much of their time worrying about hitting the shoals. In the public sector at any given time, when you want to change directions, Hanson observed that at least 20% of the organization is not going to believe there is a problem with the direction of the ship. You can always count on this 20% to oppose what you are trying to do. Under these circumstances, concentrate on the 20% who support your change in direction. Once you have these potential supporters on board and have begun to turn the ship, you can begin the process of enlarging the orbit of supporters necessary to make the change in direction you are seeking to bring about. In short, the generation of support is a continuous process that requires a strategic understanding of what
kinds of support you need at each stage of the leadership process. At each stage there are subtle changes that are made to the vision, as the leader sees new possibilities and makes adjustments to enlarge the orbit of support.

3. Institutionalization of the Vision – Visions become legacies only when they are transferred from the individuals who were its creators to organizations and institutions. This is especially the case in the public sector where visions held only by leaders are buffeted by the changing tides of public opinion and the sometimes whimsical outcome of the electoral process. Transferring ownership of a vision to inanimate structures of authority requires perseverance, consummate skills in organizing, and careful effort in selecting personnel who will be the “keepers of the vision”. Think of the difficulties and successes of the Catholic Church over the centuries of its existence as it has struggled to maintain continuity in the face of dramatic forces of change beyond its control. While individual church leaders have exercised significant influence through the force of their personality, the long-term influence of the Church has depended on the ability of individual leaders to infuse their vision into the institutional norms and operating routines of the organization.

Legacy Leadership II: The American Founding and the Substantive Values Dimension

Public service leadership is not only judged by the process of engagement used by leaders to generate the support of followers, but also by the substantive values in the name of which followers are mobilized. What values are deemed appropriate or worthy of support vary from one regime to another and, within a given regime, the values change over time. This is because values are the complex product of a common history that succeeds in imbedding these shared values into the institutions that serve as the carriers of these values through time. The United States, like many countries of the world, can point to a to a precise moment in time where these
values were “writ large” and memorialized as the common reference point from which future leaders take their bearing. For modern Vietnam, it was Ho Chi Minh. For modern China it was Mao Zedong; For the United States it was not a person, but a series of events that are memorialized in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

While there is on-going debate over the meaning of the American founding experience, there is widespread consensus that the primary goal of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution was to create a system of government that would maximize the enjoyment of individual liberty (Arendt, 1963; Douglas F. Morgan, Green, Shinn, & Robinson, 2008). This libertarian focus of the American political system is commonly understood as negative freedom (Berlin 1969), which means freedom from interference, from being pushed around, restricted, locked up” (Held, 1984, 124). This negative approach to liberty has three important implications for understanding the debate over the meaning of administrative leadership throughout the course of American history.

First, one’s definition of “good stewardship” depends largely on the role that leaders need to play in guarding the political system from the chief threats to liberty. Are these threats most likely to come from the abuse of power by government officials? Are they to come from a system that has too little capacity to enforce the laws needed to protect individual liberty from internal and external threats? Or, finally, will liberty gradually be undermined by erosion of the republican spirit upon which liberty itself rests as a result of the corrosive effects of *doux commerce*?¹ In this section we will review answers to these questions, showing how each set of answers creates a quite different framework for thinking about “good citizenship.”

A second implication of the libertarian focus of the American political system is that the public sphere is viewed as quite small and of lesser importance than the private spheres of
economic and civic activity. This results in a truncated view of public life and those who spend time making it work.

The public stage is not regarded as a place where men gather to seek self-understanding and self-enlargement by presenting themselves to others in an open dialogue of thought and action. The citizen is expected to disclose but a fraction of himself to the public gaze… and regard it as entirely legitimate that he will seek to translate his private will into public policy through whatever political instruments are available to him and we assume that he has a right to keep his political opinions and conclusions to himself. Politics quickly comes to be thought of as a distinctly second-order and instrumental activity and occupation, subordinate to the primary concerns of the private life (Schaar 1964, p. 888).

The third implication of the libertarian focus of the American political system is that citizens will spend the most meaningful part of their life engaging in economic activity and participating in voluntary associations. Alexis De Tocqueville was especially struck in his travels across the United States in the 1830’s by the vibrancy and abundance of voluntary associations and the importance they have in facilitating a shared sense of the common good.

[E]verywhere…at the head of a new undertaking count on it that you will perceive an association in the United States….The free institutions that the inhabitants of the United States possess…recall to each citizen constantly and in a thousand ways that he lives in society. At every moment they bring his mind back to [the] idea that the duty as well as the interest of men is to render themselves useful to those like them…. Sentiments and ideas renew themselves, the heart is enlarged and the human is developed…[through participation in these associations](de Tocqueville, 2000, pp. 489, 488, 491).

He was also struck by the vibrancy, turbulence and uncertain nature of economic life in the United States where “nothing is more great or more brilliant than commerce: it attract the attention of the public and fills the imagination of the multitude; all energetic passions are
directed towards it…not only for the sake of the profit it holds out to them, but for the love of the constant excitement occasioned by that pursuit (Heffner edition, 215)” The soul clings to the objects of commerce. “[I]t dwells upon them closely and day by day, till they at last shut out the rest of the world and sometimes, intervenes between itself and Heaven” (Heffner 212).

We have come to appreciate over the last 150 years that not all associations or economic enterprises are equally salutary to the public good, especially in an age of technology where advocacy groups can be created and multiplied without ever “enlarging the heart” and where the globalization of the economy produces enterprises that have no stake in the well-being of the local community in which they reside. These developments have important implications for administrative leadership. It means that leaders can’t afford to do their work without the ongoing active support of civic associations and businesses in the market economy. But it also means that leaders need to have the discriminating judgment, first, to determine what work is best left in the hands of each sector and, second, which set of cooperative hands in the civic and market sectors are most to be trusted for developing enduring partnerships.

The libertarian focus of the American founding not only requires leaders who understand and honor the respective roles of the three sectors (government, nonprofit, and market), but it also requires leaders who understand the kind of “balancing role” they need to play in making the system as whole work. One of the best entrée’s to developing this understanding is the debates surrounding the American founding. The Framers struggled with the practical and unfolding problems of trying to design a system that strikes a successful balance among the contending forces that could sink the democratic ship of liberty. In the sections that follow, we will review the successive attempts to accomplish this task by “applying the lessons learned” from previous unsuccessful efforts.
The King George Problem: Checking Excessive Government Authority

The American Revolution began with the Boston Tea Party and the mantra “No taxation without representation.” This mantra reflected deep-seated unhappiness with King George and the perception that he was exercising arbitrary and capricious power. To correct this abuse, the colonists not only declared their independence from Great Britain, but they created a corrective against the future tyrannical abuse of executive power by concentrating governmental power in the popularly elected legislative branch (New York remained an exception with strong powers reserved to the executive branch) (Thach 1969, chapter 2) and making sure this branch did not have the most feared powers: to tax and make war.

Under the new Articles of Confederation there was no tax base, no executive agencies or judiciary. The absence of a tax base meant that there was no way to pay off state and national debts from the war years and no way to sustain a costly and lengthy war. And any taxes that were levied against the states rested on voluntary compliance. The Articles were equally stingy in developing a centralized capacity to conduct a war. The reluctance to create and fund a standing army was a source of great frustration to General George Washington, who, as head of the Continental Army, reported directly to the Congress as a whole and depended on volunteers who enlisted for a limited tour of duty at relatively low and uncertain pay. During many battles, members of the Continental Army stood alongside local militia units that operated independently of the Continental Army. The financial responsibility for providing pay, food, shelter, clothing, arms, and other equipment to specific units was assigned to states as part of the establishment of these units.
The George Washington Problem: Making Government Effective and Efficient - The inability of General Washington to acquire the necessary arms and supplies during the Revolutionary War demonstrated the need for unity of command operating within a stable system of government operations staffed by full time employees with expertise. It was nearly impossible to conduct coordinated battle under the superintending authority of the Articles of Confederation, which gave this responsibility to a committee. Unity of command and the need to conduct the affairs of government with energy, with dispatch, with competence and with efficiency were the lessons learned from the Revolutionary War experience. Undertaking diplomatic relations with foreign nations also suffered from this lack of unity at the center.

The Shay's Rebellion Problem: Protecting Minority Rights - An important longstanding governance tradition relies on the libertarian foundations of the American political system to argue that citizens have the wisdom and decency to govern themselves and that government needs only to stay out of their way (Brinkley, et al., 1997). This libertarian view relies on private social institutions and the market economy to protect individual liberty and maintain social order.

Alexis de Tocqueville was struck by this libertarian quality of American life in his travels across the United States in the 1830’s. "Americans of all ages, all conditions, all minds constantly unite. Not only do they have commercial and industrial associations in which all take part, but they also have a thousand other kinds: religious, moral, grave, futile, very general and very particular, immense and very small” (Tocqueville, 2000, p. 489). De Tocqueville believed that this active associational participation among American citizens was due to "the extraordinary fragmentation of administrative power", which requires citizens to gather with others to meet their personal needs and solve common problems rather than rely on the government (de Tocqueville, 2000, p. 494).
De Tocqueville believed he was witnessing the formative stages of an entirely new social order that had never existed in previous history, where the cohering glue was provided by people taking control of their own liberty without any seemingly direct influence of formal governing authority. Instead, the cohering forces of society seemed to be operating informally as a result of the free association of individuals exercising their liberty to engage in commerce, practice their religion and join with other like-minded individuals to share beliefs and advocate causes within a rule of law system.

This libertarian model has gathered renewed support from many contemporary civic-minded libertarians who are advocating a return to the Tocquevillian ideal that is “egalitarian,” “individualistic,” “decentralized,” “religious,” “property loving,” and “lightly governed” (Barone, 1996). This ideal assumes that many of the functions performed by the government can be transferred to the multicolored cloth of voluntary associations.

One of the weaknesses of the Tocquevillian ideal was prominently on the minds of the Founders during the debates at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. The excesses of popular government soon manifest themselves as state legislatures bowed to the majority pressures of the debtor classes to suspend contract obligations in the face of severe war-induced inflation. Many realized that such actions undermined the kind of long-term certainty necessary for economic growth and development. By the time of the call for a Constitutional Convention to revise the Articles of Confederation, there was considerable sentiment favoring checks on the unrestrained power of the populace. This sentiment was reinforced by the wartime experience of attempting to conduct coordinated battle against the British with an all-powerful legislative branch.

The specter of Shay’s rebellion hung in the background of the founding debates. The Framers were keenly aware that the free association of individuals in civil society and the
The private market place can result in “tyranny of the majority” expressing its will through an unchecked legislative majority. This fear guided the Framers’ thinking in constructing a system of checks and balances, separation of powers and designing other strategies that would confound, confuse and check the ability of tyrannous majorities to organize and act to achieve their goals.

According to James Madison, the single most important safeguard against tyrannous majorities was to “enlarge the orbit” by expanding the geographic boundaries of the U.S. and encouraging unfettered access to the development of its resources. This model of a large commercial republic has provided the basis for the rise of “interest group liberalism” (Lowi, 1979, pp. 50-63) with the attendant problems of “bowling alone” (Putnam, 2000).

The civic republic tradition argues that strong and safe government is only possible if it is nurtured by three sets of conditions, one having to do with geography, one having to do with the complexity of the “business of government” and one having to do with the character of the people themselves. First, the Anti-Federalist antagonists continually reminded their Federalist colleagues that liberty could not be maintained over a large and extended territory like the United States. This was because a large and bountiful territory would require a large standing army to protect the frontiers from invasion by greedy and envious foreign powers. A standing army would be costly to maintain and eventually would develop a will of its own that would endanger the liberty of the people. For these reasons the Anti-Federalists defended a federal system that preserved states as the more important governing unit for meeting the basic needs of citizens.

An important part of the civic republican argument of the Anti-Federalists was a long-standing fear that is reflected in Lord Acton’s famous observation that “power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (Acton Institute; originally appeared in Letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, 1887). Another version of this fear is captured by Michel’s “iron law of
oligarchy” (Michels, Paul, Paul, & Lipset, 1968, p. 224), which argues that the self-serving goals of leaders displace the goals of the organization the longer they hold office. This perspective argues in favor of short and limited terms of office, keeping the business of government simple such that, in the words of Andrew Jackson, “the duties of all public offices are, or at least admit to being made, so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance”(Richardson, 1896, p. 448).

Finally, the civic republic model requires the right kind moral character among the citizenry. The Anti-Federalists worried that the energies of the people in a large commercial republic would be mobilized to increase trade and commerce in the service of what Patrick Henry in the Virginia ratifying convention characterized as “grandeur, power and splendor,” rather than in guarding their liberties. “Those nations who have gone in search of grandeur, power and splendor have also fallen a sacrifice, and been the victims of their own folly. While they acquired those visionary blessings, they lost their freedom” (Storing & Dry, 1981a, p. 214). Needed most was a vigilant temperament, and this was thought to exist especially among those in “middling circumstances,” who “are inclined by habit, and the company with whom they associate, to set bounds to their passions and appetites.” The substantial yeomanry of the country were thought to be “more temperate, of better morals, and less ambition, than the great” (Storing & Dry, 1981a, p. 158).

In summary, the civic republic tradition of government places a high value on individual liberty, to be sure, but this is nurtured “within the fabric of a relatively small and homogenous community whose citizens operate according to a shared moral code and a respect for social norms” (Brinkley, et al., 1997, p. 93). The civic republic tradition recognizes the “strong” role of government in protecting the liberty of the citizens. However, the power and authority of the
government is “less trustworthy the more it [is] dissociated from the participatory practice of local politics” (Wolin, 1989, p. 188). But the chief danger of the civic republic model is that it provides little protection against popular mobs like Shay’s Rebellion and, more generally, majority tyranny, which we will discuss further in the next section n.

The Bowling Alone Problem: Ensuring an Engaged Citizenry - The founding deliberations were significantly shaped by the Anti-Federalists who argued against a strong central government, especially one which encourages the private pursuit of material gain and is dependent on a professionalized cadre of experts. Such a government would tend to discourage civic engagement. Once ordinary citizens become disengaged and started to “bowl alone”, this would undermine the kind of eternal vigilance needed to prevent government from pursuing grand, glorious, costly and elusive adventures at home and abroad and producing policies that disproportionately advantage the few at the expense of the many (Storing & Dry, 1981a, 1981b).

This Jeffersonian model of democracy emphasizes the importance of decentralized government, with a focus on local face-to-face governance where people take personal responsibility for decision making and policy implementation rather than depending entirely on career experts to do the public’s work (Box, 1998). In its extreme form, this model is similar to direct democracy (in contrast to representative democracy), which is found in small geographic areas, such as the New England town meetings, local neighborhood associations, or is represented by co-produced public services in local government (i.e., community policing). This Jeffersonian vision has occasionally captured the hearts and minds of a national constituency and taken on the characteristics of a movement. This has occurred at several key points in American history, starting with the Jacksonian revolution in the 1830’s which introduced the principle of “rotation in office” as an antidote to rule by the rich and privileged elites. It resurfaced during the
Populist era during the 1890s as the initiative, referendum, recall, the “long ballot”, civil service reform, regulatory control over corruption and nonpartisan elections were popularized. During this period the Pendleton Act was passed. The Act created a merit system for the appointment and promotion of career public servants. Reformers argued that such a system was needed to counter the corruption of the principle of “rotation in office”, which had deteriorated into the “spoils system” that rewarded individuals for their loyalty to various kinds of ruling elites. The Jeffersonian model resurfaced once again as an important influence in structuring the implementation of President Johnson’s antipoverty programs in the 1960’s and more recently has been a galvanizing force for the anti-tax revolt in the west and the Tea Party movement in the 2010 congressional elections.ii

These contending arguments about what was needed to secure liberty against a multiplicity of dangers resulted in a complex system of government that confounds the meaning and requirements of “good leadership”. In the dual desire to control against both the tyranny of the majority and to ensure an energetic government, the framers sought to have the best of both worlds. The establishment of three branches of government (the U.S. Senate, The Presidency, and the Supreme Court) would attract those with more experience and give these individuals the independence to exercise judgment without fear of immediate retribution by voters at the polls. To control for too much power at the center and to ensure that government rested on the consent of the “governed”, the rule of experts was tempered by reliance on regular elections, the enumeration of government powers, the development of a system of checks and balances within a federal system and the adoption of a Bill of Rights.

We have summarized this complexity in Table 2:1 below. The left-hand column lists the source of danger to liberty. The middle column summarizes how each of the dangers was dealt
Table 2:1 How to Address the Multiple Threats to Individual Liberty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Danger to Liberty</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Leadership Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrary abuse of power by government officials: “The King George Problem”</td>
<td>• “Rule of Law” prophylactics such as the Bill of Rights</td>
<td>• Reliance on representative democracy with citizen control exercised through periodic elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Separation of powers</td>
<td>• Reliance on the “auxiliary precautions” of formal legal structures &amp; processes, which reduce citizenship demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Checks and balances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Federalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong representative government &amp; frequent elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited and enumerated government powers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak, incompetent and fickle government: “The George Washington Problem”</td>
<td>• Strong executive branch</td>
<td>Creation of mediating structures that reduce dependence on highly active and knowledgeable citizenry (i.e., Senate chosen by the states, court with life tenure, president elected by an electoral college with no term limits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reliance on experience &amp; expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Separation of powers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Checks and balances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Structural incentives to encourage continuity in office &amp; independent and informed judgment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Tyranny: “The Shay’s Rebellion Problem”</td>
<td>• Structural checks and balances, both internally in the government &amp; externally in the socio-economic setting</td>
<td>Reliance on a procedural democracy which places few demands on citizens except to pursue their own interests within a limited legal framework that protects rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foster a large commercial republic that would create a multiplicity of interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bill of Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged citizens and loss of republican virtue: “The Bowling Alone Problem”</td>
<td>• Small, simple and limited government</td>
<td>Reliance on a civic republic where small, local and direct democracy is sufficient to address the major problems faced by citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large representative body composed of the “those in middling circumstances”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constraints on the “emergence of a large commercial republic”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with by members of the constitutional convention. The right-hand column summarizes the implications of the solutions for democratic citizenship. As Table 2:2 suggests, the framers produced two models of “good citizenship”, which have been characterized as the “procedural
The contrasting characteristics of these two models are summarized in Table 2 (Morgan, et al., 2008, p. 53).

Table 2:2 “Good Leadership” Traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins</th>
<th>Civic Republic Tradition</th>
<th>Procedural Republic Tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anti-Federalists</td>
<td>• Federalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• small republic agrarian tradition</td>
<td>• interest group pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>• face to face communication</td>
<td>• reliance on indirect representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasis on substantive equality</td>
<td>• reliance on procedural equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasis on substantive agreement and consensus</td>
<td>• emphasis on voting and majority rule principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community good is socially constructed</td>
<td>• community is a legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasis on action, i.e., doing things together, rather than getting formal agreement</td>
<td>• emphasis on procedural fairness with open access and right to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasis on importance of place</td>
<td>• rule of law orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reliance on indirect representation</td>
<td>• emphasis on rights over duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership requirements</td>
<td>• high level of deliberative skills</td>
<td>• voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• development of relevant knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>• heavy reliance on interest group participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• personal participation</td>
<td>• opportunity for individuals to advise and counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• citizen ownership and control of decision making</td>
<td>• heavy reliance on elected officials and career administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating criteria</td>
<td>• degree of participation</td>
<td>• electoral oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• degree of citizen control</td>
<td>• due notice of important decisions and open access to decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sense of ownership of both process and outcome</td>
<td>• opportunity for a “hearing” &amp; right to be heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• procedural fairness in gathering and assessing information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Tables 2:1 and 2:2 suggest, for the Founding generation, the role of citizens in promoting the public good was problematic because each of the four sources of danger to liberty
could not be corrected without making the other problems worse. There was an irreconcilable four-way tension among the need for government competence, popular sovereignty, the preservation of minority rights and an engaged citizenry. For the Federalists, too little governmental power at the center and majority tyranny were far more deleterious to the public interest than the Anti-Federalists’ fear of too much power at the center and lack of a spirited and engaged citizenry. In the next section we use the libertarian focus of the American founding to create four models for describing the relationship between citizens and their political leaders.

To summarize, for the founding generation the public interest was problematic because each of the three major sources of danger to liberty could not be corrected without making the others worse. There was an irreconcilable four-way tension among the need for government competence, popular control, and the preservation of minority rights. For the Federalists too little governmental power at the center and majority tyranny were far more deleterious to the public interest than the Antifederalists’ fear of too much power at the center and the lack of a vigilant citizenry. The dilemmas of the founders are perhaps best summarized in the following beatitudes:

The Founding Beatitudes

Too much power begets usurpation, to which majority rule is a corrective;
Too much majority rule begets majority tyranny, to which separation of powers and checks and balances is a corrective;
Too much separation of powers and checks and balances begets incompetent government, to which unity at the center is a corrective.
Too much unity at the center begets usurpation, to which an engaged citizenry is a corrective.
Legacy Model and The Balancewheel Role of Administrators

There are important leadership implications that emerge from the American founding experience. If leaders are to be good stewards of the public interest, they need to assume personal responsibility for maintaining a balanced system of democratic governance, where each of the four dangers to democratic liberty is given equal weight. Too much energy at the center without adequate citizen oversight and participation becomes problematic. So does too much citizen participation, especially if it jeopardizes the expectations of efficiency/effective and protection of rights. All four of the values that emerge from America’s libertarian foundation help to legitimate the work of government and all four have to be kept in balance. This task cannot be successfully performed without administrative leaders playing an active stewardship role.

In figure 2.3 below we present a pictorial summary of our Balancewheel leadership model. It is grounded in the problematic tension that is inherent to the American constitutional system. The tension arises from the four inversely related problems that present grave threats to a regime of ordered liberty. They are inversely related in the sense that an increase in correctives for one problem tends to make the other problems worse. Again, the problems include the following: (1) The threat of too much power in government, making it less responsive to the people and more inclined toward executive tyranny—the “King George Problem”; (2) The threat of too little power in government, making it weak and feckless, as illustrated under the Articles of Confederation—the “George Washington Problem”; (3) The threat of a tyrannical
majority to the rights of a minority—the “Shays’ Rebellion Problem”; and (4) the threat to civic capacity and self-government posed by a system that ignores or downplays civic virtue—the “Engaged Citizen Problem.”

The founders tailored correctives to each of these threats, and these spawned distinct administrative traditions that have evolved through important political eras (see Morgan, Green, Shinn, Robinson 20089, chapter 4) and are now thoroughly woven into the fabric of American governance. These traditions are briefly summarized as follows:

1. The correctives for the “King George Problem” prescribe more direct responsiveness to the people, more deliberation and openness, popular initiatives, privatized alternatives, and smaller, weaker agencies for carrying measures into effect. We have dubbed this set of prescriptions the “Responsive Governance Tradition.”
2. The correctives for the “George Washington Problem” prescribe competent, unified, energetic governance; effective career professionals; efficient customer service, contracting out, and systematic planning. We have dubbed this set of prescriptions the “Competent and Energetic Governance Tradition.”

3. The correctives for the “Shays’ Rebellion Problem” prescribe enumerated rights, strong legal protection of those rights against overbearing majorities, due process and equal protection standards, individual and interest-group access to decision makers, interest-group balancing, appeals and other accountability protocols, and open-government standards. We have dubbed this set of prescriptions the “Minority Rights and Access to Governance Tradition.”

4. The correctives for the “Engaged Citizen Problem” prescribe enhanced opportunities for citizen participation, cultivation of conditions to support participation, co-production of public decisions and services, face-to-face interaction in governance processes, local control, and small, frugal venues and jurisdictions. We have dubbed this set of practices the “Civic Governance Tradition.”

Public administrators today may favor one administrative tradition over the others, but the more they emphasize it, they are likely to be confronted by problems that require corrective practices from the other traditions. Figure 2.3 presents the main features of each administrative tradition as it has evolved and arranges them as cells on a balancewheel. Each cell contains elements that have accreted characteristics of various historical eras as legacies that now represent significant aspects or tools of administrative practice for that tradition. As a graphic illustration, the cells may appear more distinct or separate from each other than is reflected in everyday life. The cells overlap slightly as a reflection of this reality. Moreover, all of the cells
are joined to an anchor at the base of the model, reflecting the pervasive impact of pluralism and federalism upon the entire American governing system. This is James Madison’s “double security” against tyranny. The practices of each administrative tradition are affected by the diversity of factions and the interplay of multiple sovereignties at the state, federal and tribal levels, which present additional coordinative and mediative challenges.

**Some Leadership Implications of The Legacy Balancewheel Model**

The balancewheel model has several leadership implications that go beyond what is explicit in the title, namely, maintaining a balance among the values needed to maintain a regime of ordered liberty. First, the model presents a handy way of organizing and understanding a wide variety of leadership practices commonly found in public administration. Second, the model reminds administrators of their need as leaders to respect the role that the nonprofit and market economy play in maintaining a regime of ordered liberty. Third, the model emphasizes the importance of taking “institutional approach” by public leaders in initiating change. Finally, the model takes into account the “fused power” models of government that frequently in local governments and special districts, especially where city manager systems are in place. Such systems rely more heavily on the role of leaders to maintain “systems balance” than deliberately created separate governing functions that are intended to serve as organizational counterbalances. The familiar, intimate, and often parochial nature of local control and face-to-face governance processes are obliged to be counterbalanced by the more inclusive (and intrusive) standards and practices of the rival administrative traditions, which are discussed in more detail in the next section.
Administrative Leadership Traditions.

1. Administration as Interest Group Balancing: The Madisonian Legacy - The legacy of political pluralism derives from James Madison's view that a multiplicity of interests in the economic and social spheres is the best check against tyranny of an overpowering majority. As Madison observed in the *Federalist Papers*, "The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of government" (Rossiter 1961, number 10, 79). This pluralist legacy is alive and very much well in the modern administrative state. Everywhere we turn, organized interests are at the administrative doorstep, sometimes seeming to paralyze decision-making processes. Pluralism assumes that political interests predominate in all aspects of policy making and implementation. Good administration under this legacy consists of creating the circumstances for gathering together interests on an issue and then maintaining the discourse until common agreement and action is possible. Compromise and trade-offs are assumed to be both possible and morally necessary.

The pluralist model works best when interests are well developed, when these interests are securely attached to stable groups in larger society, and when the issues under discussion are well understood. This model is particularly effective in reconciling differences but it is not well suited in conditions of strong ideological differences, or to optimize the best use of resources, or the effective achievement of a given set of objectives, or at resolving problems that are fundamentally technical.

The pluralist model has several characteristic disadvantages. Since the model starts with the status quo, it neglects interests that aren't well organized; it is not always well suited to
planning for long-term needs; and it frequently results in inefficiencies through overlap and duplication of efforts and programs.

2. Leadership as Rational Planning: The George Washington Model Legacy - The story of George Washington at Valley Forge is the story of the failure of government to carry out its assigned work efficiently, effectively and energetically. In short, it is a story of incompetent government; one not up to the task of achieving the goals it was assigned. Over time, the continued failure “to deliver the goods” is a recipe for the erosion of popular confidence and support. This is a message that has been repeated throughout history, including the recent call to “reinvent government” in order to make it perform more efficiently and effectively.

The Rational Planning model emphasizes the importance of expertise and careful planning as the basis for policy development and implementation. This model works at its best when problems are technical in nature, where there is agreement on the task to be performed, and when the experts needed to address the problems are available and seen as legitimate. This model works much less well in solving problems that are fundamentally political in nature and when the nature of the expertise needed to solve the problems is in dispute. For example, the Rational Planning Model is much better at fighting wars than in solving problems of racism, poverty and economic inequality.

3. Leadership as Entrepreneurialism: The Hamiltonian Legacy - There has been a long-standing belief dating back to the days of Alexander Hamilton's Report on Manufacturers that public service work can and should be run more like business. That is, agencies and organizations have purposes that can be expressed as goals. Further, the model assumes that public goals are well represented by individual interests. To the extent this is true, then the achievement of these goals is merely a matter of adhering to best management practices. The
regulation of the economy by the Federal Reserve Board’s manipulation of interest rates is a good example of this model at work.

   Competition, choice, and measuring effectiveness by client satisfaction are the core values of the Entrepreneurial Model. Privatizing, contracting out, or delivering services through non-profits or private sector organizations may sometimes be the most effective way for the public sector to achieve these values. Good administration under the Entrepreneurial Model is the work of the strategic apex of the organization: determining the goals, values and principles that will guide organizational work and then controlling the work based on market responses. The current Reinvention of Government Initiative, or what some refer to as the New Public Management Movement, embodies these private market place principles.

   The Entrepreneurial Model works best when goals are clear and stable, when the goals at the level of society are amenable to individual choice, and where institutions are well arranged to surface market response. The model is not well suited when society is required to act against individual interests (as is the case of racism, pornography, violence, etc.), or when problems need attention long before self-interest will motivate any individual to action (as in the case of pollution), or when there are public benefits that no single person can afford (such as defense), or where there are public benefits larger than what individuals are willing to pay for (as in the case of education), or where “natural monopolies” make private competition very highly inefficient (as in the case with public utilities).

4. Leadership as Community Building: The Jeffersonian Legacy - The Civic Republic Tradition, especially the Antifederalist legacy we have discussed in earlier sections of this chapter, best captures the essential features of the Community Building Model. It emphasizes face-to-face communication and assumes that extreme differences among individuals and groups
can be bridged. This assumption places considerable weight on facilitation, conflict resolution and dialogic democracy. The role of administrators under this model is to gather people together, to transform sharp positions into a common agenda, to give voice to this agenda, and to develop the necessary support over time to realize the common vision.

The communitarian model works best when the groups and individuals involved have a history of working together through time and over issues, where the politics of today are seen through a history of past work and an expectation of future work together, and when individuals are rooted in society such that there is a real expectation by those involved that individuals will have to be accountable for what they say and do. This model is poorly suited to settings where the participants are transitory, where there is no common past or future that is shared in common, and where an issue can be shifted to another venue or authority.

Figure 3.2 below summarizes the four major administrative leadership models that have emerged from America’s unique political history. We will return to these models at various times in the remaining chapters that follow. If there is a lesson for career public servants from this historical legacy, it is a recognition that public sector leadership involves more than a commitment to a set of personal ethical values, more than holding true to some ennobling vision, and more than inspiring others to follow. Public sector leadership is about balancing competing needs, values, and priorities within a “rule of law system” characterized by representative democracy, finely divided power among competing branches of government, and federalism. In short, it is about making the American systems of constitutional government work as a legacy for posterity. For those in the public sector, leadership is inseparable from governance.

**Leadership Responsibilities Toward the Nonprofit and Market Sectors.** The balancewheel model not only has personal implications for the kind of leadership
skills that administrators need to acquire to be true to the stewardship responsibilities, but the model has implications for the way in which administrators interact with the non-profit and market sectors of the political economy. The private sector is normally associated with activities related to the market economy and the free enterprise system. The nonprofit sector refers to the vast array of voluntary associations that includes more than 400,000 member-serving organizations like social clubs, business associations, labor unions, political parties and member cooperatives. The sector also includes approximately 1,200,000 public-serving organizations like churches, social service providers, political action agencies and funding intermediaries (Salamon 1999, 22). The U.S. Internal Revenue Service has 27 separate categories that are recognized under the U.S. Tax Code as deserving status as a tax-exempt nonprofit organization (Salamon 1999, 9).

Despite our commonly accepted view that the public, private and nonprofit sectors are distinctly separate spheres of responsibility, the lines are not always clear and there is certainly a profound influence of one on the other. For example, what constitutes our notion of freedom in the private sector is the product of the interplay of public, private and social sector activities that shape both the beliefs that we carry around in our heads as well as the conditions that govern our ability to act out these beliefs in practice.

[W]e normally enter public life in midstream, seldom at the beginning....Public problems arise in relation to some organized pattern of human action, some pattern of practice....The conditions of freedom in modern society thus depend not only on the rational consistency of law, but on...a variety of organized, coordinated performances. Whatever the number of competing firms, the “standard practices” -- of the medical system, the housing system, the agricultural system, the educational system, -- are not discretionary goods and services, produced by the market in response to the varying nuances of consumer demand.
They are, rather, structured processes, products of an evolutionary collective process of rational analysis. The justification for such rational enterprises is not so much that they reflect individual will, but more that they represent a sustained effort to reduce the degree of arbitrariness in the provision of an important service....Such enterprises belong to the public life of liberal society, and their claim to rationality, like that of the law itself, is a proper subject of public scrutiny, in the light of basic liberal values. (Anderson 1993, 98-9, 104-5)

The balancewheel model emphasizes the complex interplay of public, private and nonprofit sector activities and the mutual interdependence of one on the other. An institutional approach also reminds us that the delivery of public goods and services is not limited to what government does. Both the private and nonprofit sector participate in providing public services, even more than in the past as a result of contracting out public services and transforming some public activities into entrepreneurial undertakings that resemble the private sector. The lines among the sectors are becoming increasingly blurred, which increases the importance on the part of public administrators of understanding what each sector is uniquely suited to do well. Figure 2:4 below summarizes the common characteristics that are frequently associated with each sector.

Two different groups of scholars, coming from quite different premises, have criticized the utility of maintaining the “bright-line” distinction implied by the summary of sector characteristics in Figure 2:4. One group approaches sectoral distinctions from an economic perspective and the logic of the private market place. The more extreme members of this group argue that government work needs to be redefined in terms of maximizing consumer choice. The best policy is by definition the one that maximizes individual choice (Ostrom 1989). This approach uses the private sector as the standard against which to measure public policy in order
to move the public sector in the direction of private market place behavior. School vouchers is an example of the kind of policy that public choice advocates favor.

A less extreme version of the private market place orientation is represented by the advocates of the reinvention of government movement popularized during the Clinton administration. Proponents of this movement argue that the private sector’s emphasis on innovation, creativity and customer satisfaction is a useful antidote to the bureaucratic and rule-bound delivery of services by the public sector. Unlike public choice theorists whose primary goal is to reduce the size of the public, most proponents of the reinvention movement simply want to make the public sector more efficient and customer-friendly by introducing private sector management principles and techniques into public organizations (Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Osborne and Hutchison 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission driven</td>
<td>Clientele driven</td>
<td>Legal/rule driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results oriented</td>
<td>Needs oriented</td>
<td>Process oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>Meeting needs with few rules and questions asked</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating others for high performance</td>
<td>“Doing the right thing”</td>
<td>Constitutional agent of a sovereign power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>Target populations</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Flexibility for target population</td>
<td>Following rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Clientele needs</td>
<td>Citizen rights and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>“Doing good”</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment</td>
<td>Voluntary commitment</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of authority</td>
<td>Informal coordination</td>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moral duty</td>
<td>Duty to the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another attack on the bright-line distinctions represented by Figure 2:4 come from organizational theorists and political scientists who make the pragmatic argument that public managers need to “go with the flow”. The boundaries of organizations are growing more porous with the need to broker resources, create authority to act outside the legal framework, and to operate within networks (Bozeman, 1987; Kettl 1993). What the economic and organizational approaches share in common is a distinct prejudice against “an orientation toward law and legal processes in favor of reliance on the dynamics of the marketplace, on participation and consensus in organization life, and with a preference for process-oriented policy designs as opposed to traditional administration based upon formally delegated authority backed by sanctions (Cooper, 2000, 117)”.

Rather than pit the virtues of free enterprise and the nonprofit sector against the vices of an outmoded constitutional structure that has been incapacitated by bureaucratic inertia, we argue that each sector possesses its unique virtues, which public servants must understand and use successfully to perform their jobs. For example, the private market place orientation works well as long as the goals of society are compatible with those of individuals and the demands of customers can be arranged to surface a market response. But there are numerous instances when these private market place conditions do not exist. The following are the most common examples of “market failures” or exceptions that have provided justification for public sector intervention: 1) The provision of “public goods,” like national defense; 2) Amelioration of some of the “diseconomies” of collective action, like pollution of the environment and drug abuse; 3) Avoidance of “tragedy of the commons” problems, like natural resource depletion; 4) Reaping the collective benefits of “public economies,” like education and early childhood development programs; and 5) Taking advantage of “natural monopolies,” like water, sewer and other public
utilities. In these and other instances the public sector is encouraged to intervene in the private market place in the interest of promoting greater equity and the achievement of the common good.

But neither the public nor the private sectors are as capable as the nonprofit sector in meeting individual clientele needs with the least amount of rules and costs to the client. Soup kitchens and shelters for the homeless, runaway youth, and domestic violence victims rarely require clients to meet some kind of eligibility requirements. Nonprofit groups that provide these kinds of services to target populations are passionate about what they do and this passion is clearly reflected in the quality of care and treatment that is extended to each person in need. In addition, because of this passion, usually more service can be provided for less dollars than is the case with either the public sector or the private market place.

In short, the public, private and nonprofit sectors are uniquely suited to perform quite distinctive tasks. It is important for public administrators to know what each sector can do particularly well and why, as they are called upon to use their discretionary authority to help restructure the relationship among the three sectors. The practice of public service is not simply the management of complex bureaucratic organizations. Practice also includes the effective integration of institutional capacities across the private and nonprofit boundaries to promote the common good. In participating in the promotion of the common good, public servants should not loose sight of the difference between customers who are seeking satisfaction, clients who expect their needs to be met, and citizens who have rights and expect accountability within a rule of law system (Cooper 2004; Moe 1994).
In this section we want to make explicit what was implicit in our argument in the previous section. Leadership requires taking an institutional perspective. Institutions act as opportunity structures that influence individual behavior. Experiences with these institutions “allow individuals to learn and to adapt their behavior to the logic and mechanisms of the political context in which they live” (Stadelmann-Steffen and Markus Freitag 2010, 18; Kanazawa, 1998, 2000). They edify citizens as to what good leadership and followership mean and requires (Nishishiba, Banyan, Morgan 2011, p. 36). This institutional perspective requires taking into account the institutional role responsibilities of the different sectors as we have argued in the previous section. From the standpoint of leaders who are responsible for initiating and managing change, it requires an understanding of how change occurs in different institutional settings.

Change in public sector organizations, in contrast to the private sector, is a much slower and decidedly nonlinear process. The public sector cannot assume that good administrative work can be accomplished simply by hiring smart people with the right expertise, organizing their work activities, and providing them with clear directions and the right kind of supervision. This is seldom the case, not because “[public] employees assiduously protect their jobs and build their empires, pursuing larger budgets, larger staff, and more authority (Osborne and Gaebler 1992, 140-1),” but because public service is far more messy. Public legislative bodies are often vague about policy directions; there are frequently disagreements among conflicting constituency groups; there are multiple structures of authority; and there are varied and independently operated revenue streams, which pose unique challenges of control and coordination.

Public entities in most loosely coupled metropolitan regions are good examples of the importance of taking an institutional approach to change in the public sector. These entities are
engaged in an almost continuous dialogue with one another on a wide range of issues, including: regional transportation, metropolitan area land use planning, open space acquisition, law enforcement, sewer and water service coordination, and taxation issues. This cooperation and information sharing is essential to the success of local governments and their elected officials. This level of cooperation and information sharing is not present within the private sector where competition for profit is the dominant paradigm. While some jurisdictions still function to a certain extent on the competitive model, the scarcity of public resources is inspiring new levels of cooperation. Public servants who have an appreciation for the institutional dynamics at work in this milieu are the ones who will be successful in translating general cooperative agreements into workable plans of action that meet the test of public accountability.

The Legacy Leadership Model III: Bringing it All Together -The Legitimacy Dimension

So far we have discussed three consequences of the Legacy Leadership Balancewheel, especially in providing and institutional framework for leaders in undertaking change and in maintaining the proper role relationship among the three sectors. In this final section, we discuss a third final consequence of the model: the importance of leaders in building and maintaining the legitimacy of political institutions over time.

Public organizations have to conduct their entire business function in the public setting where all of the decisions they make and almost every document they produce can be scrutinized and second-guessed by any citizen within the jurisdiction. Public organizations must also recognize the local political pressures as well. They must meet the policy expectations of elected officials and the laws they have enacted; they must satisfy detailed strategic plans, purchasing rules, civil service guidelines, public hearings and organized citizens groups who may have conflicting or partially informed opinions.
The success of a public organization in balancing these multiple sources of institutional authority is critical to acquiring the legitimacy to undertake any given action. Take, for example, the steps necessary to complete a local road improvement project. The manager of the project must try to reconcile the interests of local residents in noise control, safety, access, and landscaping with the needs of the community at large in building effective and cost efficient road projects. The public servants responsible for managing these processes face a much more complex set of performance standards than do private sector managers who have stockholders, profit sharing schemes, profit/loss statements and competition to tell them exactly how they are doing.

For these reasons, one way of thinking and talking about the Legacy Leadership Model is in terms of “building legitimacy” and “creating trust”. This would not be necessary if public leaders could “order results” rather than build support for results by relying on a combination of hard and soft power. Even when officials have the formal legal authority to act, they frequently do not have the understanding or agreement necessary to achieve the result they are seeking. This is a normal problem of “politics” that is characteristic of most “rule of law systems”, but it is compounded in the United States by a highly decentralized and fragmented system of governance. Much of this fragmentation is the product of our legal system which divides and separates powers within a federal system of checks and balances. This system, as we have discussed previously, produces many local governing entities, sometimes with overlapping sources of authority. But there is also the fragmentation that is the product of a libertarian free-enterprise system that encourages an entrepreneurial spirit that spawns a plethora of businesses and civic associations that contribute to the common good. Working cooperatively with these groups is essential to achieve the community’s common good.
The decentralized and fragmented system of governance in the United States creates a dual structure of authority within which administrative leaders have to operate if they are to be successful. There is the vertical system of accountability that is governed by hierarchy, rules and formal roles defined rather narrowly by our rule of law system. But, in addition, there is the more informal horizontal network of businesses and civic associations whose cooperation is frequently needed in order for public leaders to be successful. One of the consequences of this system is that public servants are continuously required to justify the exercise of their authority. This on-going process of justification is not simply a matter of finding a rule or a law that authorizes a given course of action. While a rule or law is necessary, it is never sufficient.

Most citizens and government officials probably do not consciously think very much about issues of “lawfulness” or “legitimacy” when public employees provide police services, manage social service cases, negotiate contracts, enter into intergovernmental agreements, hire consultants, implement transportation and land use planning goals, and carry out a myriad of other public functions. In fact, citizens and employees alike simply view these activities as “getting the work done.” Yet, most of these decisions require the exercise of extensive discretion, the form and substance of which shapes the trust citizens have in their institutions of governance.

Consider for a moment the simple example of developing and operating a community policing program. To get such a program started requires countless organizational “get-togethers” involving community groups, police professionals, elected policy makers and their staff, and others with various kinds of expertise. Career administrators are the ones who “keep the ball rolling,” prioritize decision-making, and sequence the flow of multiple streams of resources. Once a community-policing program has been created, think of the wide variety of
activities that career police officers undertake and coordinate. For example, to remove abandoned vehicles from the streets or to take action against a local drug house, administrators need to enlist the support of other departments, jurisdictions, and community organizations. In the course of carrying out all of these activities, administrative leaders shape the legitimacy of democratic governance in at least three ways: 1) The **processes** administrators use to carry out their work helps to shape attitudes citizens have about the basic “fairness” of democratic governance. 2) The **substantive outcomes** of administrative work affects attitudes citizens have about whether government is “delivering the goods.” 3) Finally, the constant interplay between public officials and citizens from one activity to another over an extended period of time gradually **reconstitutes the meaning of democracy**. This reconstitutive work is essential if a rule of law system is to maintain popular support and successfully adapt to changing socio-economic and technological circumstances.

**1. Process Legitimacy** - Even when citizens do not agree with the substantive outcome of public decisions, they want to know if everyone has played by the “same rules of the game,” had an opportunity to be heard, and been provided with a fair chance of influencing the outcome. Like elections, citizens can accept the outcome of administrative initiatives more easily if they believe the process has been conducted fairly.

Administrative leaders have a unique set of process expectations that set them apart from their private sector counterparts. Consider for a moment the following set of expectations that citizens have of their public servants.

♦ **Responsiveness** – Few public agencies place a sign above the door that proclaims, “We have the right to refuse service to anyone.” Unlike the private sector, public servants deal with citizens who may not be able to find alternative service providers when they are
dissatisfied. As a result, citizens undertake their transactions with government agencies with a quite different set of expectations regarding responsiveness and respect.

♦ *Legal Correctness* – Public servants must always act in a legally correct fashion, even when doing so does not serve the perceived interests of the citizens. Unlike the private sector, public servants can’t simply give a dissatisfied citizen a replacement item in the same way a department store may replace a scarf damaged by your dog. Driver’s licenses and other public privileges have to be administered in a legally correct fashion, not simply in a fashion to maintain good customer relations.

♦ *Appearance of “fairness”* – Even when the law does not require equal treatment and “procedural fairness,” citizens expect government and its agents to maintain the appearance of fairness. In the private sector, “getting good service at a fair price” is frequently the standard that is used for measuring the legitimacy of a transaction. In the public sector the legitimacy of the transaction is frequently measured by the appearance of fairness.

♦ *Respect for all citizens* – Whatever the words, “we the people,” may mean in the U.S. Constitution, for almost everyone it means being treated with dignity and respect, regardless of gender, age, sex, ethnic background, education, economic status, emotional or physical capability, etc. The private sector can develop niche markets that cultivate selective respect among target populations. For example, a clothing business can decide to serve only short people, tall people, fat people, men, women, children, etc.. Public servants are expected to demonstrate equal respect for all, regardless of who they may serve in terms of their immediate job responsibilities.

2. *Result-Oriented Legitimacy* - Public servants are ultimately judged by their ability “to deliver the goods.” Citizens want results, especially the ones they personally care most about. It may be
getting their building permit processed as quickly as possible; it may be having water, electricity, garbage and sewer service without much hassle; or it may be keeping their neighborhood safe and quiet. Most public services are delivered unobtrusively with hardly any thought on the part of the citizens of what is required to make the “service work.” This quiet and trouble-free delivery of service helps to legitimate democratic governance.

But there are some less obvious ways that public servants foster result-oriented legitimacy through the exercise of their administrative leadership. We will use two examples, one of which involves the organization of internal structures and processes and the other involves the practical problem of defining “good service.”

a) Creating “Humane” Bureaucracies - Much of the writing on public service over the last three decades has emphasized the importance of finding ways of making bureaucracies more humane (Dworin and Schuman 1972; Marini 1971). There is an internal and external dimension to this effort to “humanize” public bureaucracies.

At the internal level, the goal has been to reduce the tension between the needs of the organization and the needs of the individuals who make it up. For example, individuals have a need for recognition and self-fulfillment, while an organization has a need to deliver a product or service on time and within budget. The goal is to design and operate organizations in ways that allow for high levels of self-fulfillment on the job while simultaneously operating at a high level of organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

The “humane bureaucracy movement” assumes that what counts most for legitimacy is results. If we can restructure hierarchy and work relationships within public organizations, and make bureaucracies more representative of larger societal values, we will alter bureaucratic
outcomes. By altering outcomes, we will increase administrative legitimacy among employees within public organizations and among citizens who receive the services they provide.

b. The “Good Service” Problem - Since government produces few measurable outputs and products, it ends up having to define what “good service” means. It has to do this at various levels within the organization as well outwardly to clients and other interested parties (Morgan 1997). The private sector has two major advantages over the public sector in addressing “good service” problems. First, in a market economy dissatisfied customers frequently can find more readily accessible alternatives than consumers of a public service who may need to move to another jurisdiction to have their needs satisfied. For example, “jurisdiction shopping” is a common occurrence with parents looking for the right school for their children. Second, in the private sector it is easier to resolve disputes over service by falling back on a quantitative dollar standard. When these alternatives and standards are not available in the public sector, a great burden is placed on public servants to negotiate and mediate conflicting views of what counts for “good service.”

Because of these conflicting views, standards for “good service” need to be established, especially for those delivering services at the counter or in the field where public expectations are highest. There are hardly ever enough resources for social workers, patrol officers, and other street-level bureaucrats to meet all of the needs of their clients (Lipsky 1990; Vinzant and Crothers 1998).

As the question of “good service” moves upward in the organization from the street-level provider of the service, administrative leaders play the central role in negotiating the tension between those at the bottom of the organization who are inclined to use particular standards to define successful performance (i.e., the ability to meet the needs of each individual served) and
those above who have to stretch public tax dollars as far as possible. This impulse to “stretch dollars” predisposes upper levels of public organizations to use more general formulaic standards (i.e., average clients served, the lowest cost/benefit ratio, or the total number of tasks performed or clients served).

In addition to the problems posed by the tendency to define “good service” somewhat differently at the bottom and top of public organizations, there is the additional problem of dealing with the ambiguity of what “good service” means externally to various clientele groups and interested parties. For example, some clients approach administrators with an “exchange model” of interaction, which measures the success of a transaction in terms of the norm of efficiency. Others, however, use what some have termed a “communal/harmony model” of interaction, which measures the success of a bureaucratic transaction in terms of the norm of empathy (Braithwaite, 1998, 46-101). Administrative leadership invariably plays the decisive role in negotiating these different substantive standards for determining the meaning of “good service.” In so doing, administrative leaders greatly influence the legitimacy of the American systems of democratic governance.

3. Constitutive Legitimacy - In addition to the influence that administrative leaders have in legitimating democratic governance through their facilitation of public policy processes and outcomes, they also play a central role in helping continually to redefine what democratic governance means. They do this in a variety of subtle ways, most often driven by changing public values that alter the relationship between the government and civil society (nonprofit and voluntary sector), or the relationship between government and the private business sectors of society. The following example illustrates what we mean by “constitutive legitimacy.”
A former parks manager in one of our local jurisdictions was responsible for the county park and another small neighborhood park. Her span of control was rather small during the winter and grew during the peak summer season with temporary help. The “County 2010” Plan mandated that the county would not be in the park expansion and development business. The Plan limited the county's future commitment to just two park sites. Pressures against this “hold-the-line” strategy included a large influx of population, a park advisory board, and an enthusiastic group of “fans” who actively exercised pressure for park expansion and improvements.

What should the parks manager tell her rangers, her overworked seasonal workers, and the parks advisory board? How should the county board policy affect day-to-day service to the park areas? Was “County 2010 Plan” to be treated by the manager as a vote of non-support for parks? If so, does the staff have license to give the citizens of the county what they pay for, i.e., lousy services?

Under the circumstance described above, the parks manager used the “County 2010 Plan” to communicate to employees and other stakeholders that the County was not in the park expansion business. The manager took the lead role in explaining the reasons behind this position. Yet, at the same time, the manager did not allow the policy to become an excuse for ever-declining public service. Instead, the parks manager sought to identify alternative sources of revenue and ways of meeting the service expectations of her clientele. In the case described, the Manager collaborated on a timber thinning of county land and used these moneys to acquire federal matching funds. This was done without impacting general fund moneys.

Within the financial and political constraints outlined above, the parks manager ensured that the hiring of seasonal staff every year satisfied the “spirit-and-intent” of the laws and policy
directives found at the federal, state, and county level. Since the county was pursuing various ways to diversify its work force, the parks manager was expected to further these goals while still obtaining qualified people. To accomplish these tasks, the manager leveraged other community group resources and addressed accessibility obstacles for the disabled citizens within the community.

In short, the manager was expected to run an effective and efficient operation using business practices that stood the test of public scrutiny. Yet, she was also expected to ensure that county residents enjoyed the use of the park, got treated with the utmost respect by county staff, and had a safe day. All of this had to be accomplished within a set of severe budgetary constraints. Translating these multiple directives and constraints into some meaningful unit of service to the citizens - an enjoyable day at the park- is what successful administrative leaders do. This role gets replicated throughout all levels of a public organization on a daily basis.

The Unique Role of Local Administrative Leadership in Building and Maintaining Legitimacy

The above example illustrates a centrally important characteristic of political leadership in the United State, namely, a very decentralized system of administration. As de Tocqueville observed in his travels around the United State in the 1830’s, one of the political consequences of the American system of decentralized administration is that its public servants are expected to share the sensibilities of the fellow citizens who stand at their side and to transform their bundle of conflicting expectations into the sanctity of law and right. This is why Americans simultaneously view and treat public servants as “sheep in wolves clothing” (Karl 1987, 26). As sheep they are expected to be familiar and trusting creatures, docilely following the will of the
people. But as wolves, Americans fear that administrators may use their position to take advantage of the uninformed and naive citizens they are expected to serve.

One of the most enduring leadership challenges for administrators as a result of this historical legacy is crafting a partnership role with elected officials, who in theory, are in charge of what they do. But the United State, and the constitutional system under which it is governed, is unique in the way in which it answers the troubling question of who administrators serve. Unlike France where the will of the public is supreme, or in England where ministerial authority is supreme, in the United States the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. In operationalizing this principle, the U.S. Constitution separates and mixes powers so that no one branch has complete authority over the other. Each branch has legislative, executive and judicial responsibilities. To complicate matters further, the U.S. Constitution divides powers between the central government and the states. This means at the federal level that career administrators serve both the executive and legislative branch, as well as the courts, which have final authority in determining what the law and the Constitution means.

What are the implications of America’s unique rule of law system for local administrative leaders, most of whom operate under a British-like parliamentary or “ministerial” model, where the chief executive officer serves at the pleasure of elected officials? In the first instance, it means that administrators work under the supervening authority of the legislative body. But as a practical matter, elected officials cannot provide administrators with the kind of guidance necessary to address all of their discretionary needs. Even if they could, neither elected officials nor administrators would want this kind of micro-management oversight. So as a practical matter, local government administrators have to work out a shared governance model with the elected officials. This is the chief responsibility of the chief administrative officer to whom
administrators report. The difficulty of this task is evidenced by the relatively short tenure of most city managers and county administrators (4-6 years).

Through this complicated process of translating guidelines, multiple expectations, and constraints into acceptable service, administrative leaders frequently play a central role in redefining and reconstituting what government itself means in the hearts and minds of the citizens they serve. The park manager in the above case example did this by rethinking the relationship between the public and private sector to craft a new solution that helped to redefine public expectations while at the same time continuing to redefine the meaning of the park by providing access to the disabled and employing a more diverse workforce.
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We often hear people say that “leaders are born”, not made. While it is true that some individuals possess the sensibilities necessary for public service leadership (high commitment to service, willingness to take risks, capacity to tolerate conflict and ambiguity, ability to act in the face of uncertainty), it is also true that leadership can be learned. That is why we pay attention to leadership assessments, leadership training, mentoring, and coaching. These activities help us “learn who we are”, but they also help us understand areas we need and are willing to develop. If we are unable or unwilling to develop some capacities for public service leadership, at least we can surround ourselves with the kind of people and settings that are most likely to build on our strengths rather than our weaknesses.
Essential Leadership Qualities

Regardless of the kind of responsibility one exercises or the role that one is in, there are some essential qualities that cut across all leadership settings and venues. These include the need for:

- **Courage**
- **Perseverance and Patience**
- **Capacity to tolerate ambiguity, uncertainty and conflict**

**Courage** – Leadership in all venues requires courage. Leaders must possess the confidence of their beliefs to press others for support. In the face of doubt and open opposition, they must have the courage to continuing pressing for what they believe is necessary, even at the expense of failure. As former Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts frequently observes: “If you are in a public service leadership position, you must be prepared to walk alone out on a limb, but you also must know who has the saw and who has the net!” Courage without careful planning and forethought is foolish. And fools do not in the end make good leaders, despite whatever courage they may possess.

**Perseverance and Patience** – Perseverance and patience are two sides of the same coin. On the one hand, leadership requires waiting for all of the stars to be aligned and personally working as hard as possible to get them in alignment. This is sometimes called “leading from behind”. To work behind the scenes to lay the groundwork for successful leadership action requires considerable patience and perseverance. Leading from Behind thrives on the sensibilities of the proverbial “Little Engine that Could”. Leaders do not get easily discouraged when confronted
with roadblocks or unexpected barriers to action. Such moments simply provide an opportunity to redefine the target objectives or at least reconsider the strategies for getting there.

**Capacity to tolerate ambiguity, uncertainty and conflict** – One of the characteristic features of public service leadership is the need to take action without being certain of the outcome. There are a variety of good reasons why this is the case. To start with, almost all important decisions are filled with ambiguity. There are a multitude of swirling moral claims, organizational influences, and external factors that impinge on a given situation that requires action and which pull the decision maker in different directions. Even if the factors at play surrounding a decision are in harmony, we never know for certain what the outcome of a decision will be once made. There is lots of factual uncertainty. We see this happen every day, whether it is in purchasing a new computer system, contracting out a service or going to war in Iraq. There is a long leap between the cup of decision and the lip of implementation. The multiple links in the implementation chain are not known at the time a decision is made or always controllable afterwards. Finally, the most difficult decisions in the public sector are almost always morally contested. There is more than side to an issue. In fact, there may be several different moral claims that are asserted by citizens and stakeholder groups. What is a leader to do under such circumstances when the situation for action is ambiguous, where there is considerable factually uncertainty and where moral differences of opinion exist as to the right thing to do?

The answer is that leaders must lead and they must act, despite the conditions of factual uncertainty, moral ambiguity and conflict they face. Recruiting individuals for leadership roles who can act decisively and confidently under these conditions has become an increasingly important task for successful organizations and institutions. But not everyone is fit for this kind
of role. This is a necessary starting point for all public servants in thinking about leadership aspirations and thinking about recruiting the right kinds of individuals for leadership roles.
Chapter IV

Leading A High Performing Organization

Every organized human activity—from the making of pots to the placing of a man on the moon—gives rise to two fundamental and opposing requirements: the division of labor into various tasks to be performed, and the coordination of this task to accomplish the activity. The structure of the organization can be defined simply as the sum total of the ways in which it divides its labor into distinct tasks and then achieves coordination among them. (Mintzberg 1983, 2)

Many of the questions that both analysts and members of organizations confront are fundamentally political. That is, they have to do with making choices, allocating benefits and burdens, generating commitment and legitimacy, and coping with conflict, complexity, and uncertainty. This in turn suggests that one approach to understanding organizations is to conceive of them as political systems, or polities, that develop structures for channeling political dynamics and performing political tasks. (Hult and Walcott 1990, 5)

The Ubiquity of Organizations

Ours is an organizational society. Even in our sleeping hours we are embraced by organizations—city police departments, state air quality control agencies, county health departments, nonprofit mental health service organizations, fire districts, utility districts, school districts, and more. In fact, we require a certificate at birth and one at death executed by people working in public organizations. Citizens experience government largely through contact with professionals and administrators who are charged with designing the structures and guiding
organizational behavior. Equally important, most people work in complex organizations, whether private or public. For many, personal identity is tied up with their work organizations. Listen to the introductions we make when we meet one another. Notice the way we describe ourselves with organizational references. “I’m a building inspector. I work for the City of Wilsonville.”

So much of contemporary life revolves around complex organizations that it behooves us to understand something of their structure and dynamics. A large body of literature now exists on the subject, and this chapter reviews its more prominent schools of thought. The field illuminates many aspects, good and bad, of organizational life and administrative practice. It reveals tensions that arise between treating people as instruments for organizational purposes and their maturation through organizational life, as well as between organizational values and the values of American democratic governance as expressed through the administrative traditions of minority rights and access to governance, civic governance, responsive governance, and competent and energetic governance.

Organizations are commonly understood as intentionally created social collectivities with explicit purposes and relatively discrete boundaries. In this sense they are clearly designed as instruments—a means to ends. If the things people in society want could be generated by individuals working alone, then organizations would not dominate the social landscape. From running shoes to ballet, from libraries to highways, from clean drinking water to accessible hospital care, the things people want and the things they care about require the coordinated efforts of many people. However, in addition to being instrumental bodies, organizations also possess expressive qualities that reflect their surrounding culture and mores, and in turn define organizational subcultures in which people live out much of their lives. Many organizations take on a life of their own, reflecting identities that are valued for more than the sum of their parts.
Their practices, policies, and procedures shape relationships, affect habits and dispositions, and define ways of living that help determine appropriate and inappropriate means for achieving ends. The design of an organization adapts and mutates as these expressive, cultural qualities manifest themselves. Local public schools, public libraries, city halls, state colleges and universities, parks, forestry agencies, military bases, and even prisons come to define integral aspects of community, state, and nation. Philip Selznick (1957) described this as a process of institutionalization within the broader fabric of society.

While we aggregate resources through organizations to produce goods and services, there are some distinct differences in the way this happens in public and private organizations. First, public goods and services are typically under-produced in, or not fully accounted for through, private markets (Ostrom 1990). Such goods require public policy decisions directing their production: clean air, monetary policy, social security, national parks, safe building standards, community safety, and public health. Second, public goods and services tend to reflect ambiguous values and are often more abstract in nature. For example, though we may see concrete manifestations of law enforcement, the underlying values of policing permit widely varying approaches, no one of which can or should be pursued to the exclusion of others over time. Public organizations, therefore, face more uncertainty and conflict over both means and ends, and this poses unique challenges for organization policy. Third, public organizations require more complex lines of accountability and superintendence through all levels and beyond their boundaries to myriad oversight institutions. Citizens can affect these functions at virtually every stage, from legislative lobbying to delivery at the street level as clients and customers. Fourth, the resources aggregated in public organizations to accomplish the organization’s work are public resources. As such, those who manage the resources incur strong fiduciary
responsibilities for their stewardship and are often constrained in the ways they use such resources. Public officials are thus more than mere functionaries of production. They are public officials who bear ethical responsibility for proper use of resources in the public square. All these factors affect the design and complexity of public organizations.

The delivery of public goods and services, however, does not stop at the government door. In a mixed political economy, public goods and services are delivered by organizations in all sectors: public, private, nonprofit, and special district. The complexity of our mixed political economy arises from a deliberate constitutional construction which mandates limited government and a wide-open sphere for private life. Accordingly, the Constitution is permissive regarding a wide array of public and private partnerships for achieving public purposes. Our governments can form quasi-governmental institutions such as government corporations, enter into close contractual relations with private and nonprofit firms, and vest specific governing powers in various kinds of associations and joint ventures. We are thus able to enjoy a rich diversity of organizational forms and processes for coping with so many public purposes and problems.

**How do We Identify an Organization?**

Organizations are familiar to people mainly through lived experience. When asked to describe an organization, most people start by describing one they know—often their work organizations. They describe what they do, where they do it, and how they do it. Such descriptions provide a rich natural history of organizations of different forms and levels of complexity. However, when asked to describe their organization’s structure, the overwhelming response by both pre-service and in-service students is to present an organizational chart in standard hierarchical form. Their structural description seldom coincides with the stories they tell about their work. People thus
think of organizations as natural in terms of what they do and how they do it, but as artificial in terms of overall construction. Interestingly, when prompted for more details about their structural portrait, students quickly begin describing a variety of decision structures, work relations, subcultures, and informal channels that differ significantly from the hierarchical form. This cognitive dissonance between natural and artificial conceptions is pervasive and leads to real problems in organizational design.

Most of us, when charged with designing an organization in whole or part, will instinctively adopt the hierarchical organization chart as if it were a universal structural template. In this chapter, we emphasize the point that complex organizations require diverse organizational forms in order to adequately perform various types of work, and to cope with many challenges stemming from uncertainty and conflict that are built into our system of democratic governance. Appropriate structures are contingent upon such factors.

Consider for a moment the situation faced by Prairie County officials in the case study preceding this chapter. In their various organizational capacities, they encountered tremendous changes in their communities that add many additional responsibilities to their plates and force them to rethink how they meet their missions. They clearly need more staff, new expertise, more programs, and new organizational designs to accommodate them. Such changes seem as threatening to employees and citizens as do the problems that confront them. Their first task, it appears, is to pull leaders together from key organizations in all sectors to assess needs and work out the implications for subsequent design and staffing. Thus, their first new structure is more collegial and deliberative than hierarchical in nature.

The dilemma these officials face is a common one. Organizations usually accrete multiple purposes as they evolve. Elementary schools have taken on public and community
health functions. Water districts have taken on watershed management as well as delivering potable water and removing waste water. Utility districts have moved beyond electricity or telephone services to include a variety of energy conservation and communication services. A current trend in human services is to bundle services into super departments to improve the coordination among programs serving different populations. Nonprofits often add service missions as the demands of their clients or funding sources change. State and local emergency managers face an enormous organizational design challenge because of federal policies adding terrorism response to the list of natural and social emergencies historically assigned to their first responders. New purposes add complexity, which strains existing designs. Adding to the strain are declining resources, dramatic demographic turnover in executive ranks, and changing sentiments in society about how public services should be delivered. These internal and external pressures create real tensions and tradeoffs in design. It is not surprising to see a growing literature suggesting strategies for adaptive design.

Organizations as Abstract Units of Analysis. Studying organizations is complicated, largely because they involve several possible levels of analysis. At the very least, we must consider the individual, the group, the organization qua organization, and the environment surrounding an organization—which entails populations of organizations (the ecological or strategic level of analysis). Significant insight is gained at every level of analysis. This chapter will move across these levels but will focus primarily on the organization as the unit of analysis. The reason for adopting this focus is that most students of public administration are expected to understand how an organizational entity can be better structured to achieve its purposes. In doing so, however, it is important to remember that there are no bright lines between these four levels of analysis.
For example, individual levels of analysis are typically used in areas of selection, motivation, and individual performance. What is known at this individual level of analysis influences group level dynamics and shapes leadership at the organizational and ecological level of analysis. Similarly, job design is impacted by organizational design of work units. Moreover, as organizations are often large and complex, one could choose to carry out an organizational level of analysis of subunits. That is, one could analyze the Forestry Division within the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as an organization—this would make the DNR part of the organization’s (that is, the Forestry Division’s) environment. One could also analyze the DNR as an organization, in which case the Forestry Division would be a functional division within the DNR. To extend this example, one could also study the executive branch of state government as an organizational unit of analysis, in which case the DNR would be a functional subdivision. Thus, specifying the level of analysis and the unit of analysis in organizational study is a way of abstracting particular entities from their broader context in order to limit one’s focus. While this is useful, one must not forget that the abstraction highlights some things at the expense of others in the bigger picture.

The Study of Organizations. The early study of modern organizations was based in the rational-legal norms and mechanized production associated with the eighteenth-century Enlightenment period. Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*, which frames much of modern western political and economic thought, begins with a focus on the importance of organization design in a production firm.

The effect of the division of labor, in the general business of society, will be more easily understood, by considering in what manner it operates in some particular manufactures. . . . To
take an example, therefore, from a very trifling manufacture; but one in which the division of labor has been very often taken notice of, the trade of pin-maker; a workman not educated to this business nor acquainted with the use of the machinery employed in it, could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry, make one pin in a day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater parts are likewise peculiar trades. One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into paper; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations, which, in some manufactories, are all performed by distinct hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them. I have seen a small manufactory of this kind where ten men only were employed, and where some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. . . . They could, when they exerted themselves make about twelve pounds of pins in a day. There are in a pound upwards of four thousand pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of forty-eight thousand pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of forty-eight thousand pins, might be considered as making four thousand eight hundred pins in a day. But if they had all wrought separately and independently, and without any of them having been educated to this particular business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty, perhaps not one pin in a day; that is, certainly not the two hundred and forty-th, perhaps not the four thousand eight hundredth part of what they are at present capable of performing, in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations (Smith 1799, p. 3.)
Smith’s account of the pin factory presents a classic study of organizational differentiation and specialization leading to greater efficiency. It describes a key challenge of organizational design—how to properly divide work, and then how to coordinate and control the work once divided. Smith realized that improving efficiency and productivity through division of labor would bring benefits as well as problems. It would create a great deal more surplus value than could be achieved through individual efforts, and this begged the question of how to divide the newly created wealth—a matter that would dramatically affect relations of power within the organization as well as throughout modern society. It also raised concern about how division and specialization of labor, and its resulting organizational structures, would affect the individual and their liberties. Smith had seen firsthand how the division of labor in the pin factory could produce dulling psychological and social effects on human beings, and he worried about the implications for broader civil society. Organization theorists have wrestled with this problem ever since. Gross and Etzioni (1985, 5) characterize it as a central challenge of modern organizations. How can we design organizations as rationally as possible while minimizing such undesirable effects? Broad and sustained study of this and related problems began in earnest during the late nineteenth century, coinciding in America with the rise of Progressive reform.

**Theories of Organizations**

Important developments in organization theory mark the turn of the twentieth century. First, in Western Europe, scholars such as Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, and Wilfredo Pareto studied the transformation of work from an individual, craft-based approach to a corporate, complex organizational undertaking. In Europe, large, complex public organizations preceded the emergence of large private organizations (McCraw 1984), all of which preceded large-scale
organizations in the United States by at least 50 years. In the United States, the reverse was true—large public organizations followed the emergence of large private organizations. Industrialization of textiles, oil, railroads, food stuffs, and primary extraction (mining and timbering) prompted efforts to understand more systematically how to manage division and specialization of labor in multisite organizations. European scholars began identifying organizational characteristics common to both sectors. Most prominent among them was Max Weber (pronounced “Veber”) and his bureaucratic theory of organization.

1. Classical Organizational Theory: Formal and Scientific. In the 1890s, Weber, a German sociologist, studied the emergence of modern, rational organizations around the world. From these studies, he derived what is now considered the classic model of bureaucracy. Weber portrayed his model as an “ideal type,” meaning he abstracted from organizational practices those characteristics he believed most logically fit a “legal-rational” structure. In reality, organizations display other organizing characteristics (traditional, patrimonial, charismatic, and so on) as well, but these seemed to diminish as cultures adapted to industrialization. Bureaucracy seemed more characteristic of the age. Its main features include the following:

- Fixed division of labor by official function
- Offices ordered in a hierarchy
- Reliance on expertise, skills, and experience as basis for selection
- Formalized rules that govern performance
- Separation of organizational and personal property and resources
- Resources of the organization free from outside control
- Employment viewed as a career and compensation sufficient for livelihood
- Extensive written records of administrative acts, decisions, and rules
Such characteristics create an organization that is “legal-rational” in contrast to traditional organizations in history. The traditional organization relied on the personal loyalty and other intimate ties between employees, their employers and their communities. Weber argued that efficiency is gained by substituting this loyalty-centered system with one that relies on specialization, standardization, and formalization of administrative work. Further, he argued that organizations designed on this model create uniformity of organizational action by “purging particularism” (Perrow, 1986). Trained expertise ensures competency in each office, and the hierarchical nature of the relationship among offices provides a chain of authority for purposes of control as well as formal pathways of communication for coordination among offices. Oversight is made easier through written rules and standard operating procedures (SOPs) that provide substitutes for individual judgment. All of these characteristics rationalize and standardize behavior in the organization.

Weber believed that bureaucratic organization possessed clear advantages over previous models. It creates clear lines and grades of authority. Its formalized work processes ensure uniform treatment of cases brought before the organization, and full-time employment reduces the risk of self-dealing or favoritism. Perhaps most important, employees hired on the basis of merit—and who are protected from outside influence—can focus their full attention on the achievement of organizational goals.

Despite these advantages, Weber also recognized certain negative aspects of the bureaucratic model. Employees may feel dehumanized, treated as cogs in a machine. Clients may feel much the same, treated as case numbers rather than as distinct individuals with unique needs. The formalism that ensures consistent treatment can constrain the ability of employees to deal with exceptional cases, a condition referred to as trained incapacity. It breeds passivity and
a lack of creativity needed to adapt to changing conditions. Robert Merton (1957) extended this critical insight by calling attention to the tendency of bureaucratic employees to emphasize consistent procedures to the point that the overarching purposes were lost from view, resulting in goal displacement. Weber and subsequent scholars foresaw the dangers involved in putting organizational efficiency above individual needs and organizational goals. Weber also worried that large bureaucratic organizations would concentrate power in new ways, limiting the ability of individuals to affect their own futures—a major concern shared by many subsequent critics (cf. Merton 1940; Downs 1967, Perrow 1986; Scott and Hart 1989).

Weber’s work stands as one of the most comprehensive analyses of modern complex organizations ever undertaken, and today it is still considered the most influential work on bureaucracy. Ironically, his work was largely unexamined in the United States until translations became available in the 1940s. However, many European scholars shared similar ideas, some of which influenced American thought. Military thought embraced a general staff model based in large part on early versions of the bureaucratic model developed in Prussia and France during the late eighteenth century. The American military establishment adopted these ideas in the wake of the Civil War. American corporations adapted them to industrial organization, and their adaptations were commonly identified as the business model during the Progressive Era. In this fashion, various manifestations of the bureaucratic model seeped into the fabric of American life. It manifested itself in a variety of academic and professional literature. An important aspect of this story is captured by Frederick Taylor, who looked for ways to improve work outcomes through improving work processes.

Taylor’s *Principles of Scientific Management* (1911) stands as one of the most prominent American works in the field. Taylor enthusiastically advocated the use of “time and motion”
studies to optimize the work of employees. In one of his shop studies, he pointed out that every person shoveling coal had an optimal shovel size that would help maximize daily output over a day’s labor. He surrounded workers with “functional foreman,” who would study every aspect of an employee’s work process and look for ways to improve on the efficiency of effort and motion. He believed that all types of work at all levels of organization would eventually benefit from this concentrated, systematic analysis.

Taylor insisted that traditional management practices were operating by worn-out doctrines that lacked pragmatic adaptation and systematic study. Thus, he framed his work as a criticism of general management practice. Managers, he argued, needed to carefully study and design work processes—and separate this as a function distinct from the doing of work. They were responsible for (1) the productivity of their employees by studying the one best way to divide work, (2) selecting and training workers for carefully designed jobs, (3) coordinating the flow of resources to accomplish the work, and (4) contrary to existing practices, awarding a fair division of the benefits to workers for their increased productivity.

Taylor’s contributions anticipate the rise of systems analysis and operations research, out of which emerged commonly known managerial techniques such as Critical Path Method (CPM) and Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT). His work also influenced organization theorists such as Chester Barnard (1938), who emphasized the importance of systematic coordination in making the internal operations of organizations effective, and Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, who identified core functions of executive management. These theorists focused on higher level management functions, adapting their ideas from scholars and practitioners of Taylor’s generation. For example, Henri Fayol, a Frenchman and contemporary of Weber and Taylor, drew on management and organizational experience to develop principles
described in his book *General and Industrial Management* (1949). His principles included the following:

- Division of work
- Authority and responsibility
- Discipline
- Unity of command
- Unity of direction
- Subordination of individual interest to general interest
- Remuneration of personnel
- Centralization
- Scalar chain
- Order
- Equity
- Stability of tenure of personnel
- Initiative
- Esprit de corps

Gulick borrowed heavily from this work to derive his own condensed list of managerial functions. He listed seven executive functions—planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting—and coined them in the now-famous acronym POSDCORB (Gulick and Urwick 1937, 5).³

Taken together these theorists of the classic period of organization theory operated on several key assumptions. First, there is one best way to organize work. Second, organizations are created to achieve specific goals related to production. Third, efficiency is maximized through the division and specialization of labor, planning of work, coordination of work processes, and direct supervision. Fourth, people are motivated to work in such rationalized systems by economic incentives that reflect a fair distribution of the efficiency gains. Finally, many of these theorists exhibited immense optimism about the promise of their reforms for society as a whole.
That optimism stemmed mainly from the incredible technological inventions and changes already evident in society. The era generally reflected high enthusiasm about the ability of science to solve virtually any human problem. Not only could they perfect organizational process, they could perfect the humans who worked in them. For example, early behavioral studies focused on elimination of such problems as worker fatigue, disease, health conditions in the workplace, and social-psychological disorders. Out of this work emerged new approaches to organization theory grounded in human relations.

2. The Human Relations Movement. The human relations approach is rooted in the fact that organizations are essentially human collectivities in which human relations, formal and informal, determine much of an organization’s productivity. Whereas Weber’s bureaucratic model and Taylor’s scientific management model emphasized formal structure and efficient work processes, the Human Relations movement emphasized social-psychological factors in organizations that motivate people to work. The major study that triggered this movement was designed as a set of scientific experiments (beginning in the early 1930s) aimed simply at improving worker efficiency at the Hawthorne plants of the Western Electric Company in Chicago (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939; Mayo 1933).

A series of studies were carried out by a team primarily from Harvard University with the goal of demonstrating that modifications to work process and work environment could improve productivity. The most cited study, called the “illumination study,” examined the impact on work output of electrical relay assembly groups by varying the extent of lighting in their work rooms. The controlled experiment showed that the group experiencing variations in lighting (from extremely bright to almost dark) increased productivity regardless of the direction of the
variation. Curiously, the study also indicated that production among the control groups, where there was no change in lighting, also showed increases. Light intensity, therefore, could not explain the difference. The scientists decided that what did explain the difference was the attention paid to each group by the researchers, rather than the effect of light intensity. This finding has been labeled the Hawthorne Effect in social science study. For organization theory, it reinforced the claim of those who believed that paying attention to people is what matters most in creating efficient, productive, and healthy organizations. Motivation is more a social-psychological phenomenon than a physical or economic one. This insight spawned a host of studies relating emerging theoretical insights from the field of social psychology to organizational studies.

A number of contemporary works in organizational studies lent credibility to social-psychological interpretations in the human relations school. Most prominent among them were works by Mary Parker Follett (1926) and Chester Barnard (1938). Follett wrote most of her work during the 1920s, and she exerted significant influence on most subsequent scholarship. Follett drew insight from work in socially oriented “helping” professions such as social work, nursing, and education, where concepts of mutual adjustment, collaborative leadership, and client-centered analysis prevailed. Her notions of “system” and the “law of the situation” suggested that focus on collaboration and on problems, rather than on people and their formal status, were more central to organizational productivity. She emphasized street-level work as the more prominent aspect of effective organization, provided that workers were committed to the goals of the agency. This concept of relying on the discretionary judgment of first-line service providers grew from her observations of social workers in Boston, and from the work of a growing number of nonprofit organizations delivering basic needs to the poor, the mentally ill, and immigrants.
From these studies, she formed the powerful idea that managers must share authority with rather than over workers (Follett 1926, 34). This decidedly human-centered approach to management contrasted with the prevailing structural-centered theories of the era.

Chester Barnard, a business executive as well as a scholar, produced one of the field’s most prominent works, *Functions of the Executive*, in 1938. Barnard stressed the importance of understanding informal organization as an essential aspect of effective management and organizational development. The informal organization is the social system that governs human relationships and determines how work will be accomplished, and at what level of effectiveness. Barnard explained executive leadership mainly as a function of cultivating trust and rapport in an organization’s social life. He defined authority in circular terms, arguing that it flowed as much from the ranks of employees as it did from management. He also conceived the idea of an “economy of incentives” that forms within an organization’s social system, and which defines rules of the game around which motivational patterns in workers and managers will cohere. This is made possible in large part because employees display significant “zones of indifference” about organizational relations, processes, and goals (Barnard 1938, 168). They are therefore open to a variety of systematic designs and decision rules that structure incentives as well as work. In short, they will get along to go along. In this fashion, they can be induced to follow organizational goals defined and articulated by management.

Follett’s and Barnard’s works drew widespread attention to the social dimension of organizations and prompted further study along social-psychological lines. In 1943, Abraham Maslow published one of the most influential articles ever written on management and human motivation. In “A Theory of Human Motivation,” he posited that people are driven by a series of needs and that these needs are hierarchically scaled. Motivation results from the desire to climb
from basic physiological and security needs (like safety, food, and shelter) toward social and self-actualizing needs (like self-esteem, sense of personal worth, and fulfilling accomplishment). As needs are met at one level, new needs at the next level emerge and gradually broaden motivational potential. Management can take advantage of this potential by providing organizational benefits (stimuli) that elicit higher-level drives. While there is little scientific evidence to support this notion of a hierarchy of needs (summarized in Figure 4.1), Maslow’s model has dominated generations of research and is widely used among professionals in fields such as social work, education, public service, business, and public management. It is an
intuitively appealing theory, perhaps because of its simple yet compelling imagery, and because it permits multiple ways to meet the needs of people working in organizations (G. Morgan 2006).

Frederick Herzberg and his colleagues (1959) refined Maslow’s theory by drawing a distinction between motivators and de-motivators. Motivators are those factors which help individuals develop a sense of accomplishment that spurs further effort, as opposed to de-motivators, which actually block or interfere with these things. For example, in the difficult circumstances presented in the Prairie County case, pay and training policies at the Department of Social Services (DSS) served as de-motivators for field office caseworkers. Managers needed to find ways of buffering or short-circuiting these effects as part of any broader effort to motivate these employees. In short, Herzberg’s model emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between two separate scales of motivation: working conditions, pay, and the like, which often de-motivate or just satisfy without motivating, and more intrinsic factors such as the challenges of the work itself, which can act as positive motivators under more properly managed conditions.

The emphasis on intrinsic motivators led human relations theorists to rethink work processes and content, moving away from narrow, repetitive, specialized tasks designed by others to co-development of complex tasks and enlarged responsibilities. The more challenging the work, the more potential there is for enhanced motivation, as well as greater attachment to organizational goals. This kind of thinking gave great impetus to professional development in many occupational realms and recast the culture and management practices of complex organizations.

Douglas McGregor framed the achievements of the Human Relations movement through a stark and rhetorically powerful contrast of management styles. In his classic work, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960), McGregor describes two basic orientations toward managing people in
organizations, “Theory X” and “Theory Y.” The Theory X orientation assumes that workers generally dislike work, lack ambition, are self-centered and thus uninterested in organizational goals, are resistant to change, and prefer to be led rather than to take the lead (McGregor 1960). Accordingly, management must closely supervise and control workers lest they run amok. Then, borrowing from Maslow and other human relations theorists, he develops a much more appealing alternative, Theory Y, based on assumptions that workers have a broad scale of needs that include desires for inclusion, esteem, and fulfilling work. The genius of his dichotomy lies in the self-fulfilling nature of the assumptions. Workers become indolent and resistive to management when treated in a negative Theory X fashion. Likewise, by adopting Theory Y assumptions that workers possess intrinsic motivation to work and to identify with organizational goals, managers can remove barriers and release more potential for self-motivated accomplishments. Workers will adopt organizational objectives and labor steadfastly to achieve them. Management must provide the proper conditions for this to occur, which means that less emphasis is placed on direct supervision, direction, and control, and more placed on indirect, coordinative, and facilitative functions.

The human relations school drew important insights from this kind of work. It spawned a whole new literature on organizational leadership, emphasizing styles over traits, and called attention to the need for more diverse types of managerial roles and practices than offered by conventional management theory. Much of this leadership theory operated within the framework of human relations theory, focusing on a variety of leadership styles and techniques appropriate to relations within and among working groups inside organizations. They eventually developed contingency approaches to leadership that called for different styles depending on circumstances faced by different workgroups (cf. Fiedler 1967, Vroom and Yetton 1973, Hersey and Blanchard
1977a), but all emphasized achievement of more robust work relationships through facilitative and participatory practices. Borrowing from this literature, other theorists broadened attention to the interrelation of group-based social systems with the nature of tasks and functions to be carried out. Management practices and organizational design vary across more factors than just individual needs and social relations among individuals and groups. Indeed, organizations can provide for these without necessarily enhancing their “task effectiveness.” Managers must focus on the integration of individuals and groups with roles, structures, tasks, and technologies in order to achieve organizational goals (Argyris 1964, Trist 1981.

3. The Contingency Theory of Organizations. In the 1950s and 1960s, starting in England at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, organizational scholars focused on empirical studies of organizations as sociotechnical systems. These scholars viewed the technical aspects of organization, including structure, job design, and task technology, as being interdependent with social aspects such as motivation, group dynamics, and leadership. As born out in many subsequent studies, a change in technical features of production (such as increased automation) would change peer relationships among workers that could lead to changes in their attitudes toward performance (Gibson, Shinn, and Locklear 1990). Likewise, changes in social or peer relations may affect the ways tasks are perceived and performed. Furthermore, the relationships among these factors are affected by the organization’s interaction with its environment (Trist 1981; Emery and Trist 1965; Emery 1959; Trist and Bamforth 1951). Studies of these factors concluded that the idea of a single, best organizational design had to be abandoned in favor of a contingency approach. For example, a more mechanical, Weberian-styled bureaucracy may work in a stable environment with a clear mission and little uncertainty about the tasks to be
accomplished, but it would be inappropriate in most other conditions, especially those which face high uncertainty, rapid change, and powerful forces that threaten survival (Emory and Trist 1965).

One can see the relevance of this insight in the Prairie County case. Organizations within the county had enjoyed stable, relatively peaceful conditions over many years, and some of them had simple organizational designs that emphasized hierarchical principles. But their designs and capacities were suddenly challenged by a host of changing environmental conditions, including the entry of highly exploitive mining companies and all their attendant problems. These immediately affected the nature of managerial and street-level tasks, as well as social relations, especially within the county’s public safety and social services organizations. They needed new, varied, and interlocking organizational designs in order to adapt to the new realities.

4. Adaptation and Contingent Theories. In 1967, James D. Thompson drew together several streams of literature to develop a much more sophisticated understanding of how organizations adapt to such situations. His book *Organizations in Action* set out a contingency theory of organizational adaptation that heavily influenced an entire generation of scholarship. Borrowing from an emerging systems perspective, Thompson characterized the classical organization and human relations schools as focusing on internal aspects of organization as if they were closed systems. Management work and organization design were conceived entirely as internal matters—focused on mechanics, flow of work, and harmonious work relations. Such focus takes for granted that factors external to the organization remain stable, and this cannot be safely assumed. The necessary inputs and outputs of the organization are affected in myriad ways by environmental conditions (Thompson 1967, chaps. 1–2).
Drawing from the field of organizational sociology, Thompson illustrated the need for an institutional-level perspective though which managers focus on imminent and emerging conditions in the environment of their organization. Their work consists more of diplomacy, co-optation, cutting deals, and cultivating multilateral relationships with competitors, regulators, clients, media, and suppliers (Selznick 1957, Burns and Stalker 1961, Thompson 1967). Managerial work in this realm must emphasize change, adaptation, and evolution. Institutional or strategic managers must adopt an open-systems perspective, much like a biological organism responding to its environment. They spend more time working in the environment of their organization—mostly through meetings, conferences, and other communication-oriented activities—than inside the organization itself. They must anticipate trends, scan for threats, span boundaries, enact changes in the environment that are favorable to their organization, and build on the organization’s domain (Thompson 1967, passim).

In light of the marked differences between inward-focused management and strategic management, Thompson then presented middle managers as translators, mediators, and buffers between them. Middle managers must translate the implications of strategic information, decisions, and policy changes for street-level operations (the “technical core” of the organization), and likewise inform strategic managers about the needs and capacities of the technical core in light of strategic factors. They must also mediate conflicts and tensions arising from the internal need for stability and control, and the strategic demands for flexibility and adaptation. Then, through various coping tactics, they must buffer and smooth the rates and extent of change that impact various parts of the organization. According to Thompson, middle managers perform these functions through capacity-building which entails developing a consistent supply of materials and human resources, providing support functions across
coordinating subunits, and through boundary spanning activities that organize and reorganize the
governance structures within the organization to meet new contingencies (Thompson 1967, chap. 3).

Despite their vital and distinct nature, the roles of middle managers are seldom appreciated or understood. Thompson’s work did much to illustrate their importance. Douglas Morgan and his coauthors (1996) conducted extensive field research in order to develop a richer understanding of middle-management functions in local government contexts. Their work challenges popular reinvention reforms that view middle-management functions as sources of unnecessary paperwork and redundancy that can be eliminated. The findings of their study are easily applied across a broad range of public organizations at any level and serve as a caution to those who seek to simplify and devolve organizational functions in search of greater efficiency and effectiveness. Their insights about the vital roles served by middle managers are briefly summarized in Figure 4.2.

The differentiation among levels and types of management responsibilities discerned by Thompson and many subsequent theorists drives home the point that management is not a uniform activity. Its practices vary dramatically across all levels and functions of organizational life. Thus, it is not uncommon for a “technical core” (street-level) manager to be promoted into a middle-management position and experience great difficulty adjusting to its tasks and orientation. The same is true for middle managers who are promoted into strategic roles. The tasks and perspectives ingrained at one level of management may actually inhibit the ability to understand and exercise management roles at other levels. As mentioned earlier, this phenomenon is referred to as trained incapacity (cf. Merton 1940), and it requires substantial reorientation and training to overcome.
Figure 4.2
Vital Functions of Middle Managers

1. *Interpreting and representing their work unit’s interests:* Must articulate needs/interests in allocation of resources for personnel and infrastructure, and develop policy responses to daily issues affecting distribution and definition of work unit tasks and responsibilities.

2. *Lending and securing assistance:* Much time is spent finding areas in which a middle manager’s subunit can be helpful to other subunits of the organization, as well as to external entities, and not be hurt in negotiations over turf responsibilities.

3. *Developing organizational relationships:* Must manage interdependent relationships with other work units in the accomplishment of shared tasks (a “linking/spanning function”). This includes fostering routine and coordinative relationships with external suppliers, regulators and clients, as well as with one’s own strategic managers.

4. *Leveraging others’ time:* Takes on ill-defined tasks and vague mandates to determine their significance for superiors and subordinates, thus saving their time for other work.

5. *Interpreting and negotiating what “good service” means:* Public entities often encounter uncertainty and controversy over appropriate means as well as goals. Middle managers frequently help develop and/or interpret standards that define “good service” at all levels of the agency. They must also help mediate the tensions among competing standards imposed by external regulators and suppliers.

6. *Insuring accountability in the context of diffused power and authority:* Must translate implications and influence of multiple sources of authority over the organization in coherent, operational terms. Must acquire legitimate authority to act on responsibilities with which the agency is saddled. Authority and responsibility are often incommensurate, which means it must be shared with other agencies and jurisdictions. This requires negotiation, coordination, and integration of intra- and inter-organizational tasks.

5. Contingent Structures for Getting the Job Done

In Thompson’s model, complex organizations require varying structural designs in order to cope with their myriad tasks and functions. Different kinds of tasks face different kinds of challenges, depending on the type and extent of uncertainty involved. Complex tasks with lots of uncertainty as to expectations and/or outcomes require highly interactive, collegial structures (reflecting reciprocal interdependence), as illustrated by medical teams working in an emergency room or SWAT teams dealing with a threatening situation. Tasks with more certainty and fairly stable rates of change can be handled more efficiently through hierarchical, linear, and specialized structures. For example, a nonprofit food pantry may assemble meals on an assembly line in which tasks are sequentially interdependent. The work at one stage is dependent on work done at the prior stage. In other cases, the work may involve multiple lines delivering the same kinds of products or services, as illustrated at a motor vehicle licensing office. The staff depends on a common pool of resources (pooled interdependence) but provides multiple avenues for accessing them.

Other important dimensions of organizational work involve task variety and task analyzability (Perrow 1986). Low task variety allows workers to focus their efforts on narrowly defined problems, such as how to place test monitors on well heads for purposes of assessing pollution levels. High task variety requires broad training that enables workers to adjust quickly to many different kinds of challenges. Social workers handling family services cases rely on a range of skills and concepts, and they may have to interact with other professionals to render effective aid to their clients. Task analyzability refers to the ability to assess and solve problems in a timely fashion. Low analyzability requires more intensive and interactive work, as exhibited
in teaching special education students. High analyzability enables standardization of work processes, as exemplified in building inspector units.

As task structures develop, they must be linked and integrated into the broader organization through various methods of coordination and control. These include more complex approaches involving mutual adjustment among organizational colleagues and different levels of management, as well as simpler approaches such as supervisory or expert-based direction (Mintzberg 1979). Here again, middle managers play a crucial role in developing and operationalizing the working relationships among subunits. As they do so, they also develop compliance mechanisms for monitoring performance and enforcing standards (Gross and Etzioni 1985). The sources of compliance are both internal and external. Typical internal mechanisms include accounting/auditing procedures, standard operating procedures, program objectives, job descriptions, performance evaluations, and consensus building. External controls may include legislative and/or executive oversight, imposed competition with rival organizations, budgetary conditions and restrictions, and procedural regulation. There are also unobtrusive control mechanisms that may actually play more powerfully on employees than direct mechanisms.

Herbert Simon (1945) noted that those who set the premises or parameters of decisions exert tremendous control over those who must make the decisions. Thus, the way new employees are trained, the organizational vocabulary they learn, and the workgroup processes to which they are socialized exert a general but very powerful problem- and process-defining influence on their thought and behavior. Andrew Dunsire’s (1979 empirical studies of employee behavior revealed that these unobtrusive factors more effectively guide and structure behavior than monitoring and supervision.
MANAGING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT AND CONTROVERSY

Relative to public organizations, Thompson’s contingency model overplays the drive to reduce uncertainty about goals, expectations, and effectiveness for the sake of organizational survival. Karen Hult and Charles Walcott (1990) observe that conflict and controversy are pervasive factors that affect structure and behavior in public organizations. Seeking to reduce these factors in public organizations is not always desirable, especially when so many public purposes are inherently ambiguous and must be held in tension with competing values. Moreover, because public organizations play constitutive as well as instrumental roles in society, they acquire more characteristics of political communities in their own right than do most private-sector organizations. Hult and Walcott thus emphasize public organizations as political systems or polities. Within these polities, a diverse array of organizational and network designs called governance structures may be found. Governance structures assist in coping with widely varying roles and responsibilities and in governing relationships among the citizens in the system (Hult and Walcott, chap. 8). The authors refer to the work of designing and arraying public organizational structures as organization policy (139): different network structures are used to knit organizational subunits together and to link a public organization to other organizations in its environment. Through their studies of public agencies, Hult and Walcott developed a typology of governance structures commonly found in public life. Figure 6.3 below lists types of governance structures and networks they identified.
Figure 4.3

Governance Structures and Networks

Governance Structures

- Hierarchical structures—top-down control, information up the chain, focus on rules and accountability, determinate ends and means
- Adjudicative structures—designed for recurring disputes of win/lose or right/wrong type, with rules of procedure to present views before a neutral decision maker
- Adversarial structures—permits advocacy of more than two points of view before a neutral party
- Collegial-competitive structures—legislative or deliberative bodies, reflecting multiple interests, no neutral decision maker
- Collegial-consensual structures—emphasizes agreement on the merits rather than by compromise, multiple revision of proposals, brainstorming, eliciting opinions
- Collegial-mediative structures—tactical maneuvering of interests, logrolling politics, clarification of positions, facilitation by mediators
- Market structures—undirected interplay of individual groups, minimal coercion, unspecified ends other than self-interest

Governance Networks

- Bureaucratic—standardized reporting, hierarchical authority
- Team—collaboration and collegiality, strong membership ties
- Decentralized—interactive, competitive, mutual adjustment
- Confrontational—intermittent clashes, limited participants, arbitral
- Bargaining—rule-structured compromise and negotiation, votes and vetoes
- Consultative—conveying multiple types of expertise to decision makers
- Appeals—reconsideration of decisions by other bodies via hearings and reviews
- Hybrid—networks embedded within networks, transformation of forms over time

1Hult and Walcott 1990, chap. 3, 33–47.
ORGANIZATION POLICY AND THE CENTRALITY OF NETWORKS

Hult and Walcott’s treatment of networks anticipated growing interest by scholars associated with the New Public Management movement of the late 1990s and 2000s. These scholars focus attention on the flexibility and adaptability of governance networks in public settings marked by decentralization, downsizing, and privatization (Salamon 2002, O’Toole 1997, Milward and Provan 1998, 1995). Public organizations are viewed as collages of implementation networks that manifest a wide variety of contractual agreements and granting relationships with nonprofit and private sector organizations that now implement many public services. Philip Cooper (2003, 16) aptly characterizes this as a shift of policy from authority to governance by agreement.

Networks in this literature appear to supplant programs as the dominant unit of analysis, preferring rapid adaptability and transformation of operations to stable, programmed routines. Thus, as might be expected, the literature emphasizes hybrid forms of networks.

The network literature is also related to an older body of scholarship on policy subsystems (cf. Wamsley 1985), which emphasizes interorganizational and interpersonal relationships that cohere around policy fields. Policy implementation in a federal system such as ours cannot be confined to any single organization or agency. One must usually map out a complex set of stakeholders made up of organizations, networks, and key individuals who are linked through interdependence of authority, power, location, and resources. Policy subsystems form a unit of analysis in their own right and explain much more about how things get done than by relying exclusively on organization-level perspectives. For example, in the Prairie County case, local officials formed a network that linked organizations and other key players (like guardians ad litem) to leverage resources, alliances, expertise, and organizational capacity for more effective solutions and coping strategies. This resulted in a new subsystem of closer,
coordinative relationships among criminal justice agencies, schools, mining firms, housing authorities, county and town elites, and youth placement centers across the state. One cannot understand how families and kids receive social and protective services without tracing implementation processes through the subsystem.

While the network and policy subsystem literature adds valuable insights to our understanding of policy implementation, they tend to take for granted that most of the players in these systems require support systems, legal portfolios, and powers typically conferred through an organizational home. They tend to stress informal, flexible, and adaptive relationships, and to overlook the need for solid institutional grounding. This is especially true of the network literature. Cooper (2003, 160–62) notes that contracting through leaned, weakened public institutions “is hardly likely to obtain a good deal for the public,” and that contracts are still legal instruments that require an infrastructure of carefully developed standards and resources in order to ensure fidelity to the public interest. The capacity of government for maintaining this infrastructure is already stretched to breaking point, while New Public Management doctrine continues to emphasize deregulation and elimination of red tape. As Cooper notes, more attention needs to be paid to how contracts are actually managed and what the results really look like (162). This leads inevitably to concerns about adequate support and organization. Hult and Walcott add that this includes paying more attention to the status and conditions of employees as organizational citizens.

PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS AS POLITIES

The varied governance structures identified above by Hult and Walcott enable employees to interpret, classify, and process problems, and to cope with them over time. Moreover, the
structures are grouped into various kinds of political systems in which organizational citizens work out such matters as issues of power allocation, “the extent and nature of members’ participation in organizational decision making, and the bases of the political system’s legitimacy” (Hult and Walcott 1990, 113–14). These matters transcend the concern for instrumental control that is so prominent in the field of organization theory (cf. J.D. Thompson 1967, Mintzberg 1983, Etzioni 1975).

By treating organizations as polities, Hult and Walcott emphasize politics as a central rather than a peripheral and aberrant activity in organizational life. Though politics may at times interfere with good managerial practices, it also structures and conditions them for effective operation. For example, some organizations may adopt attributes of a collectivist polity that emphasizes equal distribution of authority among colleagues in order to manage complex tasks requiring high levels of interaction. Hospitals, analysis shops, and legal organizations (or subunits therein) are good examples. In others, management work may be conditioned by more plural, competitive relations among colleagues and subunits, and thereby require bargaining and compromising practices among disparate yet confederated members. Local community service organizations, for example, may be comprised of formerly separate nonprofit providers who banded together to leverage resources while continuing to maintain their respective missions. Other organizations (such as police, fire, and military agencies) may reflect the political characteristics of a command polity, with hierarchical, rule-based management practices (Hult and Walcott 1990, 114–16).

Understanding organizations as polities, then, means that management practices contribute in varying ways to an organization’s authoritative allocation of values (Easton 1965), and to the determination of who gets what, where, and when through its political economy
Management thus constitutes a form of governance, and all employee groups participate in it, regardless of their titles. This becomes quite evident in the dynamics of human resources management, wherein employee groups seek to enhance their status, power, and roles in determining work responsibilities, resource allocation, and organizational conditions (see chapter 8). From this perspective, organization design addresses constitutional elements that include criteria of membership, empowerment, rights and benefits, substantive roles and responsibilities, and status. As such, organization design is not treated simply as a matter of unified, rational effort, but of political evolution through decisions based in compromise, tradition, habit, rules, chance, intuition, and competing forms of advocacy (Stone 1997, 233–56).

A variety of theories have evolved in political science and organizational sociology that treat organizations as political systems. Herbert Simon (1945), Richard Cyert and James March (1963) and Johan Olsen (2001) developed a branch of administrative science that focuses on decisions as a unit of analysis in organizational life. Decisions are not simply isolated, discrete entities: they are typically arranged in routinized patterns called programs (Simon 1960). As many readers will notice, this is a term now used formally as well as informally to designate many public entities. Programs are designated organizational subunits that must be linked and coordinated to achieve broader organizational goals. However, the process is not simply a matter of conscious, rational design, but of programmed competition and advocacy among coalitions of organization interests (Cyert and March 1963). Simon noted that few decisions are ever optimal in nature. Rather, they are “bounded” by limitations of knowledge, experience, habit, and capacity, and therefore require managers to make decisions that are just satisfactory and
sufficient for the moment. He coined the term *satisficing* to characterize such decisions (Simon 1947, 38–41; also see Cyert and March 1963).

From these ideas, Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) derived a model that describes complex organizations as “garbage cans” of programmed solutions which compete to solve problems. Such organizations are made up of coalitions that offer outputs from well-established routines and outcomes from political battles and compromises with competitors. Graham Allison (1971) used this schema in his classic study of the Cuban Missile Crisis to illustrate how decision models based in programmed routines and political advocacy reveal a vastly different reality than is typically portrayed in “unified rational” accounts of such affairs. He showed, for example, that the U.S. Air Force predictably lobbied for surgical air strikes as a solution to the presence of nuclear missiles in Cuba, while the Navy predictably advocated a blockade. One can easily guess what kind of solution the U.S. State Department pursued. Applying the same kind of analysis to the Russians revealed that decisions to move missiles to Cuba resulted more from bureaucratic routines and outcomes of political battles than from a rational master plan.

Similarly, Charles Lindblom (1959, 1965) adapted a pluralist political model to organizational life, and he described decision making as a matter of “successive limited comparisons” that allow agencies to adapt incrementally, rather than of “rational-comprehensive” analyses commonly advocated in traditional management literature. In their limited capacities, according to Lindblom, agencies must rely on existing patterns of resource allocation and status quo operations, and they must adapt slowly at the margins in response to external pressures. Administrators adopt a variety of political tactics and games to finesse these marginal adjustments. Aaron Wildavsky, another highly influential political scientist, employed this framework in his classic work *The Politics of the Budgetary Process* (1964) to describe the
variety of games played by federal agency officials to win favorable budgetary decisions through congressional and executive branch politics. He also illustrated the usefulness of the approach in explaining how policy analysis works in practice (Wildavsky 1979).

Finally, theorists such as Thomas Sergiovanni and John Corbally (1984), Edgar Schein (1985), Vijay Sathe (1985), Gareth Morgan (1986), and J. Steven Ott (1989) devoted attention to the concept of organizational culture as a useful framework for explaining the dynamics of organizational design and behavior. Borrowing from the sociology of professions, the study of organizational socialization, and from work on political symbolism and interpretivism, these theorists interpreted organizations as systems of highly ingrained, taken-for-granted assumptions, values, and symbols that affect behavior in largely unconscious ways. They provide premises, parameters, norms, and expectations that unconsciously guide or induce people to prefer one method over another, to make certain kinds of decisions over others, and to choose certain groups over others in organizational life. Attention is drawn to shared meanings and assumptions, mental models, established rules of the game, organizational climate, guiding metaphors, and integrating symbols (Schein 1993. These are phenomena of human belief, interpretation, and values that structure political relationships and define appropriate means as well as ends. Every organization displays an array of these phenomena that define the lived experience of organizational life. They define expectations of what constitutes good work or good management in organizational contexts. They define the proper ways of acting and interacting in the organizational community. They also constitute interpretive systems for determining what is real, what is believed, and what is significant about organizational activities and the environment (Daft 1984).
Thus, upon entering an organization, newcomers must look for ways of making sense about what is going on. They will have to learn the ropes and adopt the organizational vocabulary in order to fit in (Ritti and Funkhouser 1977, passim). They will have to acclimate to its political culture and subcultures. Only then will they begin to understand what proper management and organization design means, because these are heavily contingent upon the character of the organizational community. Moreover, organizational members must know how to work within the culture to effect changes that will respond appropriately to external influences. Such adaptation is neither purely instinctive nor purely rational. It is negotiated, interpreted, translated, and mediated, and is marked as much by miscommunication and failure as success. This is the messy world of political life where both means and ends are matters of interpretations that can be debated and misconstrued, and tend to be ambiguous, normative, and paradoxical in nature (Stone 1997).

NOTES

1. Weber (1864–1920) identified bureaucratic organizations as the defining characteristic of the modern political economy emerging in the late 1800s. His broad, comparative studies of ancient and contemporary society influenced scholars well before his works were translated into English and made available in America. His analysis of bureaucracy is scattered among a number of his works. The most influential collection of his work was published in a translation by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills in 1946.


4. In *Chester I. Barnard and the Guardians of the Managerial State* (1992), William G. Scott analyzes the history of this influential circle of scholars in Boston who were funded by newly formed philanthropies that served to reinforce behaviors most appropriate to large organizations—behaviors that were antithetical to liberal democracy. According to Scott, the emerging social sciences serve the same organizational masters.

Chapter V

Creating Authority in a Power Shared World

- Creating Ownership of the Whole Through Collaboration and Co-production
- Managing Conflict
- Strategies for Collaborative Processes and Agreements

We live in a world where no one is “in charge.” No one organization or institution has the legitimacy, power, authority, or intelligence to act alone on important public issues and still make substantial headway against the problems that threaten us all. No one is in charge when it comes to the greenhouse effect, AIDS, homelessness, the federal deficit, declining inner cities, drug abuse, domestic violence, or a host of other public problems. Many organizations or institutions are involved, affected, or have a partial responsibility to act. . . . As a result, we live in a “shared-power” world. If we are to survive and prosper, and if our children and grandchildren—and their children and grandchildren—are to enjoy the benefits of our ability to make the world better, we must find ways to think and act more effectively in a shared-power world. (John M. Bryson and Barbara C. Crosby 1992, xiv)

At century’s end, the United States is confronted with a host of complex problems that touch every segment of society. The nation’s urban communities are in crisis as homelessness, crime and severe poverty continue to take their toll. Once again, our public education system is under attack. The embarrassing discovery that millions of adults are illiterate has stoked the fire of education reformers who believe that massive changes are needed for America to compete successfully in a rapidly changing, increasingly interdependent world. The number of Americans who lack adequate health care . . . has become a national disgrace. . . . The nature and scope of these and countless other problems, and the perception that public and private
institutions are ineffective in solving them, have sparked a renewed interest in leadership. (Larry D. Terry 1995, 1–2)

In a world characterized by diffusion of power in both policy making and delivery of public services, administrative leaders play critical roles in accomplishing the work of democratic governance. As we have argued throughout this book (see especially chapter 1, pp. 24–28, and chapter 4, pp. 162ff.), no one person or jurisdiction is in charge of the fractured world administrators inhabit. Heads of agencies, directors of nonprofits, and executives of special districts are in charge of a mission, a program, or a project, and carry responsibility for achieving these as part of a broader public good. But these leaders rarely have the ability on their own to define a problem or have access to all parts of a solution necessary to deliver the public goods and services they are charged with providing. In short, public service administrators occupy what Barbara Crosby and John Bryson (1992, 2005) characterize as a world of shared power.

Leading in a shared-power world requires many traditional management skills, such as planning, directing, and coordinating, but it also requires the addition of a different set of skills that include collaborative decision making, brokering deals, and bridging resources. This is “boundary-spanning” leadership; it places a premium on the ability to work in the midst of an undefined structure with a loosely coupled group of participants, assist them in creating a sense of shared meaning, and support them in maintaining direction. This is more like navigating a sail-powered tall ship than driving a sports car. So much depends on circumstances, on elements outside of one’s control, and on the willing cooperation of others working in concert. In short, leading public service organizations today requires increased collaborative skill in choosing priorities and bringing them to fruition.
This chapter helps readers understand the significant challenges faced by the current generation of public service leaders, especially those operating in legally mandated decentralized structures of authority: the enduring tensions enumerated in earlier chapters, the nature of our mixed political economy, and the forces of globalization that disconnect people from place. While leadership has been a dominant theme in the popular press and a topic of consistent attention in academic literature, many of the espoused theories of leadership envision leaders who take charge, who unilaterally marshal people and material resources within their organizations to meet exigent circumstances. This is not the world that public administrators inhabit, whether at the front line, in middle management, or at the executive levels of organizations. In fact, it has never been the world public administrators have inhabited.

There are those like Crosby and Bryson who argue that the world today presents new challenges of dispersion and balkanization—challenges that threaten our sense of commonality and common good while vastly complicating our interdependent relationships at home and abroad. The world today may be more fragmented, or perhaps fragmented differently than in the past; however, we do not believe that the need for a leadership model that helps us deal with leading in a shared-power world is different today than it was over 200 years ago when our dispersed-power model was established in our constitutional systems of governance.

This chapter presents a model for leading in shared-power contexts based upon the constitutional balancewheel described in chapter 2. We believe this model is well suited to the diffuse and rapidly changing conditions of the modern world. Our approach to leadership shares much in common with Crosby and Bryson (1992, 2005), but is more institutional and constitutional in focus, and therefore one that is attuned to things we hold in common as a distinct political community. The following sections of this chapter address the current
challenges to leadership, the inadequacy of conventional leadership theories, and how the requirements of constitutional governance affect and inform leadership. We then use the legacy model of leadership presented in chapter and illustrate its operation in practice.

CREATING OWNERSHIP OF THE WHOLE THROUGH COLLABORATION AND CO-PRODUCTION: HOW AMERICAN RULE OF LAW SYSTEM" CREATES THE NEED FOR LEADING IN A POWER-SHARED WORLD

Many of the challenges that public administrators face have been aptly characterized as “wicked problems” (Rittel and Weber 1973). Such problems are exemplified in the emergency response and security issues faced by the new U.S. Department of Homeland Security, in efforts to manage watersheds and community public health, in the disputes over curricula in public education, and in managing the effects on our communities and labor force of an increasingly globalized world. These problems defy simple solutions and single organizations. They necessarily transcend sectors and political jurisdictions. Even seemingly straightforward problems such as delivering clean drinking water, establishing a library, or creating kindergarten programs are likely to involve dozens of organizations, policy actors, and interest groups. Gareth Morgan illustrates the complexity of policy problems through maps, as exemplified in Figure 5.1 (2006, 268) and Figure 5.2 (2006, 269).

The problems of mad cow disease and maintaining electrical power supply illustrated in these maps are typical of problems faced by those in positions of both political and administrative leadership. Educational attainment, child hunger, transportation planning, emergency preparedness, drinking water supply, health insurance, and developing vital cities all have maps at least as complex as those in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2.
Figure 5:1 Positive and Negative Feedback in the Power Industry.
Figure 5.2 The "Mad Cow" Phenomenon. (Used by permission, Morgan, Gareth. Images of Organizations. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California, 2006, page 200)
These maps help us realize that multiple organizations, associations, and individuals acting both in their personal and organizational capacities play important roles in helping to solve or cope with any given problem. Some of this complexity lies in the nature of the problems addressed. For example, national security, law enforcement, education, public health, and transportation planning are inherently complicated. But the ways in which we deal with them are also complicated by our governing principles, structures, and processes.

The founding principles of the American Constitution provide a good starting point for understanding why leadership in the United States has always been a shared-power activity. America’s governing system provides for a mixed political economy in which neither the marketplace nor the political arena exercises complete hegemony in the allocation of resources, or in the generation of regulations, goods, and services. Its federal (national/state/local) design guarantees that there are multiple levels and venues for political action. The size and diversity of the republic, and the liberties it encourages, guarantee the proliferation of factions or interest groups that frustrate unifying leaders (The Federalist No. 10). Checks and balances curb authority by distributing power among various branches. It may surprise some readers that our state and national constitutions evince profound mistrust of leaders. The founders feared demagogues who would manipulate passions and prejudices for personal gain at public expense. They believed the rights of minorities would easily be trampled upon through exploitation of majoritarian politics, and that the rule of law might too easily fail without structural precautions that moderate the temptation to demagoguery—the pursuit of narrow interests by ambitious and charismatic leaders.

These structural characteristics ensure that no leader, nor unit or branch of government is solely in charge of public policy. Our constitutional structures at the federal and state levels
anticipate, even build in, an element of conflict as an integral safeguard against overbearing leadership. Moreover, the limited powers of our governments leave ample room for private and nonprofit sectors, and enable proliferation of special districts, all of which play significant roles in addressing public problems. When combined with the recent trends toward greater privatization of public services and globalization of our economy, it is not difficult to see why administrative leadership and capacity are diffuse and indeterminate, and why no one seems to be in control of policy processes and outcomes.

There are also some less obvious though important ways in which the American constitutional system poses leadership challenges for public servants. First, at a basic cultural level, Americans are at once committed to individualism and deeply suspicious of those charged with public leadership. Second, the commitment to individualism has spawned a multiplicity of interests that make it difficult for leaders to create agreement among competing groups. And finally, multijurisdictional responsibilities make it difficult for leaders to address problems that require collaboration across political boundaries. Each of these challenges requires some elaboration to fully appreciate.

**Individualism**

The problem of public leadership has deep roots in the American political tradition. As discussed in chapter 2, our political and economic systems share a common root in classical liberalism, which asserts that authority rests first with individuals. Governmental power is derived as a grant of authority from those who want their rights protected through a social contract. Similarly, in a market economy, the idealized actor is the individual who exercises autonomous choice in pursuit of his or her material self-interest. It is through the aggregation of individual preferences
and actions that political society and its economy are formed. This presents a rather stark view of society as a mere collection of autonomous strangers interacting only as they are motivated to advance their mutual interests. Such a view minimizes the role of community and government, and therefore also of public leadership. Furthermore, people are much more complicated than this stark, individualistic image depicts.

While Americans express strong individualistic preferences, they also express a desire to live in communities with a real sense of identity and commitment to a larger common good. For example, when asked where they would like to live, most choose vibrant communities that work—where schools function, where potholes are filled, where the perception of a high quality of life exists, where public services are effective and efficient, where people are known and respected, and where the public, private, and nonprofit institutions join in fashioning community identity and spirit (cf. Bellah et al. 1985). Successfully managing this tension between libertarian individualism and our more communitarian aspirations constitutes a key standard against which public service leadership is measured, and it is not an easy standard to meet.

**Multiplicity of Interests**

A well-documented outcome of our penchant for individualism is the rise of increasingly specialized interest groups. The pluralist tradition of special interest group advocacy teaches us to pursue our individual interests through organizations and associations that will advocate for us in the halls of government. We do not entrust such work solely to our elected representatives because they are incapable of knowing the diverse interests of such a large and heterogeneous population. People join advocacy groups, professional associations, labor unions, and political action groups that target highly specific measures, and then they search for political candidates
who support them. In many instances, these groups will faithfully carry an individual’s views into the political arena and effectively advocate for his or her interests. However, even within such specialized organizations, it is likely that intense differences among members on key issues will still arise.

The interest group pluralism that is inherent to the American extended republic creates circumstances where disaggregated interests profoundly disagree with each other, not only among groups of people, but within each group as well. Groups easily splinter into a fury of single-minded commitments and passions. When this occurs, leaders are faced with the condition of hyperpluralism, where coalitions of interests are exceedingly difficult to achieve for broader collective purposes. For example, a diverse array of special interests may be able to coalesce around a narrow issue, but not be able to sustain this agreement to a larger common interest. This is reflected in efforts to ban tobacco advertising, preserve endangered species, create national scenic areas, legalize medical marijuana, regulate pollutants in the environment, and a host of other issues that cut across organizational, jurisdictional, and sectoral boundaries (see Abbott, Adler, and Abbott 1997; Yaffee 1994; Fritschler and Hoefler 1996; Bryner 1995). Furthermore, rather than people sorting out what they care about most and affirming it through civic engagement, interest groups step into their place, speaking for them as professional representatives. As a result of this group-oriented approach to public affairs, many citizens thereby gradually lose their capacities to engage civilly in public arenas—they lose the temperament needed to engage in politics. The potential for responsible, democratic leadership suffers in the process (Putnam 2000, 49–51).
Multiplicity of Jurisdictions

While hyperpluralism results in a world of divisive single interests represented by professional advocates in the policy-making process, the implementation side of the process is also fractured. Multiple political and legal arenas make it likely that normal implementation processes will result in conflicting outcomes. For example, a local community may vote to develop plans for more green space that follows watercourses to connect the town with remote rivers and open spaces. The town’s new “green necklace” plan will likely face some daunting challenges. For example, the state legislature may decide to decrease funding for parks and open spaces in order to meet higher state priorities on funding education, criminal justice, or transportation. The federal government may complicate things with expensive environmental regulations or incentive programs that heavily skew or derail the community’s plans. Other political entities are also likely to exercise jurisdiction over portions of the watercourse or associated lands. Parts of the land may be held by any combination of counties, private landowners, or states that have jurisdiction over navigable waterways up to the high-water mark. In some settings, Native American tribes or the federal government may hold significant portions of the watercourse.

The green necklace plan envisioned by the town thus depends on the action of multiple jurisdictions. Making such a plan actually work, therefore, requires administrators to coordinate actions across many organizational boundaries and jurisdictions, with each facing different legal, organizational, and political imperatives. Figure 5.3 below illustrates how this might look.
The green necklace plan may appear as a typical program management problem that requires coordination of multiple participants. The difference is that program management, as it
is typically understood and applied in the private sector, does not assume that participants have equal and independent governing authority. This means that “what counts for success” may not be defined by the project requirements, but may be defined by larger governing principles, structures, and processes that are in conflict.

Another complication arises from the way in which multiple jurisdictions deliver their services. Development and implementation of the green necklace plan will require a series of land-use ordinance changes, alterations to public landowners’ management plans, and some land exchanges with willing sellers to balance private with public interests. The constellation of jurisdictions affected by the new plan may require the services of a local land trust or a special-purpose intermediary such as the Wetlands Joint Venture or the Nature Conservancy to focus collaborative efforts on achieving a workable land exchange. Furthermore, private landowners may not be interested in selling their lands, but willing to condition them with easements or other legal mechanisms. If this happens, questions arise about who can or should hold the easement, with options ranging from the local governments to a nonprofit trust or a homeowners’ association. Creating the desired policy outcomes thus requires familiarity with a wide variety of coordinative mechanisms to accommodate a multitude of jurisdictions, the business and nonprofit sectors, and dozens of interested individuals and groups.

The conditions described above explain why power sharing is especially relevant to the work of American public administrators, and why public leadership will always be frustrated. However, despite all the impediments, leadership is still possible, still viable, and still necessary. There are many kinds of leadership and many theories of leadership, all of which are useful in the right contexts. Few theories, though, take the shared-power context of public life fully into
account, and most overlook the distinct institutional qualities required in American constitutional governance.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND THEIR INADEQUACIES
An extensive literature exists on leaders and leadership. It draws from all the professions, including public administration, business administration, education, social work, and from academic disciplines such as history, political science, psychology, social psychology, sociology, and anthropology. It is hard to consolidate, summarize, or distill this literature around any single theme or principle. For our purposes we have organized this literature around its focus on individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis. We do this for two reasons: first, the literature lends itself to this kind of analysis; second, in our own leadership development work with practitioners, we have found that the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed for these different kinds of leadership are quite different. We briefly review the characteristics of these three approaches and identify a variety of inadequacies. We end our analysis with an examination of the implications of the various approaches for the kind of constitutional and governance work that administrators are required to undertake.

Trait-Based and Individual-Centered Theories
Leadership inevitably focuses attention on the unique qualities of individuals who assume the mantel of leadership responsibility. A classic example of this popular approach looks for traits or characteristics that distinguish leaders from followers (Yukl 1981; Boyatzis 1982; Kirkpatrick and Locke 1991). Until recently these traits have been associated with the “great man” approach to leadership, emphasizing distinctive qualities (usually male) in settings traditionally dominated by men. People are fascinated with the qualities they believe make great leaders, especially those
who shaped our own history, whether they are presidents such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt or industrialists such as Andrew Carnegie and Lee Iacocca. Charisma, courage, energy, wisdom, and other traits have been studied as a basis for distinguishing these leaders from their followers. More recent research has explored traits among women, such as compassion, emotion, affinity, and other qualities that yield a distinctive “relational” approach to leadership (Regan and Brooks 1995; Gilligan 1993). An accompanying literature summarizes individual characteristics of women leaders (cf. Helgesen 1990, Farrel 1996; Martin 1996; Rosenthal 1998; Fisher 1999). However, as appealing as these studies of men and women leaders may be, individual trait theories fall short of explaining leadership.

Analyses of trait-based studies and their supporting literature have found no clear distinction between leaders and nonleaders in terms of the many dozens of traits explored (House and Aditya 1997; Kirkpatrick and Locke 1991). Little consistency and predictability can be found in relating any given trait to successful leadership (Jennings 1961). Recent research using bundled personality characteristics suggests that some traits are related to leader emergence, but they are not reliable in predicting leader success (Judge et al. 2000). While trait-based theory explains some dimensions of leadership, the failure of this approach to explain or predict effectiveness has led researchers away from individual traits to the importance of contextual influences within particular settings.

One set of scholars has focused attention on the dynamics that occur within small group settings, while another set has focused on the larger external factors that shape what counts for “good leadership.” Together, the group- and contingency-based theories have helped to broaden the leadership lens to focus on those factors that are distinctive to successful leadership in the
public sector. We will discuss this broadening focus of leadership studies in the sections that follow.

*Group-Centered Theories*

Sociologists have taken the lead in focusing attention on the dynamics of leadership within group settings. For example, Guy Swanson (1970), observed that when people find themselves in groups, they engage in formative social processes that are interpretive and deliberative in nature. Leaders emerge through the group’s search for substantive meaning and direction. Leaders test ideas in relationship to group members. Group members array themselves in association with the people who are expressing ideas that resonate with them. The intricate dance between leader and follower builds the shared meaning of the group and inculcates a sense of purpose from which specific goals emerge. This social process matures as leader-expressed meanings and actions become vested in the group as whole. The group-formation literature underscores the interaction necessary for groups to take ownership of expressed values, and how work roles are sorted out and defined over time (Wilson 2002; Hunt 2007). The process is interactive and recursive, meaning that leadership roles are redefined and reassigned as group values evolve and group solidarity ebbs and flows.

Group theory introduces another level of sophistication through its attention to ideas and meaning, as well as roles. Leadership does not depend entirely upon manipulation of psychological needs or upon a person’s leadership style. Leaders emerge, evolve, and devolve within groups over time, in part due to the normative saliency of their ideas and their ability to inculcate or cultivate shared meaning. As shared meaning coalesces, work roles develop that define expectations and appropriate relations among members. People grow or adapt to the
defined roles, which shape attitudes and norms about proper leadership. Good leadership is defined in large measure by the content of, and relationships among, institutional roles. These aspects of group theory embrace the idea that leadership functions exist in many group roles, that there are multiple leaders, and that intergroup dynamics play as much of a formative influence on groups as internal dynamics.

Group theories have had an important influence on our thinking about organizations. For example, some organizational sociologists describe complex organizations as conglomerations of workgroups that evolve around common means as well as purposes (Weick 1979). Organizations engender patterned relationships that constitute structures, within which there is order and role definition. The complexity arising from the development of these multiple patterns of relationships within organizations is now known as contingency leadership theory.

Contingency Theories

In the 1950s and 1960s, social psychologists began to focus on leadership as a manifestation of group functions and dynamics in corporate organizations (McGregor 1960; Hersey and Blanchard 1981, 1977a, Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson 2001; Blake and Mouton 1964). Their research found that effective leadership depends upon an appropriate match between organization/group conditions and leadership style (Fiedler 1967; Fiedler and Garcia 1987; Vroom and Yetten 1973; House 1971; House and Mitchell 1974; House 1996). Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1964) developed a popular leadership grid along two primary dimensions, one focusing on “concern for task” and the other on “concern for people.” The grid, presented in Figure 5.4, displays a range from 1 to 9 along each dimension, reflecting varying degrees to
which concern for task and concern for people yield varying leadership styles. William Reddin (1970, 41–47) refined the grid into quadrants that yield four basic leadership styles: supporting, coaching, delegating, and autocratic. These styles emphasize the importance of sizing up what is most appropriate to the needs of a given group before determining what type of leadership will be most effective.

A variety of contingency models exist in the literature. All follow the same basic logic and strongly resemble each other. They improve on trait and group theory approaches by suggesting that leadership can, at least to some extent, be trained and adapted to varying circumstances to enhance effectiveness. For example, emergency conditions may call for more directive, task-oriented leadership, while leading a problem-solving team through an emergent,
poorly defined, and long-term situation may require more attention to relationships and process skills. In a public sector marked by frequently conflicting values these skills are especially important.

However, the inadequacies of the contingency model are evident in its exclusive focus on workgroups and organizations with simple superior/subordinate relationships. It presumes a single, formal leader, or at least a clear hierarchy of formal leaders within a single organization. Such assumptions should not be made—especially in public service contexts where subordinates often have multiple superiors and many workgroups have collegial membership across several organizations. Moreover, legal authority and personnel protections in public life are likely diffused among subordinate as well as supervising positions. The absence of clear hierarchy and multiple legal obligations mean that subordinates bring more independence to the table than is presumed in the corporate contexts of contingency models. Contingency theorists are likely to claim that their models still apply but must be tailored to the differing circumstances of each sector. While there is some merit in this argument, their research methods consistently ignore sectoral differences in favor of a workgroup model based in generic social-psychological theory. Philip Selznick (1949, 1957) built on these insights to fashion an institutional approach to leadership that recognizes the significance of the organization as the unit of analysis.

Organizational and Institution-Centered Leadership Theories

Selznick begins with the organization as his unit of analysis. He argues that leadership at organizational levels is a process of weaving and co-opting narrower group interests into a broader organizational community of mutual interests and common vision. His classic study of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA; 1949) illustrates how federal officials bargained, cajoled, and co-opted a diverse array of community and business leaders into long-term collaboration
with the TVA that would bring electricity to the valley, control flooding, and promote economic
development of a primitive region. Selznick emphasizes leadership in this context as an
institution-building process that transforms instrumental group and organizational agendas into
larger communities of shared meaning, capacity, and purpose (see chapter 6). He describes how
institutionalization emerged over time through a gradual and successive process of tying the
work of the TVA more deeply to the partners in the region. This type of leadership presumes a
sense of the whole, a sense of proportion, of how disparate groups and interests in the
institution’s environment can be knitted together.

Selznick’s work has been criticized for its preoccupation with the co-optive nature of
leadership of large-scale, conservative, and monolithic institutions of the post-World War II era.
Although this critique has some merit, his work represents an important precursor to “new
institutionalism,” a school of sociology-oriented scholars who, in the 1980s, rejuvenated the
focus on institutions as the primary unit of analysis. These scholars emphasize the fluid,
interpretive, adaptive, and dynamic nature of institutions (cf. Powell and DiMaggio 1991;
Douglas 1986, Elkin and Soltan 1993). Selznick’s pioneering work and the “new
institutionalism” that followed drew attention to the unique characteristics of public institutions
where powers are intentionally diffuse and shared.

LEADING PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Since the mid-1970s, a number of scholars have focused their attention on the uniqueness of the
public sector and the implications this may have for the exercise of leadership. One of the more
influential theorists, James McGregor Burns (1978), developed a leadership dichotomy that
adapted much of the previous literature for use in political settings. He posited that leaders
generally adopted one of two general methods of leading. Many leaders use a “transactional” approach that relies on a sense of reciprocity or exchange between leaders and followers. Politicians, for example, make campaign promises to constituents in exchange for their votes. While this is a common approach to leadership, it lacks much in the way of synergy needed to cultivate and sustain a common vision or shared sense of the public interest.

For Burns, the more attractive type of leadership is “transformational,” which he defines as the ability to raise the consciousness of followers regarding common and higher values that transform mere aggregations of interests into a shared commitment to a larger common good (Burns 1978, 141–254). This kind of leadership changes people, affects their outlook on individual and collective life, and draws them together with a new identity and shared meaning. For all its claims, however, Burns’s work rejuvenates an individual-level of analysis, as evidenced in his biographical treatments of exemplary transformational leaders, and fuses it with the modern social-psychological literature. It is an extremely appealing fusion, but from a normative, constitutional perspective, it creates the potential specter of demagogues—leaders with immense charisma who manipulate the social-psychological dimensions of motivation through charm and propaganda to consolidate power toward their own ends. Communities of “true believers” who construct a solidarity of shared meaning may be transformative, but they may not be very interested or respectful of the constitutional system of governance and the competing values it seeks to hold in dynamic balance. We believe Burns’s emphasis on the social-psychological dynamic of leadership gives insufficient attention to institutions and roles defined in part by norms and structures inherent to America’s constitutional system of governance.
Another popular author, Jeffrey Luke (1998), developed the concept of “catalytic” leadership. Luke argues that successful leadership results from the proper timing of speech and actions that catalyze others to employ resources, information, and positions for collaboratively determined purposes. The control over formal authority, resources, or information is less important than being able to make sense out of the complexities of a community or policy subsystem, and having a sense of proper timing of one’s actions. In Luke’s catalytic model, effective leaders identify critical points for action (thinking strategically), cultivate key relationships among power holders and operational groups, and maintain constancy of purpose that inspires others (leading from passion and strength) to achieve appropriate ends.

With catalytic leadership, individuals and groups convene multiple stakeholder groups, and facilitate and mediate agreement around tough issues. We live in a complex world of interconnections in which take-charge leaders are less successful than individuals and groups who provide the spark or catalyst that truly makes a difference. (Luke 1998, 4)

Implicit in Luke’s approach is the idea that leadership is not necessarily a matter of constant effort, repeated exhortation, and monitoring by leaders. Rather, effective leaders know how to wait, how to time words and actions for full rhetorical effect. They sense when groups are more or less ready to hear a message, to engage in meaningful discourse, to reach consensus, and to act. This kind of leadership helps cultivate conditions of trust and interaction that lead to fruitful communication and discourse about things that matter to everyone involved. It also respects followers for their own judgments as political actors who bring their own contributions to the effort (Green and Zinke 1993).

John Carver’s work (1990) has also made an important contribution to our thinking about the distinctiveness of public leadership. Carver focuses on the challenge of leading in a world of
shifting coalitions and rapid organizational change. In the nonprofit world, for example, leaders often run organizations that depend on shared commitments and causes among staff, volunteers, and partners whose organizational identities are tenuous at best. Their host organization may radically change in scale of operation as well as in its linkages to related nonprofit organizations and public agencies. Leaders must maintain constancy of the binding purpose or mission in the face of severe organizational instability. Preparing employees, whether paid or volunteer, for such conditions presents a leadership challenge in its own right. For example, a local community and educational services nonprofit in Salt Lake City recently experienced severe cutbacks in a critical service due to reductions in federal grant funding. Two paid staff positions were threatened as a result. The director of the nonprofit had prepared the employees well in advance for this contingency, and worked with them to find alternative funding from a local organization to continue their services with some modifications. This included converting the staff members to employees of the paying organization, while retaining them at the same site to preserve service integration.

Finally, Crosby and Bryson (1992, 2005) have synthesized the work of a generation of scholars and reflective practitioners on leading in public organizational and community settings where no single person is in charge. They argue that the conditions of modern life require “a new understanding of power” (2005, 17) whereby agencies, organizations and other entities must learn to share resources, authority, and activities to meet common goals. Achieving concerted action requires a variety of leadership capabilities. From their research, Crosby and Bryson derived a list of the following capabilities:

- Understanding the social, political, and economic givens as well as potentialities
- Understanding and deploying personal assets on behalf of beneficial change
- Building effective workgroups
• Nurturing humane and effective organizations
• Creating and communicating shared meaning/vision in forums
• Making and implementing decisions in legislative, executive, and administrative arenas
• Sanctioning conduct and adjudicating disputes in courts
• Coordinating leadership tasks over the course of the policy change cycle (2005, 34–35)

No leader possesses all of these capabilities. Rather, they are exercised by “a number of people leading at different times and in varying ways over the course of a policy change effort” (Crosby and Bryson 2005, 36). Crosby and Bryson thus emphasize that leadership is itself a collaborative enterprise. We characterize the methods and techniques they and their colleagues use in this enterprise as matters of conciliatory practice because they are designed to win accord—to move from hostility or distrust to agreement, even if only for a short time.

PUBLIC LEADERSHIP: CONSEQUENCES FOR CONCILIATORY PRACTICE

The various leadership theories we have reviewed presume a distinctive set of skills necessary to make the models work. For example, trait theories assume that one must possess or develop the traits necessary to be an effective leader. Group theories assume that individuals must learn the skills to keep the group “on task,” while also attending to the social needs of individual members of the group. Contingency theories require that leaders have the kinds of knowledge and sensibilities to understand the nuances of context, setting, and place (see chapter 2). Public-sector leadership is similar in many respects but differs in one significant way. Group and trait theories do not require the leaders to serve as stewards, “keepers” if you will, of a set of public values (see chapter 2), governing processes and structures that have been legitimated by previous constitutional and legal decisions. This means that conciliatory leadership practices occur within
a legal framework that imposes parameters on what is acceptable and what is possible. Conciliatory leadership requires an understanding of these substantive and procedural values which we have discussed in chapter 2.

Within the framework of acceptable possibilities, leaders who use conciliatory practices in public settings build toward shared meaning by helping “constituents think about the relationships between individuals and their communities, the groups whose well-being is most crucial, the content of the common good, and means of achieving it” (Crosby and Bryson 2005, 193). This is often a messy process, marked by struggle and conflict where parties selectively use and withhold information in different forums and arenas to increase their advantage. The process often takes on characteristics of a game which yields winners and losers, and where new players join in midstream while others withdraw. Out of this “organized anarchy” (Kingdon 1995), leaders try to elicit enough shared meaning to craft a vision, however limited, of a common good. The process relies on an implicit assumption that leaders can articulate and exploit the interdependence of self-interested players such that it broadens their receptivity to more common interests. As agendas broaden, so does the capacity for developing a working consensus through coalition building.

The process for achieving consensus and action is recursive, often cycling through the same phases. What started with an initial sense of “the problem” or “vision” that incited group formation subsequently requires revisiting as new players join. As the nature of the problem or vision is redefined, the menu of plausible solutions changes (Stone 1997). We illustrate this recursive process in Figure 5.5 below. The process of engagement begins with a leadership initiative that is carried forward by a single or small number of leaders who engage stakeholders. In the process of engagement, the definition of the problem and range of plausible solutions are
redefined, and the support necessary to move to the next stage enlarges. This continues through stages until sufficient clarity and agreement is reached and the processes of institutionalization can begin to take place. It may start with an organizational solution that establishes a mission, creates a structure of authority, assigns roles, allocates resources, and establishes oversight mechanisms to ensure that the work gets done. As this process continues to build support, the organization may eventually become a community institution. We see this transformational process occur at the local level in the support for sports, education, civic vitality, the environment, and other activities that generate community solidarity and organization.

Figure 5.5

The Recursive Nature of Conciliatory Engagement
This recursive process of engagement means that the “definition of the problem” and the range of “acceptable solutions” changes throughout the process as a result of the role of various participants in the process, their values, capacities, and needs, as well as the result of the structure of specific forums and arenas that determine how negotiations and compromises will be reached.

As leaders stimulate this process, they must attend to group formation processes as well as to the task of substantive decision making. This entails choosing whom to involve, keeping track of values, facilitating group dynamics, ensuring individual commitment to the process, and arranging necessary steps for decision making (cf. Crosby and Bryson 2005, chap. 5; Miller, Shinn and Bentley 1994; Behn and Vaupel 1982). Each element of the conciliatory process requires the use of important tools or practices. While it is not within the scope of this text to provide a detailed description of these tools, we have illustrated their nature in an extended endnote to this chapter. vi

Leading through the exercise of conciliatory practices is well suited to shared-power contexts. The practices play an integral role in cultivating civic dialogue and institutionalizing political as well as administrative processes. As such, they are compatible with some important aspects of American governance, especially the responsive governance tradition of bringing plural interests together on an issue, and then maintaining discourse among them until common agreement and action is possible. They also reinforce the civic governance tradition, which emphasizes face-to-face communication and assumes that differences among individuals and groups can be bridged through facilitation, conflict resolution, and civic dialogue.

However, as we have noted in chapter 2, these traditions also have their inadequacies, and require balancing with other traditions. While the conciliatory practice model reinforces the
values of responsive governance and civic dialogue, it can come at the expense of the competent
government and minority rights traditions. For example, civic dialogue may do little for groups
that are at a standoff as a result of fundamentally different worldviews of what is right and just.
In such cases, the parties may not be able to reconcile their differences through dialogue and may
need to be protected through a legal system that guarantees equal rights and due process. At the
opposite end of the spectrum, where groups or interests are not well articulated and formed, it
may be necessary to validate the existence of these groups and the interests they represent prior
to undertaking conciliatory practices. Finally, conciliatory practices are not effective when there
is a need for high levels of technical knowledge that have to be applied quickly to solve an
urgent problem. Emergency management represents an extreme example of this kind of issue.

To summarize, conciliatory practices associated with the civic governance tradition work
best when the groups and individuals involved have a history of working together through time,
and over tough issues. Such groups can benefit from the streams of engagement, with each
succeeding point of engagement benefiting from the achievements of past. This kind of historical
focus works best for participants who are rooted in the community where they have accrued
substantial tacit knowledge of community relations, values, and ways of proceeding, and where
they can be held to account for their roles and participation through the civic dialogue
(McCullough 1991). When these conditions do not exist, conciliatory practices require more
work. As Robert Putnam has observed, both bonding and bridging capital are important for
creating a shared sense of community and sustained common action (Putnam 2000, 22–24, 362–
63). In their absence a greater burden is placed on leadership to create the conditions through
deliberate intervention processes.
PUBLIC LEADERSHIP AND CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE: A RETURN TO THE LEGACY MODEL

Earlier in this chapter, we explained why and how the American constitutional system deliberately diffuses power and balkanizes the political landscape through checks and balances, separation of powers, and federalism. It does so in large part out of distrust of leaders. It is significant that the leadership theories reviewed above seldom mention the possibility or even the likelihood that there is a lot of bad leadership in political society that needs to be thwarted. We are not referring simply to leadership failure, but to leadership that perverts the public good through pursuit of personal or single-minded values at the expense of the balance and processes needed to preserve our regime of ordered liberty. In addition to the problem of what the founders called the “impulse of popular passions,” administrative leaders increasingly face the “impulse of popular fads.” Most people are aware that political and managerial movements frequently spread as fads over American society, and that leaders try to exploit them for both good and bad reasons. Those with substantial experience in public life know that these movements inevitably fade, but not before they do as much or more damage as they do good. The founders understood this, believing that every good is alloyed with attendant evil. As a result, good government meant that they must moderate both.

The legacy leadership model employed here takes this insight seriously. The model emphasizes the stewardship functions that administrative leaders play with respect to the traditions and attendant values of the American constitutional order as presented in chapter 2 (also see Morgan, Green, Shinn and Robinson 2008 and Morgan 1998, vol. 4, 2140–43). Second, they assume responsibility for developing a process of engagement that successfully accommodates change without sacrificing the integrity of the core values or governing design.
Finally, they serve an educative and advisory role to both citizens and elected officials. We develop each of these stewardship roles in the paragraphs that follow.

**Protecting Substantive Values and the Governing Design**

According to the legacy model, the first and primary role of administrative leaders is to attend to the substantive and conflicting values inherent in the foundations of the American constitutional system and in the administrative traditions that have developed around these values over nearly 225 years of history. Again, these traditions are presented in the Democratic Balancewheel model as responsive governance, competent and energetic governance, minority rights and access to governance, and civic governance. As we indicated in chapters 4 and 5, these values stand as counterweights or correctives to each others’ excesses. The nature of their relation is captured concisely in the “Founding Beatitudes” introduced in chapter 2, and revisited here.

**The Founding Beatitudes:**

Too much power begets usurpation, to which majority rule is a corrective;

Too much majority rule begets majority tyranny, to which separation of powers and checks and balances is a corrective;

Too much separation of powers and checks and balances begets incompetent government, to which unity at the center is a corrective.

Too much unity at the center begets usurpation, to which civic engagement is a corrective. (Morgan 2001, 156)

Most governing systems in the United States are designed to perpetuate these correctives and any resulting tensions through a complex structure of authority that separates powers, creates a system of checks and balances, and divides governance between federal and the state structures
of authority. This governing structure is embedded in a complex rule-of-law system enforced by powerful reviewing courts. Public leaders must operate within this governing framework, and some are exasperated by it, seeking to resolve the troublesome tensions in favor of the tradition that serves their agenda best. Many reforms spring from such efforts but are eventually confounded by those who, for whatever motives, wish to assert rival traditions. This continuing cycle is perplexing, especially to the many officials and citizens who do not understand the governing design. Their frustration contributes to cynicism about politics and the governing system as a whole. One important aspect of good public leadership, therefore, entails acting as a steward of the system as it manifests itself in specific governance settings.

As we have argued throughout this book, career public servants are well situated to exercise this kind of leadership, first because of their longevity, and second because of their relative insulation from partisan pressure. Their longevity allows them to accrue valuable knowledge and experience working at the intersection of these contending traditions as they carry out political, administrative, and technical responsibilities. This makes them an indispensable resource for political leaders, most of whom have comparatively short careers. Politicians rely on career officials not only for information, but also for guidance on maintaining institutional integrity and for playing roles that elected officials cannot always perform under the partisan pressures that pervade their work. Politicians may have to take a position on a policy issue or assert a particular prerogative or practice due more to partisan or constituent agendas than to their own preferred approach, and they may rely on career officials to resist, compromise, or remedy the matter for them. Though the career official’s insulation from partisan pressure is only partial, it is sufficient to enable him or her to play a steward role where others cannot.
Officials at the middle and street levels share in these responsibilities as well. For example, many public servants must firmly protect rights and access in the face of powerful pressures to ignore them. Police officers, prosecutors, and courts operate by elaborate rules and professional training designed to protect the accused, and even the convicted, against the acute impetus for revenge. Police administrators must also ensure that their street-level officers are trained to restrain themselves in order to protect suspects from improper or excessive police enforcement actions, without unduly compromising effectiveness. Other administrative officials must design procedures for open government, deliberation, access, and participation without unduly compromising timely and effective decision making. Yet others must seek ways to devolve or privatize public functions while retaining a meaningful degree of accountability. These balancing responsibilities often occur under serious pressures to ignore them. It takes leadership and a lot of risk taking to stand up to these pressures and enlist others in the effort. At times, it may even require that subordinates stand up to superiors—to lead from below.

Rosemary O’Leary (2006, 70–89) illustrates this in a case about a U.S. Forest Service employee in the Hoosier National Forest who used every internal procedure and many external political and legal tactics to resist changes made by his superiors to off-road vehicle (ORV) policy that seriously violated the agency’s own mission and legal standards. He was a loyal and dedicated employee, and a well-liked personality in the Hoosier Forest area of Indiana. In the controversy, he protected fellow employees from any culpability resulting from his actions, while eventually enlisting environmental interest groups, the press, local community elites, and national political figures in his efforts. At the height of the controversy, he even joined in a lawsuit against his own agency. He was subsequently fired for his efforts, but then vindicated in a subsequent hearing, followed by reversal of the ORV policy. O’Leary describes this as a case
of “guerrilla government,” which from the standpoint of the employee’s superiors is an apt characterization. But from the perspective of constitutional governance, the employee led responsibly in the service of open, accountable government and the rule of law. In doing so, he helped to preserve and protect the integrity of Forest Service policy and practice.

Facilitating Change

The second function of stewardship in the legacy model is to accommodate the need for change without sacrificing core values or the integrity of the governing design. Public administrators face constant pressure to change, whether it is to “run government more like a business,” to “steer rather than row,” to contract out the delivery of services to the private and nonprofit sectors, to reduce bureaucracy and red tape, to become more client centered, or to administer “faster, cheaper, better.” Administrative leaders must sort out which changes are worth embracing and which should be resisted. They need to know how to structure and administer processes of engagement that enable change to occur over time. Figure 5.3 above in our discussion of conciliatory practices illustrates the model of change we have in mind.

In working through each phase of change—creating a vision, enlarging support, institutionalizing the vision—administrative leaders employ skills in visualization, communication, group facilitation, political organizing, and organization management. They must exercise a blend of skills and techniques based on personal abilities, organizational strengths and weakness, and on assessments of events, social conditions, and political pressures. They must “read the tea leaves,” “size up the situation for action,” and, in the words of the great hockey player Wayne Gretzky, “skate to where the puck is going to go.” As each of the three phases are completed, the results become increasingly stable and resistant to modification.
The legacy model treats leaders as stewards of core constitutional values and governing processes, as well as catalysts to the process, generating in their followers a common ownership and understanding of the issues, fashioning effective means for delivering the goods, and carrying the vision into the future. As leaders and followers work through the phases, they often become increasingly aware of new perceptions and expectations, and of the need to redefine the situation requiring action. This process provides the grounding for more durable and responsive policy solutions as it develops the capacities of the players which subsequent leaders can leverage for future policy changes.

In addition to bringing the appropriate skills to bear in facilitating change, the legacy leadership model requires leaders to take risks. This occurs each time a public official tells others what they do not want to hear, or stands against those who are sacrificing the well-being of workers, the environment, health and safety, the education of children, or individual rights for the sake of their own agendas. The model sets an expectation of conflict as a built-in feature of American public life, which means aspiring leaders must prepare themselves for it, be ready to engage it, and to appreciate its value in balancing competing administrative traditions.

**The Educative Function of the Legacy Model**

The third function of legacy leadership involves the educative and advisory role that administrators play in routine interactions of senior administrators with elected and appointed officials, or in bureaucratic encounters of citizens with middle managers and street-level public servants. In these various roles, public officials provide indispensable information about institutional missions, capacities, procedures, and the nuances of bureaucratic politics. As importantly, they can educate and advise these officials and citizens with respect to the interplay
of our administrative legacies—of the recurring and conflicting values that should come into play with particular policies and decisions.

Elected political leaders want to bring their vision or agenda to bear on public institutions; administrators play vital roles in making this happen or not happen. With their knowledge of departmental, agency, or local government dynamics, administrators filter political agendas through phases of institutional planning and implementation and, along the way, educate stakeholders about issues, capacities, and processes. In doing so, these administrators may show a real understanding of the governing legacies that will inevitably affect this process, or they may simply react to such legacies as they impinge upon the process. If they are aware of them ahead of time, they can build consideration for them into the process and educate other players accordingly. If they are ignorant of them, then they, along with many of their colleagues and superiors, will feel victimized and compromised when others foist them on the process from afar. Knowledge of the four administrative traditions outlined in chapter 2 can help guide stakeholder analysis and process development. They provoke questions critical to this process, examples of which are provided below.

1. **Responsive Governance Questions**

   • To whom will proponents of a new policy need to be responsive?
   • What avenues of access by stakeholders and citizens already exist or need to be provided?
   • What groups are left out of the process and what needs to done to include their voice in the processes of decision making?
   • Will or should initiative/referendum processes impact the new policy, and if so, which stakeholders will likely be involved?
   • What role should market-styled incentives or privatization play in the policy? What vendors can effectively provide the services or products? What kind of accountability
mechanisms need to be built into both the contract approval and contract oversight processes?

2. Competent and Energetic Governance Questions

- How will this program be implemented to ensure that it is both efficient and effective?
- What kind of employees—civil service, merit, or contracted—are needed to make the program work?
- What kind of organizational capacity and structure is needed to ensure effective implementation?
- What powers are needed under the new policy for effective implementation?
- At what level of government will the most effective implementation occur?
- Which agencies will impact the design and implementation of programs?
- Which employee groups should have a say in the design and implementation of the policy?
- How will the program be evaluated? How will success be measured?

3. Minority Rights and Access Questions

- Whose rights are affected by the new policy or agenda, and which advocacy groups need to be involved as a result?
- Is due process of law needed, and if so, how much, and who should manage it?
- Are there equal protection issues involved? Who needs to be part of the design and implementation processes as a result?
- What accountability protocols should be developed for the new policy or program?
- Which oversight agencies or offices need inclusion in the design process?

4. Civic Governance Questions

- What processes of face-to-face interaction are important to the success of the new policy or program?
- Does this program trump nongovernmental (nonprofit, for-profit, individual) missions and responsibilities? Should it do so? If so, who needs to be involved in the design and implementation phases?
• Should the program be more decentralized to facilitate tailoring and flexibility at local levels?
• What avenues and processes of citizen participation or engagement and coproduction should exist under the new policy?
• How many different levels of government need to be involved and how can this involvement be carried out in ways that are respectful of their separate domains of authority?
• Administrators who perform this educative and advisory role become indispensable to their political superiors and wield substantial influence on policy design and implementation as a result. They become both process and substance-centered leaders, guiding themselves and others by substantive values that affect the legitimacy of vision, process, and outcome.

Officials who exercise substantial discretion as they interact with people on the street have opportunities to educate and advise the public in ways that can foster appreciation for, and improve engagement in, American governance. The venues and occasions for this kind of interaction vary widely. An important question that arises here is whether one is dealing with “single-shot players” or “regulars.” Single-shot players encounter governance only sporadically, and often in very short episodes. They typically know little about governance principles and processes, and the opportunities for educating them are quite limited. Nevertheless, occasions do arise when there is time for substantial discussion around a specific concern. In community governance, for example, it is not unusual for individuals to contact their local department of public works to demand that a stop sign be posted near their home to slow traffic in the area, or to request more police presence in their neighborhood. These citizens are commonly referred to traffic safety advisory committees and community policing programs, where they can work through the details of their concerns. In the process, they usually learn a lot about what can realistically be achieved with traffic signs, and how they can work with community policing
officers to improve the security of their neighborhood. And, if community officials are attentive, they can easily find moments to illustrate, in words and actions, how values and processes associated with responsiveness, face-to-face civic governance, rights and modes of access, and effective measures can be used to meet their concerns.

To illustrate further, one can easily see how the librarians in the angry patron case (see Appendix A) had opportunities to educate the disgruntled patron about the competing values they must balance as they manage their library collections. They have the chance in these kinds of “bureaucratic encounters” (Hasenfeld, Rafferty, and Zald 1987) to help patrons understand the inherent difficulties in determining appropriate acquisitions and in providing meaningful book and periodical collections for a wide variety of community patrons. The patron’s interest and attention is already engaged, and he may well seek changes at higher levels of appeal, so the potential for significant education about the administrative legacies involved is very ripe.

The “regulars” are people who interact with governments on a fairly routine basis, and many of them represent organized interests. These players may already be very knowledgeable of governance processes and are fully engaged for purposes of access and influence. They are probably very articulate about select values within one or more administrative traditions and may be very entrepreneurial, seeking economic advantages and administrative processes that are effective toward their agendas. Others may be rights advocates or reformers seeking more governmental efficiency or accountability. These individuals are not likely to be receptive to abstract discussions about conflicting values and legacies. Their attention is focused on their agendas. And yet, opportunities still exist for cultivating a dialogue about competing interests that should also be at the table. The officials who involve these groups can keep track of which ones advocate values from which legacy, and consequently, they can usually find voices for most
or all of them. The process of public education occurs when the participants are drawn into extended or “deep” dialogue with the contending groups (Miller, Shinn, and Bentley 1994; Cummings and Worley 2005).

The peregrine falcon case presented in Appendix A helps illustrate how the educative process can work. Discovery of the endangered peregrine falcons on Eagle Rock triggered a cascade of legal and bureaucratic mandates upon the Washington State Parks Department that required quick and effective action. Following the recommendations of the State Fish and Wildlife Department, the state parks director immediately closed Eagle Rock to climbers and then initiated statewide hearings that led the Parks Department to conclude that a site-specific plan was the best way to deal with the situation. The department hired a climber and a falcon specialist as consultants and established an Eagle Rock Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from the local climbing organization (with a membership of over 3,000), the Access Fund, and other climbers not affiliated with any official organization. From the standpoint of a legacy-education process, the advisory committee holds the most promise. Initially, it provides a venue for educating the climbing community about who should be involved in developing an acceptable plan for Eagle Rock.

The committee already consists of regulars (organized groups) and single-shot players with a stake in the outcomes. Parks Department officials should facilitate a stakeholder analysis (refer again to endnote 4) with these members so they can participate in assessing who else should be involved, whether as members or as consultants, and on what basis. This is where criteria from all four administrative legacies can come into play as more than an abstract discussion. Advisory committee members want to know who will likely affect the content of the plan (e.g., whose values and powers are at stake), what rules and processes should be followed
and why, and which parties currently have decision-making authority. Parks officials can assess the extent to which committee members are themselves invoking values or criteria from the administrative legacies, and whether other criteria are being neglected. It is not necessary that all four legacies are equally prominent in developing the site plan, but it is important that their principles and values receive consideration. This improves the educational potential of the deliberations while building legitimacy for the resulting plan in the eyes of affected stakeholders. There is, however, no formulaic answer to the question of how one knows when a successful balance of competing values is achieved. Doing this work is like making bread: the basic ingredients may remain the same from recipe to recipe, but the baker must take into consideration the local setting and conditions to decide how to adjust temperature, timing, and quantities of ingredients to make good bread. Even then, there will be contending standards by which interested parties wish to judge the loaf.

As we have observed throughout this *Handbook*, increasingly the test for measuring the success of leaders is their capacity to address problems for which no one organization, jurisdiction or sector has primary responsibility. Working across these boundaries to create agreement and to sustain this agreement over time is a growing requirement of leadership in the public sector. As we have observed above in Section I, public leaders increasingly find themselves confronted with what some have called “wicked problems”. These are defined as intractable issues for which there are no easy answers. Part of the reason the answers aren’t easy is that no one is in charge. The goal of this section is to provide a framework for taking on these kinds of wicked problems.
CONCLUSION

Leadership in American public life is intentionally frustrated by diffusion of powers among many public officials and among multiple sectors of society. It is intentionally weakened out of fear for its excesses. Ironically, this condition sometimes provokes intense desire for just what we fear most—the charismatic leader who charms us with articulate and emotional pleas, who supplies winning ideas and achievements that fascinate us. We have had many such leaders, some achieving fame well beyond their generation, most often for leading the American people through the most trying circumstances. Others achieved more notoriety than fame, and they remind us of the perils and fickleness of relying on charismatic leadership in public life. The founders taught us the wisdom of taking precautions against the free play of such leaders. They established a system of governance that encourages us to rely on more modest types of leadership.

Much of the leadership theory we have reviewed in this chapter is of this modest sort. It focuses on leadership of groups for more mundane matters of task effectiveness, concern for maturation and professional development within organizations, conciliatory practices designed to draw citizens into public discourse and engagement, and on the stewardship roles of subordinate career officials. We have focused on shared leadership in shared-power contexts, first because this is the kind of leadership that is most amenable to responsible exercise, and second because it is the kind of leadership increasingly needed in daily life—for the maintenance of regular affairs, for our education as citizens, and for the preservation of our public institutions in an increasingly fragmented world.
NOTES

1 This chapter cites the first and second editions of *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. Complete publication information for both editions follows:


2 Literature related to leadership is extensive. Several of the social science disciplines have handbooks published periodically with a section on leadership. These are good places to start for a systematic review of leadership. The bibliography included with this volume also provides a good starting point for those wishing to conduct their own study of the literature.

3 While there is an early literature on women who lead, much of the research and theory development has occurred in the last 25 years. The literature cited in this section provides examples, but it is not comprehensive. Applied areas such as health and nonprofit leadership have developed a related literature. Similarly, there is a literature building for both public- and private-sector leadership related to women. Also, in the last 20 years, a number of centers for the study and promotion of women in leadership have been created. For example, the National Education for Women’s “Leadership Oregon” is a Hatfield School program associated with a Rutgers-based national network of such programs.
Section VI

Wicked Problems and Sustainable Development

It is important to train leaders who have the capacity to deal with what have come to be called wicked problems. Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber, who first coined the phrase, argue that many issues are “illusive or difficult to pin down and influenced by a constellation of complex social and political factors, some of which [may] change during the process of solving the problem.” They argue that these kinds of problems are also frequently viewed “differently depending on the perspectives and biases of those with a stake in the problem,” which adds further complications to the process of successfully tackling the issue. In short, sustainable development issues are wicked because they do not easily lend themselves to any of the traditional strategies we have tended to rely on, such as political strategies of “satisficing”, economic strategies of “economizing” or scientific strategies to “maximize” among a range of acceptable options.

Need for Multi-Stakeholder and Collaborative-Centered Research Strategies. Sustainable development issues are wicked in part because we are dealing with competing values held by human beings whose interpretation of what is happening around them is in a constant state of flux. In this kind of environment the competencies needed to start and sustain dialogue among the vested parties may be more important than one’s credentials as an experienced and well-trained researcher. Developing the kinds of leadership skills that foster patience, persistence, creative energy, unification, and coalescence around a common agenda are key to successful sustainable development work.

---

Need for Boundary-Spanning Research Strategies. In addition to the need to work collaboratively across multiple stakeholder groups, the wicked problems of sustainable development normally do not respect the established structures of political authority or jurisdictional boundaries. This means that the hard power that resides in formal and legally-defined leadership roles is not sufficient to address most of the issues that span political, organizational, intersectoral boundaries. Boundary-spanning problems require “constructing” the authority to act, rather than taking it as a given. If this authority cannot be successfully cultivated, then there is no effective way to use research knowledge in ways that make a difference on the ground.  

According to research undertaken by the Center for Creative Leadership, the ability of leaders to undertake boundary spanning work has become increasingly important across all levels of leadership. Their studies indicated that 97% of the leaders they interviewed cited it as important at the senior executive level, 91% of leaders at the middle management level and 43% at the entry level. However, there is a critical gap in the ability of leadership to work across boundaries; only 53% agreed that their peer group of senior executives were effective in working across boundaries, only 19% for middle managers and 8% for entry level managers.

Need for a Transdisciplinary Research Focus. Based on what has been described in the previous sections, it comes as no surprise that sustainable development research needs to be undertaken by loosely coupled teams whose members have overlapping but broad ranging sets of

---


7 Yip et al., Boundary Spanning Leadership: Mission Critical Perspectives from the Executive Suite, p. 5.
expertise. Both liberal arts breadth and disciplinary depth are required by everyone. The traditional analytic-centered models characteristic of most policy study centers need to be supplemented by new integrative–centered models that take into account the multiple stakeholder and boundary-spanning characteristics associated with sustainable development work.8

Conclusion: A review of the sustainable development literature has surfaced some important conclusions for creating a research center devoted to sustainable development issues.

- Sustainable development research in the future will be driven less by the policy analytic skills found in traditional policy research centers and more by the research capacity to deal with boundary spanning governance and leadership issues.

- Sustainable development research requires linking the short-term research projects of students and faculty to long-term and future-generation centered research questions.

- Sustainable development research requires forming partnerships between the university and agency practitioners to create a common and sustainable research agenda that cuts across organization, jurisdictional and intersectoral boundaries.

Leadership for Sustainable Development: What is Different?

Sustainable development has been pushed to the forefront of leadership priorities as the forces of globalization have heightened the challenge of mitigating the adverse consequences of economic development on the environment. This is not only an issue of managing scarcity and calculating the strategic consequences on the interests of nation-states, but with global warming sustainable development has become an issue of the survival of the planet and the species who inhabit it.

---

What difference does sustainable development make to the Legacy Leadership Model we have outlined in this paper? There are at least three consequences that a focus on sustainable development has for our model:

- It adds new dimensions to the problem of balancing competing moral values. Balancing
- It adds a sense of urgency.
- It increases the importance and urgency of developing competencies for multi-level government and institutional leadership

**Moral Balancing Becomes More Complicated** – We have argued that one of the unique responsibilities of public service leaders is their need to balance a larger repertoire of moral values that are in tension than is the case for leaders in the market, civic and nonprofit sectors. Sustainable development adds to the complexity of this task as is illustrated by Figure 6.1 below.

As Figure 6.1 illustrates, sustainable development places in conflict the values of economic growth, social equity and the protection of the environment. How leaders manage this tension depends on a multitude of factors, including where a community is along the development continuum, the ability of a community or nation to extract raw materials from within and outside its boundaries, As international and internal political pressures, the overall stature of a nation within the international community and the contextual forces at work within a leader’s local sphere of authority and influence.
How success is defined in managing the sustainable development tensions varies widely. As Figure 6.1 indicates “bearable” impact on the environment, “equitable” social outcomes and “viable” economic development have quite different meanings to different people in the far reaches of the globe and at different points in their history. For example, there are parts of the world where sustainable development is a “way of life” as opposed to a public policy that is in competition with other policies that are in contention for the allocation of scarce financial resources.

**Sustainable Development Adds a Sense of Urgency** – Sustainable development adds a sense of urgency to the task of public service leadership although the motivating factors for this urgency may be not always be the same. For global warming specialists, the urgency lies in the geometric impact that small temperature changes have on planet flora, fauna and geo-political transformations. For political leaders the urgency is driven by a combination of internal and international pressures that can produce quite divergent outcomes. For example, the United
States is being pushed by the less developed nations of the world to assume a disproportionate role in reducing its carbon footprint on the globe. These nations argue that the developed nations need to bear a bigger share of the burden in reducing global carbon emissions in order to allow the developing countries to “catch up”. In the short run, economic growth could be sacrificed in the more developed nations for the sake of protecting the environment and promoting greater global social equity. The sustainable development agenda, regardless of how it may be dealt with by individual leaders, has created a sense of urgency that makes it increasingly difficult for leaders to avoid taking responsibility for managing the problem.

**Sustainable Development Requires New Competencies for Multi-Level government and Institutional Leadership** – Sustainable development problems have many of the dispersed-power characteristics we have already discussed. Economic growth, social equity and environmental stewardship require collaboration across multiple organizational, jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries. This is because resources to solve the problem may be dispersed, there may be competing interpretations of what counts for “economic growth”, “social equity” or “environmental stewardship”. There may also be conflicting priorities among those who can create and sustain a successful outcome. Whether it is preserving a watershed, meeting the social needs of a target population or advancing economic growth, there is a need to create agreement among conflicting views in order to harness the resources to advance the sustainable development agenda. Leaders need to know how to operate successfully in this horizontal set of relationship where power is dispersed and where authority has to be created, rather than assumed.

One of the characteristics of sustainable development is that it affects all individuals where they live. It is not an abstract notion held by a few leaders at the top and given expression
in vague policy documents that are not viewed by many as having any daily impact on their lives of individuals. For this reason, there needs to be visible local examples where people live of why sustainable development is important and how it can be done. When this occurs, it can inspire others to take advantage of the numerous opportunities for individuals at the local level to exercise leadership, whether it be in their formal governmental roles, in their individual and civic capacities or through their work.

However, the degree to which individuals become a “thousand points of light” in the service of sustainable development depends not only on visible signs of its importance where they live, but also on the kinds of examples that are set at the policy levels by political leaders at every level of government. Without active leadership on behalf of sustainable development by political leaders, the potential army of soldiers that can be enlisted into service will never realize its potential, a particularly lamentable outcome given the urgency and breadth of global action that is required.
Chapter VII – Globalizing the Legacy Leadership Model: EMERGE

- Developing Regime-Centered Leadership: An International Framework
- Leadership Ethics and Values in an International Setting
- Lessons from Vietnam, China and Japan
- The Emerge Leadership Model

DEVELOPING REGIME-CENTERED LEADERSHIP

This chapter summarizes the Legacy Model of Public Service Leadership and its implications for doing international work in other countries with a special focus on sustainable development. The model is titled “Legacy” because of its emphasis on the conditions necessary to transform leadership initiatives into legacies that live beyond the work of individual leaders. The model is informed by our experience over several decades of doing public sector leadership development both nationally and internationally, an examination of the extensive literature on “what counts for leadership success”, and by our more recent focus on the implications of our model for sustainable development. The authors of this model have come to the following conclusions, which will be elaborated more fully in the paragraphs that follow.

- Public service leadership has unique features that distinguish it from leadership in the private and nonprofit sectors.
- While public service leadership is unique, there are some generic characteristics that are transferable to the international setting.
- Leadership for sustainable development adds some important dimensions to the Legacy Model, but does not fundamentally alter what is unique about public service leadership.

The Uniqueness of Public Service Leadership in Most Contemporary Political Systems

Leaders in the public sector have a special responsibility for the common good. While difficult to define with precision and constantly a “work in progress”, the public good at every level of governance throughout the world is capable of being defined. This definition consists of the following four elements, which are depicted visually in Figure 7.1: the formal and informal governance structures and processes that define the legitimate exercise of public authority, the values that these processes and structures serve, the contextual conditions (i.e., history, culture and socio-economic institutions) that give specific meaning to the values and governing structures to citizens at a given time and place, and the leadership competencies necessary to transform public policy goals into organizationally effective and efficient results. Together these four elements create authority
and legitimacy, thus distinguishing public sector leadership from leadership more generically or leadership that is specific to the market, nonprofit or civic sectors.

In arguing that public service leadership is responsible for the achievement of the common good we do not mean to suggest that civic, market sector and nonprofit leaders do not contribute to the common good. Of course they do, but the leaders in these sectors do not have responsibility for ensuring that all of the parts of the socio-economic order are coordinated to maximize the achievement of the larger public good. In defining public service leadership in this way means that all public service leaders are doing political work.

But political leadership is differentiated in most all modern political systems. For example, these systems provide a place for leadership that is narrowly partisan or ideological in nature. They also provide a place for leadership that relies heavily on professional expertise and technical competence to achieve the public good. Water and sewer systems, regardless of the partisan nature of the political system, require a minimum level of technical competence and professional expertise to create and maintain the infrastructure system. But all of these different kinds of public officials, regardless of the setting, share the aspirational goal of promoting a larger public good that stands apart from their personal self-interest or the popular partisan interests of the moment. The unique nature of the political work performed by public sector leaders can be illustrated by contrasting market and nonprofit sector leadership from leadership in the public sector.
On the surface there are many similarities between leaders in the nonprofit and market sector and those in the public sector. For example, leaders in both sectors are agents of shared values that operate within structures of authority and require leadership competencies that transform the policy goals of an entity into efficient and effective outcomes. The difference is that public service leaders are responsible for the whole, not just a part of the public good. Leaders of nonprofit, civic and market-based organizations can promote the values of their sector or particular organization without having to worry about the consequences of their advocacy on the market economy or upon the role responsibility of the public sector. Public service leaders cannot do this because they have architectonic responsibility for how all of the parts of a given political system can be made to function together to achieve the common good. This has been well-illustrated by the recent and on-going attempt of the U.S. government to cope with the collapse of the market economy and in prior decades to determine the appropriate role of nonprofits in the delivery of public service. Public leaders carry the worry beads for figuring out how all of the parts can be made to function in ways that promote the good of the whole and do so in ways that are consistent with the fundamental values of the political order.

A second distinguishing characteristic of public service leaders is their need to make decisions that are adequately informed by the past and take into account the impact on future generations. Private and nonprofit sector leaders do not have this kind of intergenerational responsibility, although they may instrumentally make use of the past and the future to garner support and build the legitimacy for their organizational missions. But in doing so, they have no fiduciary obligations that are inherent in their role responsibilities as governing agents.

We have no word that adequately captures the architectonic responsibility of public leaders for the whole, for the common good. An older word that has fallen out of favor is regime. In its older usage regime meant “way of life”, which adequately captures the notion that public service leaders are responsible for preserving the distinctive way of life represented by a given political system. Unfortunately, the term regime has lost favor because it has become associated with a “fascist-like” regimen that imposes control over the lives of individuals and all activities in the socio-economic domains. The older and gentler notion of regime is what we have in mind when we refer to the distinctive moral responsibility public officials have for the common good.

The Hatfield School of Government’s Center for Public Service undertakes leadership development for public service. All of the Center’s programs are grounded on the assumption that leadership for the common good is different than leadership for success in the market economy. While there are important similarities that are transferable across sectors, public service leadership must take into account the unique characteristics of the political system within which the leadership is being exercised. We call these “regime characteristics”, which we have divided into the following four categories: values, structures, processes and history. The chart in figure
7.2 below provides a summary of how these regime characteristics influence the leadership development programs for American public servants offered by the Center for Public Service.

What is Universal About the Legacy Leadership Model?

The political values, structures of authority, the history and the culture obviously differ from one regime to another. Taken together these factors create the backdrop that shape leader-follower expectations and the scope and depth of discretionary authority for those who hold leadership roles at various levels of the political system. For example, the tradition of ancestor worship in Vietnam plays an important role in shaping “what counts” for the legitimate exercise of political authority. Leaders in Vietnam take for granted the legitimacy of using their discretion to assist members of their family and to hold income earning positions that may be closely related to their official government duties. In the United States these practices would be labeled “nepotism” and “conflicts of interests.

These differences in cultural backdrop create an opportunity for regimes to be ranked higher than others on various evaluative scales that can be used to assess their goodness, their effectiveness, their efficiency, their reliance on citizen participation, their protection of property rights, their protection of civil and individual rights, their environmental stewardship and so on. But all regimes share a common need to build and maintain legitimacy with its citizenry. The Legacy Leadership Model emphasizes the following four factors that are necessary for building and maintaining this legitimacy: core political values, governing structures and processes, leadership competencies and contextual attentiveness.

Core Political Values – Every political system stands for something, a set of values that it holds up as the aspirational standard for measuring its achievements. For example, the United States values liberty as the primary value, in contrast to China and Vietnam, which give primacy to the value of equality. While these primary values may differ from one regime to another, there are secondary values that create tensions, which leaders of the political system must take into account and balance. For example, China, Vietnam, the United States and Japan, in the face of radically different histories and cultures, must balance the values of economic prosperity, individual liberty, equality and protecting the environment. How these values get balanced at any given time depends not only on the values that are given primacy over others, but also on the structures and processes of political authority, the competencies of the leaders and the way in which these factors are shaped by local conditions and contexts.

Governing Structures and Processes – If the values of a political system help to answer the question, What makes us special?, the structures and processes for making and implementing policy decisions play a significant role in determining the operational success of these values on a daily basis. How political decisions get made, who participates and how decisions at the center get transformed into implementation plans in the far corners of the regime is often the heart of the matter regarding political legitimacy and effectiveness. As countries around
the world over the past decade have pushed decentralization within the nation-state, there have been
countervailing pressures to coordinate policy decisions across nation-states to mitigate the unintended negative
consequences on external partners. For example, global warming has produced a debate as to who should bear
the responsibility for mitigating the adverse impacts. Political systems face an on-going struggle to create
governing structures and processes that reflect the growing complexity and interdependency of both domestic
and global problems, whether it is the challenge of managing the global economy, the equitable distribution of
the bounties of economic growth internally or the mitigation of global warming.

**Leadership Competencies** – Legitimacy is shaped by the values and the political decision making structures
and processes, but it is also shaped by the competencies of those who fill these positions and serve as the agents
of the regime’s values.

Governing competencies have traditionally been judged in relationship to a given position within the
system of governing authority. Knowing what competencies are needed to carry out a given leadership role is
essential to building the legitimacy of the overall political system. If officials are corrupt or if administrators
can’t successfully implement policy initiatives undertaken by elected officials, the entire regime suffers the
adverse consequences. If administrators can’t work in teams, coordinate their activities, create and run high
performing organization or enlist the support of engaged citizens, the legitimacy of the system suffers. Leaders
at every level of government and in every position within the organizational hierarchy need to be armed with
the leadership competencies appropriate for their position and commensurate with their scope of responsibility.

**Contextual Setting** – Perhaps the most important “definer” of legitimacy is the perception by citizens in a
given time and place that leaders are mindful of their unique geographic setting, history, culture and other
relevant contextual factors. This is one of the most difficult challenges that leaders face. How can political
systems create policy goals at the center while taking into account the various local circumstances that will
ensure support for the achievement of these goals over the long haul? All governments from the local to the
international level continue to experiment with various models in order to find better answers to this question,
whether it comes in the form of creating citizen/neighborhood associations, decentralizing government decision
making, or creating semi-autonomous governing entities and regions.

The Legacy Leadership Model emphasizes the role of leaders in building legitimacy by promoting the
values unique to the political system, preserving the integrity of decision making structures and processes,
broadening and deepening their leadership competencies and recognizing the importance of the local context in
how they exercise their authority. Political systems approach each of these four pillars of legitimacy in a
slightly different way, but all systems need leaders who understand what it takes to be successful on all four
fronts. For this reason, we believe the Legacy Leadership Model has universal applicability.
The Uniqueness of the Legacy Leadership Model

The Legacy Model is different from other leadership models in its emphasis on the following combination of factors that determine leadership success:

- It emphasizes a focus on the public good.
- It views all leadership as a political activity at all levels of the governance structure.
- It emphasizes the facilitative and institutional responsibility of public service leaders to work collaboratively across the market, civil and nonprofit sectors to promote the common good.
- It emphasizes the multi-level dimensions of leadership competencies.
- It emphasizes the cultivation of judgment.
- It emphasizes the importance of balancing equally important but competing public values.

Focus on the Common Good – We have pointed out earlier in our discussion that public sector leadership is uniquely focused on the promotion of the larger common good. Whether an elected official or an administrator in charge of running programs, departments or policy initiatives, all play a role in, and share responsibility for, the promotion of the common good.

The Political Nature of Public Service Leadership - One of the important consequences of a model that focuses on the promotion of the common good is that it calls attention to the political nature of all public service leadership in building and maintaining the legitimacy of the larger political order. Regardless of the position one holds - appointed, elected, or career civil service - individuals are exercising their discretionary authority in ways that either builds or decreases the legitimacy of the system in the eyes of those being served. Communist countries like China and Vietnam officially recognize the importance of viewing leadership in political terms by having dual leadership of agencies, a party leader and an administrative leader. But in western countries heavily influenced by scientific management and the separation of politics from administration, the political role of administrators at all levels of government has been downplayed, especially in the United States. This continues to be the case despite growing evidence that it is not true and inappropriately contributes to the “myth of technical neutrality”. This myth stands in sharp contrast to “what counts for legitimacy” in the eyes of the citizens in whose name administrators serve.

By drawing a false dichotomy between political and administrative leadership we fail to pay appropriate attention to understanding the unique kind of political role that different kinds of leaders play within the structures and processes of governing authority and how these various roles build and maintain the legitimacy of the larger political order. Take for example, the differences between the nature of the political work undertaken by an appointed department secretary working for the central government and a local department.
head working for a city manager. Both exercise important influences in shaping the policy agenda of the elected officials and in determining the meaning of a given policy by shaping the strategy for implementation. But the appointed central government official does this primarily through the lens of his/her partisan political affiliation, while the local career administrator does this indirectly in a manner resembling the model of the British civil servant. The former is governed by party partisanship while the latter is governed by the partisanship of a statesman, someone who stands above the party partisan frays of the moment to look to the longer term impact of policies on the common good of the political system. The partisanship of the statesman is interested in insuring that decisions are informed by the experiences of the past as well as the urgencies of the moment. Both the statesman and the party partisan exercise political leadership, but in ways that make significantly different contributions to the common good.

Multi-Level Government & Sectoral Institutional Focus – In keeping with the Legacy model’s emphasis on the special role of public service leaders for the common good, public officials need to know how to facilitate intersectoral problem solving and how to leverage intersectoral resources for the promotion of the common good. This requires leaders to think and act institutionally. Institutions reflect as well as imbed the values of groups, individuals and organizations and serve as the enduring agents of change over time. Whether it is the family, constitutions, religions, political parties, civil associations, schools, the market economy, ethnic groups, tribes, etc. institutions make it possible for political systems and leaders to get their work done. When these institutions are working at cross purposes or independently from one another, the public good is ill-served.

Our institution-centered focus on leadership requires making a distinction between “leaders” and “leadership”. Leaders are individuals who may or may not occupy formal organizational and political roles that coincide with their leadership activities. Leaders can be given the knowledge, skills and placed in “practice settings” that have been deliberately designed to enhance their leadership competencies. On the other hand, leadership is a set of relationships that is imbedded in an institutional setting that has a history, multiple stakeholders with differing expectations and is encumbered by legal, political and policy requirements. The unit of analysis for a “leadership-focused” approach is the social/organizational setting within which leadership activities occur. This contrasts to a “leaders-focused” approach in which the unit of analysis is the individual leader, not the “socially constructed reality” within which the leader operates.

One can’t talk about leadership without also talking about followership and the conditions that transform formal power into the legitimacy that produces willing followers. When referring to the need for leadership, leadership competencies, or even using the term leader throughout this paper, we will be using it in this expanded institution and follower-centered sense. In doing so, we acknowledge the importance of developing the capacities to exercise leadership horizontally across increasingly independent spheres of power and influence. We call these capacities “leading in dispersed-power settings”. In the section that follows we will
explain why we think the problem of leading in dispersed-power settings has become ever more important for political leaders throughout the world. After this explanation, we will explore some of the implications for our Legacy Leadership Model.

1. Why leading in dispersed power settings has become more important in all regimes. There are five factors that contribute to the rise of dispersed centers of power in the modern world. First, the global community is facing multiple “drivers of change”, but the logic for each driver is inherently contradictory to the logic of the other “drivers of change”. For example, Daniel Bell in his book entitled, the *Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1974), documents the independent but competing logics of economic development, technological innovation and the political solidarity and stability of the nation-state. The logic that makes for political success (agreement on shared and enduring values) is eroded by the principle of innovation at the heart of technological innovation or the social balkanization that results from the logic of economic development. Faced with these unique but frequently conflicting “drivers of change” in the global community, leaders find themselves struggling to successfully balance sets of values resulting from the competing logics of the post industrial world. Chinese leaders seek to expand the market economy without compromising the Communist Party’s commitment to equality and control by the party. At the same time the United States is seeking to control the market economy without compromising its commitment to private property and individual liberty. These goals are complicated by expanding technological innovations that sometimes work at cross purposes with political and economic goals. For example, China and the U.S. have different points of view on copyright protection of new technological innovations because of the different priorities they place on the constellation of political and economic values that are in conflict. The global “drivers of change” are further complicated by the role that culture plays in shaping how these drivers will be accommodated. The resurgence of tribalism in reaction to the homogenizing forces of globalization has made the work of public service leaders ever more complicated (Barber 1996).

A second reason for the increase in dispersed power problems is an artifact of the unique nature of the challenges leaders face today. An increasing number of these challenges are “wicked problems” (Rittel and Weber 1973). There are three characteristics of a “wicked problem”. The first is that they are polycentric in nature; there is no one clear center from which one can define the problem or obtain traction for solving it. Action is required simultaneously along multiple axises. A polycentric problem resembles a multi-centered network with many hubs, much like modern urban transportation undergrounds of the kind you find in Tokyo, New York, Paris and London. These network systems have no one clear center of focus, but many that are mutually interdependent. As a result, leadership action initiated in one part of the network sets off moving forces that affect every other part of the network. Simple examples are the disappearance of endangered species
and global warming. It is hard to know where to start and regardless of where one starts, there are negative consequences of our actions, however well-intentioned our goals and aspirations.

A third reason that many of our contemporary leadership problems are “wicked” is because solutions produce a mixture of good and bad outcomes. There are no solutions without some adverse consequences. Solutions require large scale action that cuts across conventional political and organization boundaries. Such problems are exemplified in the emergency response and security issues faced by the new U.S. Department of Homeland Security, in efforts to manage watersheds and community public health, in the disputes over curricula in public education, and in managing the effects on our communities and labor force of an increasingly globalized world. These problems defy simple solutions and single organizations. They necessarily transcend sectors and political jurisdictions. Even seemingly straightforward problems such as delivering clean drinking water, establishing a library, or creating kindergarten programs are likely to involve dozens of organizations, policy actors, and interest groups that make the problem-setting and solution-producing activities difficult and which produce outcomes that have mixed benefits. In chapter VI we presented several examples of such problems, including the mad cow disease (Figure 6.1) maintaining an overstretched electrical power supply system (Figure 6.2) and the effort to create a Green necklace Park (Figure 6.3).

These maps, one of which we include below (7.1), illustrate problems that are typically faced by those in positions of both political and administrative leadership. Educational attainment, child hunger, transportation planning, emergency preparedness, drinking water supply, health insurance, and developing vital cities all have maps at least as complex as those in Figures 5.1-5.3. These maps help us realize that success depends on different kinds of leaders at different levels of the process working cooperatively across multiple leadership, organizational, jurisdictional and sectoral levels. Some of this complexity lies in the nature of the problems. For example, national security, law enforcement, education, public health, and transportation planning are inherently complicated. But the ways in which we deal with them are also complicated by the increasing complexity of governing principles, structures, and processes.

The increased complexity of governance systems adds a third reason for the need to take more seriously what is needed to “lead in a dispersed-power setting”. This is especially the case in the United States where there is a high level of decentralization and local autonomy. But these characteristics are growing in other countries where the central governments are adopting local autonomy and decentralization initiatives. This has occurred in Japan, Korea and Indonesia. We can expect this decentralization of problem-solving responsibility to expand as the leaders of nation states realize that they do not have the resources, the local knowledge and the political efficacy to effectively solve many of the complicated problems confronting local communities.
A fourth factor that has increased dispersed power challenges is the expanded scale of problems we are facing today compared to the past. Jared Diamond’s book on the collapse of civilizations (2005) documents the complicated process of the decline of numerous civilizations over the course of history, but none of them faced the kind of global interdependence that civilizations face today. For example, seventeen percent of the mercury in my hometown river comes from the content of clouds blown from around the world where our northwest rains in Portland, Oregon during the long dreary winter months gathers the poisonous effluents from the air in China and drops them into our watersheds.

A final cause of dispersed power is the increased awareness and education of the global community. Even in areas where individuals may be illiterate, they have access to satellite television and telephone service and an understanding of how various countries are dealing with the challenges of balancing economic development, social equity, environmental stewardship and concerns citizens may have about the efficacy of their political system and leaders. Technological innovations have made censorship a more complex and uncertain strategy than has been the case in the past. As a result, political leaders face an increased challenge of
managing expectations of different sectors of society while at the same time managing the economy, the political system and an increasingly complex civil society.

2. Some implications of leading in dispersed power settings. The expanding world of horizontal complexity represented in Figure 6.1 requires leaders to supplement their traditional knowledge and skills that have enabled them to operate successfully within bureaucratic hierarchies. They must now learn how to build trust and agreement with partners that span organizational, jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries. They need a new set of leadership competencies to lead effectively in a world where power is dispersed across groups, organizations, governing entities and individuals throughout every level of society. The kind of new leadership competencies that are needed to deal successfully with the current challenges have to be in alignment with the kind of leadership roles individuals have.

THE EMERGE LEADERSHIP MODEL

The EMERGE leadership model was developed as a collaborative leadership development model in partnership with the Vietnam Ho Chi Minh Political and Administrative Academy, which has sole responsibility for the leadership training of all public, NGO and party leaders in the country. The model is represented as an “emerging star”. The center and each point on the emergent star represent one of the expanded six core leadership “competency modules”. The primary focus is on leadership as a process of recursive emergence from the perspective of a public official – so the acronym for the framework is “EMERGE”. Each letter in the acronym represents an integral leadership function and stands for a title of Modules V to X.

Though each of the modules can be presented as a stand-alone learning session, all ten (10) are interrelated. When presented together these modules provide a comprehensive, albeit concise, guide to public sector leadership for sustainable development in a country specific context. Modules I – IV provide participants with an introduction to basic leadership concepts for the EMERGE framework. Modules V-X present specific leadership competencies (including core concepts, tools and applications) associated with the EMERGE framework.
Module Summary

Module I: Introduction to Public Leadership
Module IIA: Perspectives on Leadership
Module IIB: Concise History of Leadership Studies
Module III: Public Leadership for Sustainable Development
Module IV: Learning Leadership
Module V: E – Exploring the Leadership System
Module VI: M – Mapping the Institutional Context for Leadership
Module VII: E – Embedding Vision, Values and Norms
Module VIII: R – Releasing the Energy of Yourself and Followers
Module IX: G – Guiding Improvements in Organizations and Society
Module X: E – Enabling Good Judgment through Strategic Navigation

MODULE I: INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC LEADERSHIP

Rationale for Module Content

The EMERGE leadership model is grounded in what has come to be called in leadership research and writing as a “regime theory” approach. Over the past decade there has been a resurgence of scholarship that uses “regime” as the unit of analysis for understanding political change, governance and leadership development (Rohr 1989; Morgan, et. al. 2008; Ozawa, 2005; Soltan and Elkins; Johnson, 2002; Stone 1989; Leo 1997, 1998; Lauria 1997). The word regime focuses attention on the organic wholeness of a political system that contributes to the distinctive way of a life of a political community. It emphasizes the synergistic influence of history, institutions, and culture in nurturing a shared system of values and shared agreements on formal and informal governance processes and structures. America’s regime is quite different than Vietnam’s because the two countries have fundamentally different histories, cultures and political/governmental institutions.

Regardless of the regime one is seeking to lead, globalization presents public sector officials with increasingly complex and wicked political and policy issues. Public officials, both politicians and public servants, urgently need a more robust leadership framework to address these wicked issues. There are three defining criteria for a robust leadership framework. First, the framework must mirror – in both its theories and practices -- the complexity and uncertainty inherent in the problems that it seeks to address. Without this, the framework will not have sufficient “requisite variety” to adequately frame the issue at hand and open pathways for an appropriate response. Second, the framework must be grounded in the unique characteristics of the regime within which it operates, in this case Vietnam. Third, a robust leadership framework needs to be oriented to the practical needs of public sector officials so that the framework can be used to mainstream and
institutionalize multifaceted political and policy functions needed in balancing the collective and individual interests of current and future generations.

The EMERGE framework is robust; it meets each of the three core criteria outlined above. First, the framework mirrors the complex and uncertain nature of wicked problems with its embodiment of a “dynamic systems approach” to leadership as recursive emergence. In this sense, the EMERGE framework is both innovative and transformational. Second, as a result of our “co-production” process, the EMERGE framework is firmly grounded in the unique public sector characteristics of the Vietnam regime. The common leadership lessons outlined in Module 2 are grounded in the unique history of the particular system in which the leadership development is taking place. This is reinforced by case applications that are specifically developed for political setting within which the leadership development is taking place. Finally, the EMERGE leadership framework has a strong “theory to practice” orientation which relies heavily on the “Leadership Legacy” approach as described in chapter 2.

This public leadership curriculum has a specific point of view. The target learner audience is the public sector officials, both politicians and public servants at different levels of the political system, who perform a vital leadership role as part of their current or future positions. Module I addresses the question: “Why should I learn more about public leadership, and why is there an urgent need to learn more about public leadership now?”

Public officials are responsible for carrying out a complex array of professional roles -- including both leadership and management -- in relationship to others within a dynamic institutional context. Some of the key dimensions of the institutional context include; interpersonal, within teams and organizational units, between organizations (political, governmental, enterprises, and others), multilevel, networked, multidisciplinary, multisectoral and multistakeholder. Module I sets the stage for learning about leadership within this complex setting.

Learning Objectives of Module I

I. Learners will understand why it is both urgent and important for public officials to improve their leadership knowledge and practice within the political context they serve.

II. Learners will understand the EMERGE public leadership framework rationale, main elements and core definitions.

III. Learners will be able to identify a significant and interesting leadership problem within their work context that they would like to better understand and address as part of their leadership development experience.
MODULE IIA: PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP

Rationale for Module Content
All public officials have experience with “leadership”. From this experience, and from the extensive literature on leadership, come many differing perspectives on leadership, e.g., why leadership is important, what counts for leadership success and whether leadership can be learned. In this module, learners are challenged to identify their existing public leadership perspectives. Then, these perspectives are aggregated and compared to a list of historical “leadership truths and myths” synthesized from public leadership theory and practice. From this comparison, learners are able to identify areas of dissonance between their existing beliefs about public leadership and the evidence-based facts about leadership from contemporary research. At the completion of Module IIA, learners are able to answer the question, “Which of my perspectives about public leadership are actually grounded in evidence, and where do I need to augment my perspectives with more knowledge?” In this case, “The fact is that evidence-based theory changes the facts.”

Learning Objectives of Module IIA
I. Using their personal understanding and experience, learners will be able to identify several common perspectives about public leadership in Vietnam.
II. Learners will be able to use several real historical leadership case studies to generate a summary list of hypotheses about evidenced-based public leadership truths and myths.
III. Learners will be able compare and contrast their personal perspectives on leadership with the leadership research findings from the historical cases in order to identify areas of congruence and divergence.

MODULE IIB: CONCISE HISTORY OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Rationale for Module Content
This Module begins with a concise overview of the primary public leadership theories and practices in Eastern and Western societies. This historical understanding of public leadership is used to generate a list of commonly-shared lessons related to modern public leadership. For example, history teaches that public leadership is a “systems construct” that requires concurrent attention to both its integrated nature and its differentiated elements. The commonly-shared historical lessons represent the evidence-based building blocks for the EMERGE public sector leadership conceptual framework. The Module concludes by demonstrating the alignment between each historic leadership lesson and the six major elements of the EMERGE leadership framework. Upon the completion of this module learners will be able to understand the practical value of mastering the EMERGE framework contents for improving their personal leadership knowledge and skills, and for addressing the leadership challenges present in their own work settings.
I. Learners will have a concise understanding of the historical evolution of leadership studies in Eastern and Western societies along with a list of academic references of more in-depth disciplinary study.

II. Learners will be able to identify several commonly-shared lessons of contemporary public leadership from Eastern and Western historical study.

III. Learners will be able to demonstrate the high degree of alignment between the historical commonly-shared leadership lessons and the six core EMERGE leadership framework elements.

MODULE III:  PUBLIC LEADERSHIP AND WICKED PROBLEMS: THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CASE

Rationale for Module Content

Public leadership is defined in part by its focus on the particular set of problems known as Wicked-Problems (WP). Wicked-Problems are characterized by complexity, dynamic and changing interrelationships, nonlinearity, intractability, discontinuity and hence unpredictability. Wicked-Problems require the ability to: see the whole while working with the parts, i.e., systems thinking; think in both the present and the future; balance equally important but sometimes competing values; manage tradeoffs; recognize unintended consequences and surprises; learn and adapt; and importantly, act with precaution. Wicked-Problems are particularly suited to leadership development, since they require thinking ‘outside the box’, creating, articulating and inspiring visions, transforming values into actions, and collaborating across boundaries to move step-by-step toward the common good. The EMERGE Leadership Framework is designed to facilitate leadership success in working with all kinds of Wicked-Problems. Sustainable Development (i.e., development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the needs of future generations) represents one of the most complex and wicked of all policy issues faced by most contemporary political systems. Because of this, it serves as a convenient case-in-point to demonstrate the nature of Wicked-Problems as well as some leadership skills and tools critical to working with them.

Learning Objectives for Module III

I. Learners will understand the nature of Wicked-Problems and their centrality to public leadership in Vietnam.

II. Learners will be able to identify Wicked-Problems in their own jobs through the examination of the specific case of Sustainable Development.

III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to integrate the knowledge of Wicked-Problems into decision-making processes through examination of the specific case of Sustainable Development.

MODULE IV: LEARNING LEADERSHIP

Rationale for Module Content

Wicked-Problems are complex, nonlinear, constantly changing, and largely intractable, i.e., extremely difficult to deal with or solve. Leadership works in an environment defined by Wicked-Problems. Consequently, leadership will always be challenged with the limits of their understanding and experience.
Success in these circumstances requires continuous and intentional learning. Leadership is responsible to identify and facilitate their own personal and organizational learning needs, to support the learning of others in the leadership system and to facilitate learning at all levels of the organization. Learning is approached as a recursive process wherein learners consider new ideas, practice new skills on-the-job, engage in continuous reflection to make associated improvements. In this way, new knowledge and skills are integrated into a constantly expanding and relevant repertoire of leadership behaviors.

**Learning Objectives for Module IV**

I. Learners will understand the core concepts of personal learning along with the principles of leadership learning.

II. Learners will be able to use the adult leadership learning definitions, concepts and leadership learning principles for facilitating learning in themselves and others (including co-workers, followers, collaborators, etc.).

III. Learners will demonstrate successful learning in themselves and others in the leadership system context using the adult leadership learning definitions, concepts and leadership learning principles.

**Module V: E – Exploring the Leadership System**

**Rationale for Module Content**

Public leadership transpires within an organizational setting. The basic organizational building block for public leadership is the proximate “leadership system” comprised of a leadership problem, leaders, followers and related organizational elements. In this module, leaders learn about the major characteristics of leadership systems and how to define their leadership role within a leadership system setting. All public officials perform a number of important roles, one of which is leadership. This module empowers public officials to understand their leadership role with the assistance of a leadership role analysis tool. Leadership systems and the leadership roles within them evolve over time. Therefore, it is important for public sector officials to understand how to “analyze and understand” the leadership system context so as to determine the appropriate leadership knowledge and skills needed for success.

**Learning Objectives of Module V**

I. Learners will be able to define a leadership system and its dynamics including key leadership roles of leaders, followers and related organizational elements.

II. Learners will understand the purpose and uses of the leadership role assessment tool based on a case illustration in their public organization setting.

III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to apply the leadership role assessment tool to discern and analyze their own leadership system, the roles s/he needs to play in that leadership system, and the practices associated with those roles.
MODULE VI: MAPPING THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT FOR LEADERSHIP

Rationale for Module Content

The leadership roles that public officials perform within their leadership system are influenced by the broader institutional context. For example, wicked public policy issues extend across the intergovernmental boundaries of the proximate leadership system into the more distant, multilevel and networked institutional context. This more distant institutional context contains many conditions, both manifest and latent, which can support or constrain the role and practice of leadership. Some of these conditions include: culturally-embedded visions and values, the distribution of and access to power sources, the needs and demands of influential stakeholder groups, the perception of urgency, and the understanding of information flows. When public leaders can map and appreciate these supporting and constraining conditions with the assistance of contextual intelligence tools, then these conditions can be mobilized and nurtured through the use of political functions and policy mechanisms in order to mainstream emergent pathways to the public good.

Learning Objectives of Module VI

I. Learners will understand the salient features of the leadership system’s broader institutional terrain.
II. Learners understand the purpose and uses of the contextual intelligence tool for identifying and understanding institutional conditions and trends that can be mobilized and guided to support leadership system performance.
III. Learners can correctly apply the contextual intelligence tool to identify and validate macro level patterns of leadership influence in a sustainable development case setting.

MODULE VII: EMBEDDING VISION, VALUES AND NORMS

Rationale for Module Content

Leadership is challenged to work on Wicked-Problems within a complex and highly dynamic leadership context. Leadership needs a method to select and maintain clear direction within that context so that it can act proactively and generate outcomes for the public good. Vision and values provide the compass and strategies by which Leadership can act deliberately and efficaciously to accomplish the public good. Capitalizing on the inherent potential of Vision and values requires that they be systematically transformed from words into vision-directed and values-based outcomes. This process includes using values to create norms, and institutionalizing those values and norms into organizational processes and systems. It also includes thinking strategically through mundane as well as significant issues to ensure vision and values are utilized as guides and criteria for decision-making and action-taking.
Learning Objectives for Module VII

I. Learners will understand the purpose and power of vision and values within the public sector.
II. Learners will develop strategic thinking skills to transform vision and values from words into purposive action and ethical outcomes.
III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to utilize a strategic thinking tool to determine the decisions and actions that are both aligned with the vision and values and address the common good as exemplified through a Vietnamese sustainable development policy issue.

MODULE VIII: R – RELEASING THE ENERGY OF YOURSELF AND FOLLOWERS

Rationale for Module Content

Within public leadership systems, leading officials have various types of power available to them for use in releasing the energy of themselves in relationship to followers in a manner consistent with the accomplishment of the organization’s vision and values. These powers consist of a combination of formal authorities (hard powers) and informal influence (soft powers) that can be used alone or in combination to empower, influence and persuade. The smart application of hard and soft power, referred to in the psychology and political leadership literature as “smart power”, depends on a deep understanding one’s own leadership strengths, the various types of power, their sources, and specific features of the leadership system. Public officials need to understand how to access and make the appropriate use of smart power in order to strategically navigate the political and policy processes in a flexible yet principled manner that contributes to the collective good.

Learning Objectives for Module VIII

I. Learners will understand core concepts of power for energizing relationships between themselves and followers that contribute to progress and positive results.
II. Learners will understand the purpose and uses of the smart-power tool for leading within the context of a wicked public leadership problem.
III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to correctly apply the smart power tool within the context of a Vietnamese sustainable development case situation.

MODULE IX: G – GUIDING IMPROVEMENTS IN ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETY

Rationale for Module Content

In addition to mobilizing followers within the leadership system, leaders need to extend their leadership impact within broader organizational and societal settings. This module introduces learners to the theory and practice of leading organizations and societies drawing on the knowledge from social psychology, sociology, political science and public administration. Learners learn about convening coalitions within and across organizational boundaries. A case application is used to demonstrate the application of the convening tool in the Vietnamese context.

Learning Objectives for Module IX
I. Learners will understand the leadership factors associated with organizational and societal change.

II. Learners will understand the purpose and uses of the convening coalitions tool for leading organizational and societal progress aligned with the collective good.

III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to correctly apply the convening coalitions tool within the context of a sustainable development case situation.

MODULE X:  E – ENABLING GOOD JUDGMENT THROUGH STRATEGIC NAVIGATION

Rationale for Module Content

Judgment has to do with the ability to “size things up” and make “the right decisions, e.g. both effective and ethical” in the face of morally ambiguous, politically conflictual, incomplete and temporally urgent information. Public judgment requires an understanding of different models of decision making, and the different leadership concepts and tools, embedded in the EMERGE approach to leadership. Experienced judgment nurtured by the balancing of competing values is required for adapting the emergence and convergence of actions around pathways to the collective good. Recent advancements in the practice of leadership suggest that the principles of deep design and strategic navigation (Hames, 2008) are integral to good judgments within the context of wicked issues, including sustainable development. This model introduces the principles and practices of strategic navigation and provides learners with an opportunity to apply the strategic navigation tool in the context of a sustainable development problem.

Learning Objectives for Module IX:

I. Learners will understand the dimensions and challenges of public judgment.

II. Learners will understand the purpose and uses of the strategic navigation tools for making good leadership judgments in the context of wicked problems.

III. Learners will demonstrate the ability to correctly apply the strategic navigation tool within the context of a sustainable development case situation.

From their research, Crosby and Bryson have derived a list of the following capabilities that they believe are necessary for public officials to be successful for leading in power-dispersed settings (2005, 34–35)

- Understanding the social, political, and economic givens as well as potentialities
- Understanding and deploying personal assets on behalf of beneficial change
- Building effective workgroups
- Nurturing humane and effective organizations
- Creating and communicating shared meaning/vision in forums
- Making and implementing decisions in legislative, executive, and administrative arenas
- Sanctioning conduct and adjudicating disputes in courts
- Coordinating leadership tasks over the course of the policy change cycle
Crosby and Bryson point out that no leader is ever likely to possess all of these capabilities. They are exercised by “a number of people leading at different times and in varying ways over the course of a policy change effort” (Crosby and Bryson 2005, 36). This places a premium on leaders who know how to “size things up”, see the whole, “to skate to where the puck is going to go” (in the words of the famous hockey player, Wayne Gretsky), to see around the corner, to make good judgments, to surround themselves with the right people, to simultaneously be attentive to the short-run without abandoning a strategic focus on the middle and long term. At a dispositional level, the emerging leadership setting requires leaders who are comfortable operating in an environment characterized by uncertainty, ambiguity, conflict and constrained resources. (For further discussion of this issue see the section on Cultivation of Judgment that follows in this chapter).

**Multi-level Leadership Focus** – It is important that public service leadership development be multi-level in its focus, giving appropriate attention to 1) individual leadership strengths/styles, 2) leading groups and teams, 3) leading organizations (i.e., managing information, budgeting, personnel, purchasing, contracting and other systems) with a focus on “change management” and 4) leading in the larger community setting which shapes the environment of the organization. This multi-level focus is summarized in Figure 6.2 below.

It is common knowledge that some leaders can easily inspire followers but cannot run organizations or facilitate group and team-oriented activities. Others are good at leading in large community settings with multiple stakeholders while others become nearly incapacitated when facing hostile groups, the media or any kind of larger public limelight. An important part of leadership development is the opportunity to assess and discover what kinds of leadership knowledge, skills and abilities one already possesses and how these are aligned with one’s dispositional “wiring” and the requirements of a given leadership role. This “self-knowledge” is a critical starting point for developing ones competencies in each of the other 3 levels of leadership activity.
This multilevel leadership orientation has both a vertical and horizontal dimension. Vertically, leaders at different hierarchical levels within an organization need to understand the roles and sources of power of others in order to cooperatively integrate the work of other levels to accomplish the overall mission of the organization. Viewed from a horizontal perspective, the multilevel focus emphasizes the importance of each organizational unit reaching out to elicit support from counterparts in other organizational entities whose cooperation is necessary to achieve the larger set of public goals. In short, it is important for leaders to understand that individuals at all levels of the organization play a critical, but slightly different role in promoting the public good, starting with street level leaders who deliver the service to those at the other end of the leadership spectrum who are responsible for the strategic direction of the organization. A multilevel focus (vertical and horizontal) reinforces the notion that the public good requires all members of an organization to perform their respective leadership responsibilities in a collaborative and mutually reinforcing fashion with both those within the organization as well as the relevant stakeholders outside the organization.

The Cultivation of Judgment - As the reader will notice, at the center of the Multi-level Leadership Development focus in Figure 2 there is a list of “integrative strategies” that are designed to assist aspiring leaders to view leadership development as an on-going developmental activity. Leaders do not often have the luxury of compartmentalizing their leadership world into the categories used for training purposes. For example, targeted efforts to build leadership capacity at the individual, group, organizational and political levels begins to break down in practice. An organizational leader may call members of the senior leadership team together for meetings to explore ways of dealing with the political consequences of various courses of action. Under these kinds of circumstances all four dimensions of leadership come into play.

We have tried to capture the interactive nature of the individual, group, organizational political levels of leadership by the flowing block arrows at the top and to the left of Figure 6.2. What is common to all leadership levels is that leaders have to make judgments based on all of the evidence available within a constrained time-frame that requires leadership action. It is this ability to make sense out of the whole, without losing focus on the particulars, which is the essence of leadership development. We have not found a precise recipe for cultivating what Geoffrey Vickers calls The Art of Judgment and what others call “prudence” (Vickers 1974; Cooper, 1991, 165; Morgan 1990; Green 1992; Dobel 1999, 15). But we believe the Legacy Leadership Model that we have developed over the past several decades does a better job of cultivating this elusive art of leadership judgment than traditional training approaches. (For a more expansive explanation of what we mean by this “art of judgment”, see Endnote 1.)
Public Service Leadership Requires Balancing Competing Moral Values – One of the major differences between public and private sector leaders is that the former lead in a much murkier and grey environment filled with contested values. There is not a financial “bottom line” profit & loss target that serves as a common denominator for measuring success. For public officials, success is in the “eye of the beholder” – the party, the business community, the environmentalists, the religious/ethnic community, the press, the internet, leaders of other nations, etc. As the eyes of the beholders expand in number and increase in diversity, public sector officials have the problem of mediating competing values or competing interpretations of the values at the center of the political system.

It is frequently the case that the moral values of a given political/legal setting are in tension, if not conflict. For example, in the United States leaders struggle to balance the following values at the heart of America’s rule of law system: 1) Responsiveness to citizen concerns, 2) Efficient and effective management of the public’s business, 3) Protecting the rights of citizens and 4) Respecting the larger community culture within which public service is delivered. In many communist countries leaders are struggling to balance the competing goals of 1) maintaining the political legitimacy of the party, 2) securing social equity, 3) promoting economic well being and 4) protecting the environment.

Regardless of the nation-state setting, conditions of scarcity and the expanding diversity of community values make it increasingly difficult for public service leaders to successfully balance the contending moral values that are at the center of their work. For this reason, the Legacy Model places priority on dealing with these “governance” challenges, which cannot be effectively resolved by only developing “better management systems”, improving “customer service” or designing “performance-based” evaluation measures. While all of these are important public management reforms, they do not provide much help to public leaders (whether in the U.S, China, Vietnam or Japan) who must struggle with managing competing public values that are forever in tension with one another. To develop the capacity to take on these kinds of “governance” problems, it is important that the education of aspiring and current leaders include practice in balancing competing values with real-time cases. These cases can be provided by the participants themselves, by senior organizational leaders who serve as co-instructors or by instructors who write up specially designed cases based on real-life conditions.

Leadership for Sustainable Development: What is Different?

Sustainable development has been pushed to the forefront of leadership priorities as the forces of globalization have heightened the challenge of mitigating the adverse consequences of economic development on the environment. This is not only an issue of managing scarcity and calculating the strategic consequences on the interests of nation-states, but with global warming sustainable development has become an issue of the survival
of the planet and the species who inhabit it. What difference does sustainable development make to the Legacy Leadership Model we have outlined in this paper? There are at least three consequences that a focus on sustainable development has for our model:

- It adds new dimensions to the problem of balancing competing moral values. Balancing
- It adds a sense of urgency.
- It increases the importance and urgency of developing competencies for multi-level government and institutional leadership

**Moral Balancing Becomes More Complicated** – We have argued that one of the unique responsibilities of public service leaders is their need to balance a larger repertoire of moral values that are in tension than is the case for leaders in the market, civic and nonprofit sectors. Sustainable development adds to the complexity of this task as is illustrated by Figure 6.3 below.

As Figure 6.3 illustrates, sustainable development places in conflict the values of economic growth, social equity and the protection of the environment. How leaders manage this tension depends on a multitude of factors, including where a community is along the development continuum, the ability of a community or nation to extract raw materials from within and outside its boundaries, As international and internal political pressures, the overall stature of a nation within the international community and the contextual forces at work within a leader’s local sphere of authority and influence.

**Figure 6.1: The Sustainable Development Challenge**

How success is defined in managing the sustainable development tensions varies widely. As Figure 6.3 indicates “bearable” impact on the environment, “equitable” social outcomes and “viable” economic development have quite different meanings to different people in the far reaches of the globe and at different
points in their history. For example, there are parts of the world where sustainable development is a “way of life” as opposed to a public policy that is in competition with other policies that are in contention for the allocation of scarce financial resources.

**Sustainable Development Adds a Sense of Urgency** – Sustainable development adds a sense of urgency to the task of public service leadership although the motivating factors for this urgency may be not always be the same. For global warming specialists, the urgency lies in the geometric impact that small temperature changes have on planet flora, fauna and geo-political transformations. For political leaders the urgency is driven by a combination of internal and international pressures that can produce quite divergent outcomes. For example, the United States is being pushed by the less developed nations of the world to assume a disproportionate role in reducing its carbon footprint on the globe. These nations argue that the developed nations need to bear a bigger share of the burden in reducing global carbon emissions in order to allow the developing countries to “catch up”. In the short run, economic growth could be sacrificed in the more developed nations for the sake of protecting the environment and promoting greater global social equity. The sustainable development agenda, regardless of how it may be dealt with by individual leaders, has created a sense of urgency that makes it increasingly difficult for leaders to avoid taking responsibility for managing the problem.

**Sustainable Development Requires New Competencies for Multi-Level government and Institutional Leadership** – Sustainable development problems have many of the dispersed-power characteristics we have already discussed. Economic growth, social equity and environmental stewardship require collaboration across multiple organizational, jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries. This is because resources to solve the problem may be dispersed, there may be competing interpretations of what counts for “economic growth”, “social equity” or “environmental stewardship”. There may also be conflicting priorities among those who can create and sustain a successful outcome. Whether it is preserving a watershed, meeting the social needs of a target population or advancing economic growth, there is a need to create agreement among conflicting views in order to harness the resources to advance the sustainable development agenda. Leaders need to know how to operate successfully in this horizontal set of relationship where power is dispersed and where authority has to be created, rather than assumed.

One of the characteristics of sustainable development is that it affects all individuals where they live. It is not an abstract notion held by a few leaders at the top and given expression in vague policy documents that are not viewed by many as having any daily impact on their lives of individuals. For this reason, there needs to be visible local examples where people live of why sustainable development is important and how it can be
done. When this occurs, it can inspire others to take advantage of the numerous opportunities for individuals at the local level to exercise leadership, whether it be in their formal governmental roles, in their individual and civic capacities or through their work.

However, the degree to which individuals become a “thousand points of light” in the service of sustainable development depends not only on visible signs of its importance where they live, but also on the kinds of examples that are set at the policy levels by political leaders at every level of government. Without active leadership on behalf of sustainable development by political leaders, the potential army of soldiers that can be enlisted into service will never realize its potential, a particularly lamentable outcome given the urgency and breadth of global action that is required.

**Summary and Conclusions**

The Legacy Leadership Model provides a strategic framework from which to organize specific leadership actions at all levels of an organization, at all places within a community and at every level of government. In structure and flow, the Legacy Leadership Model follows a three-phase process depicted in Figure 6.4: (1) identifying a problem that requires action and creating a vision that gives the problem meaning; (2) generating support for the vision; and (3) making the vision a reality through implementation and institutionalization.

The model is an iterative process, which requires that at multiple stages of the process, there are opportunities for the problem to be redefined as a result of enlarging the circle of support and learning from the experience of taking action. It is modeled after the theory of “double loop learning” in which participants in a problem-solving activity are encouraged to learn from what they have done by taking into account failures and mistakes as well as what has worked (Argyris and Schon 1974). This learning is accomplished by asking participants to take time out to make explicit their theory in use (first loop) and then take time out again after applying what they know to capture the “lessons learned (the second learning loop) from the application phase of the process.

As Figure 6.4 indicates, the Legacy Model is understood as a political process that requires the mobilization of political support, the arbitration of competing values, and the transformation of these values into an agreement that is given institutional form. Without creating an institutional framework for holding these values and giving them meaning over time, leaders cannot create legacies; they can only create projects.

Legacy Leadership is hard work and not for the lazy or faint-hearted. It requires the development of a complex array of leadership competencies and the personal courage, perseverance and selfless service to others that is more akin to a “calling” than a job or profession.
Endnotes

1. We believe successful leadership requires the development of what Aristotle called practical wisdom. It is a necessary leadership ability that is equally required for a social service caseworker, an agency head responsible for regulating environmental pollution or a party leader trying to determine the best strategy for sustainable development. Practical wisdom is the capacity to apply the right principles appropriately to the unique circumstances of a setting to accomplish the right thing. This capacity is not acquired by getting a better “scientific understanding” of a given situation or “getting the principles right”. While having the “right science” is necessary, it is hardly ever sufficient. Instead, practical wisdom is acquired in the same way professionals acquire “tacit knowledge” over a long period of practicing their craft. Whether one is a stone mason, a doctor, a soccer player or a public official, tacit knowledge is acquired by doing, reflecting on the consequences and using the “lessons learned” to inform your next leadership action (laying the next stone, assessing a patient, kicking the next field goal or deciding on the next policy steps needed for sustainable development). Following is an excerpt from previous work we have written on the nature and importance of the cultivation of practical wisdom for successful leadership development (From Morgan, et al. 2008, chapter 1, 17-18):

Over the last several decades, the theoretical knowledge of the sciences has undergone serious challenge from critical theorists (Habermas 1985), humanists (Hummel 2007), feminists (Gilligan 1993), and organizational theorists (Lipsky 1980; Argyris and Schon 1974). As part of their critique, these theorists have recognized at least three forms of tacit knowledge that can only be derived through action rather than through formal scientific analysis. These forms stand on a separate, if not equal, footing with theoretical knowledge (Jonsen
and Toulmin 1988; Vickers 1965; Weick 1979). More importantly, in the world of administrative practice they overshadow scientific knowledge as the most common bases for making judgments about the what, where, when, and why of public policy and decision making.

There is, first, the prudential understanding that is acquired by undertaking an activity over a long period of time. The subtle nuances and complex interactions among materials, people, and settings acquired by master artisans and craftsman through a long period of “hands-on” experience exemplifies this kind of tacit knowledge. Police officers, case managers, and city planners rely on it routinely to make decisions under conditions of limited resources, short time frames, significant uncertainty, and political conflicts that often make systematic analysis impossible.

A second kind of tacit knowledge can be described as a “feel for the whole,” and it is critically important to successful administrative practice. For public servants, knowledge of the whole tends to accrue through experience in a variety of positions, and by moving to higher-level administrative roles that require an increasingly broad or “strategic” sense of their institution. As they do so, they become more aware that their work forms part of the larger process of democratic governance. They develop a sense of proportion among priorities, and of balancing competing demands. They learn how to weave together people and programs and how to mobilize interests into new missions and institutional arrangements. From this point of view, knowledge of the whole is transitory in nature (Schmidt 1993, 527)—about managing change for the common good—and is thus inseparable from democratic statesmanship (Green 1998). We will develop this point more fully throughout Part I of this book.

Third, there is critical knowledge that gives skilled practitioners a sense of when things are not quite right, or when things do not add up. In these situations their judgments often run against perceived facts and guiding principles. They also often run against the tide of opinion among colleagues, or in the general public, which then invites conflict. The capacity to preserve and protect critical knowledge for the public benefit requires institutional safeguards such as secure tenure for key positions and careful staffing of critical workgroups to avoid problems with “groupthink” and related organizational pathologies. Critical knowledge comprises a “sixth sense” for public servants who know that good administrative work cannot always follow prescribed formulas or seemingly convincing data.

These three types of tacit knowledge contribute to the vital capacity for making judgments where other types of rational or systematic decision making fail because they lack conditions sufficient for their application. Our goal in elevating the status of tacit knowledge is not to denigrate theoretical or scientific knowledge. Instead, we want readers (1) to recognize that tacit knowledge is central to successfully managing public affairs, and (2) to connect it to the larger purposes that administrative work is intended to serve. While it is important to capture what our public servants know, it is equally important to assist them in better understanding how their
work fits into the enterprise as a whole…. This includes responsibility for more than just one’s own job. That job is conditioned by an “encompassing web of offices, processes and institutions” that require implicit obligations which transcend the boundaries of any given position (Burke 1988, 42; also see Rohr 1986; Elkin and Soltan 1993; Richardson 1997; Spicer 1995; Terry 1995; Lawler et al. 1998; Wamsley et al. 1990).
Conciliatory Practices for Leading in a Power-Shared World

Increasingly, leadership in the public sector requires the exercise of informal rather than formal authority. This is because (as we discussed in chapter 5) too many problems fall through the cracks. Wetlands and watersheds can’t be preserved because they may not be controlled by the same entity. In addition, much of what is needed to promote the community good may be in the hands of civic organizations and the private sector. In short, power is shared and problems can’t be easily fenced within the legal boundaries of a given entity. This condition places a premium on leadership that reaches across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries to create partnerships that leverage resources and power (Morgan, et al 2008, pp. 290-296, 303-305). There are various ways of representing the range of leadership skills that are needed to be successful in this kind of environment. We present three such views in the Figures that follow.

Figure 8.1 below provides a summary of conciliatory practice tools that can be used to help create authority in a power-shared world.

Another way of viewing the various competencies that are needed for successful leadership is summarized in figure 8.2. This matrix summarizes the kinds of expertise along the horizontal axis that are relied upon by various practitioner-support units in the College of Urban and Public Affairs on the vertical axis. The value of this matrix is that it highlights the breadth of leadership skills that are needed in the community and the role of the university in providing these skills.
### Table 8.2: CUPA Leadership Competency Mapping Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUPA Sustainable Development Initiatives</th>
<th>Science of Urban Sustainability</th>
<th>Discipline of Community Engagement</th>
<th>Art of Convening</th>
<th>Art of Governance</th>
<th>Policy Wisdom</th>
<th>Practice of Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin Collaborative</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Grid Project</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin Trajectory Project</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Research &amp; Practices Network for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-distinct Project</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Sustainable Watershed Management</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Solutions and National Policy Consensus Center</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China CUPA Urban Sustainable Land Use Program</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Urban Sustainable Post-Do Funding</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Hie Chi Minh HSOG leadership for Sustainable Development Program</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Interns in Sustainable Development</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity and Opportunity Forum</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Systems</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Faculty Development in Vietnam</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International PSU SD Strategy</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitions Planners</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Capacity to systematically gather and test science-based knowledge on urban sustainable development theories and practices.
2. Reliance on engagement with community partners to assess, plan, implement, and evaluate solutions to problems that affect them.
3. A particular form of community engagement that relies on the science and practice of engaging stakeholders in problem identification and problem-solving processes that result in shared ownership.
4. “Sets of principles, norms, roles, and decision-making procedures around which actors converge in a given public policy arena” to make authoritative decisions (Fredrickson, H. 2004. “Whatever happened to public administration: governance, governance everywhere, p. 135).”
5. Substantive knowledge of the best science governing a policy area, of the methods for undertaking policy analytic work, and the policy processes necessary to transform policy goals into successful outcomes.
6. The knowledge and competence to use one’s leadership role to create a shared vision of a sustainable future, to align local and global communities with that vision, and inspire change and innovation.
7. Numeric Scaling Explanation: 1-5, with one being low and 5 being high. A low score means the grant does not call upon this competency for its success, while a score of 5 indicates that this competency is central to the success of the grant. A medium score indicates that the grant makes use of this competency but the success of the grant does not depend on it.

All cells were self-scaled by the grant recipients except for those in bold and italicized. These were scored by the Planning grant principals based on reading the Miller Grant Proposal.
How Do You Choose Whom to Involve?

This is an exercise in “stakeholder analysis,” which raises important questions that affect the design as well as outcome of the process. Typical questions used to conduct such an analysis are listed below (also see Miller, Shinn, and Bentley 1994, chap. 6):

- Who shares authority in the decision setting?
- Who shares power and capacity (with or without authority) to get the job done in the affected setting?
- What jurisdictions are involved with the policy issue, problem, or setting?
- Who will be saddled with significant aspects of implementation if an agreement is reached?
- Who is the group allegedly representing?
- What key values are at stake, and what groups are most sensitive to them?
- Who will be affected by the outcomes of the process?
- Which groups or individuals have historically been left out of the process, but should be involved?

This exercise should be carried out by an initial group staffed with people who are sensitive to those who may oppose outcomes from the collaborative effort, or who may be disenfranchised by it and lacking a voice. No group should be excluded from the eventual collaboration on principle. This helps ensure that the collaborative process passes appropriate “publicity” and “participatory” tests. In addition, as the process unfolds, it is important to assess who, or which parties, will be critical to holding the agreement together through the subsequent implementation phase. This may not be obvious at the start of the process.
Finally, in conducting stakeholder analysis, it is often useful to construct a stakeholder map. The map’s design can help visualize the array of stakeholders by the intensity of their power, their direct versus indirect relation to the process and desired outcomes, their degree or interest, their access to resources, their relation to the initial leading group, and/or their organizational identities. Such maps also help participants visualize the pattern of institutional relationships that define their community or policy subsystem. There is no single best way to design such maps, and a collaborative group may end up constructing more than one for different purposes. Two common designs for such maps include (1) concentric rings with a core group or organization at the center, with other stakeholders arrayed at different levels around the core; and (2) a networked array or constellation with no core group or organization. More elaborate stakeholder charts and diagrams are offered in the literature (cf. Crosby and Bryson 2005, 83–84, 203–5, 262, 283), but we think workgroups should tailor such visual aids in their own way and strive for a balance between simplicity in visual presentation and comprehensiveness in order to preserve their usefulness.

**How Do You Manage Conflicting Values?**

Conciliatory practices entail keeping track of value differences that participants care about. This is a leadership task of the highest order. First, those who wish to lead must reflect on and articulate what matters most to them in the collaborative process. Second, they must understand and promote respect for what other participants really care about—what draws them into the collaborative process (Crosby and Bryson 2005, 37–42). Through use of group facilitation techniques such as periodic brainstorming, nominal-group, and values clarification exercises, leaders must keep track of emerging values as they are discovered in the process. Many participants will prioritize criteria differently. Conciliating practices do not disregard these differences; rather, they promote respect and inclusion for them. Figure 5.6 illustrates a framework developed by the Rural Resource Management team (Behn and Vaupel 1982; Miller, Shinn, and Bentley 1994) for tracking multiple interests and values.

As the decision process moves forward, participants may say, “I cannot support that alternative because. . . .” Such statements often articulate meanings not adequately captured in enumerated criteria. Exploring and reflecting upon these meanings contributes to a richer understanding of relevant values, and thereby enhances the “problem structuring” phase of the process. The way a group defines its values affects the definition of the problems or issues the group wishes to act upon, and thereby focuses the group on particular kinds of decision outcomes (Stone 2002). This aspect of conciliatory practice is usually untidy and open-ended, often provoking suggestions about reweighing criteria and offering new alternatives or variations of existing alternatives.

**Figure 8.2**

*Keeping Track of Values Decision-Making Framework*
As the decision process moves forward, participants may say, “I cannot support that alternative because. . . .” Such statements often articulate meanings not adequately captured in enumerated criteria. Exploring and reflecting upon these meanings contributes to a richer understanding of relevant values, and thereby enhances the “problem structuring” phase of the process. The way a group defines its values affects the definition of the problems or issues the group wishes to act upon, and thereby focuses the group on particular kinds of decision outcomes (Stone 2002). This aspect of conciliatory practice is usually untidy and open-ended, often provoking suggestions about reweighing criteria and offering new alternatives or variations of existing alternatives.

A task-oriented leader may see these efforts as distractions from the “real” work of decision making—as “politics” in a negative or irrational sense. This is often a mistake, because it presumes that such leaders have already adequately defined the problem, and that they really do not care to listen and cultivate dialogue through which broader commitments and consensus may be built. Moreover, it is common to discover new values or see new alternatives that had not manifested themselves in participants’ minds in earlier stages. In the process, people with varied interests may discover a truth greater than either party carried in to the debate, or at least identify one that each party finds worth holding in common. This is what civil discourse is all about. Keeping track of values thus offers a way for seemingly disparate individuals and groups to find and articulate common ground upon which some consensus and decision becomes feasible. The results may not be “optimal” in the traditional managerial or economic sense, but they are likely more politically palatable and sustainable.

How Do You Keep Everyone Committed to the Process?

Drawing in affected stakeholders and keeping track of values are necessary functions for sustaining and facilitating group interaction and commitment. The players must continually perceive an interest in staying in
the game and believe that the process is, on balance, fair and equitable. Ensuring this involves looking for opportunities to reframe or modify alternatives and make concessions that satisfy the priorities of multiple groups. This can be achieved in part through a “rolling alternative” strategy. It is similar to the negotiation strategy of writing umbrella statements or statements that capture the interests of contending parties, such as business and environmental groups in regulatory contexts (cf. Fisher and Ury 1991, and Ury et al. 1988).

Keeping track of what the players care about also enables leaders to identify potential agreements or political solutions to apparent conflicts. For example, it may be possible to identify trades sequenced across time—business concessions (immediate timber harvests) at one point, and environmental concessions at another (land exchanges that enhance conservation).

Conciliatory practices yield varying levels of agreement on specific issues, ranging from no agreement to complete consensus. An important aspect of such practices includes recording patterns of agreement and disagreement. For example, an ad hoc stakeholder advisory group recently presented a management plan to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission. They had developed the plan through a collaborative process that did not come to complete consensus on the preferred alternative. The group decided that they had gone as far as they could on the issues, and that the plan preferred by most group members should go forward as the recommendation of the group. The preferred plan was then improperly characterized in public as representing complete agreement by the advisory group, rather than as a plan with substantial agreement and some dissent. The political backlash that ensued could have been forestalled by recording and presenting the nature of both the agreement and the disagreement. Those who disagree must be given their due. Recognizing the dissenting parties helps sustain their commitment to the process and reinforces the idea that the process provides opportunities to revisit issues subsequently. This helps build trust in the integrity of the process, and thereby raises the level of civic capacity.

Another aspect of sustaining commitment and healthy group dynamics means taking the complexities of public problems and the reality of multiple leaders seriously. Leaders must know their own limitations as well as their strengths and seek out other leaders who can compensate for the weaknesses. In some situations, at least, the leader must learn to become a good follower—sometimes referred to as leading from behind (Blanchard, Randolph, and Grazier 2005). Furthermore, the most able leaders may not be the best persons to serve as facilitators of group deliberations. Nor may a leader with the most expertise on a subject be the right person to represent a group during deliberative and coalition-building phases. Rather, such leaders may be more effective playing supportive or advisory roles. In many institutional contexts, it is common to hear people say that it’s not what you know, but who you know that matters. Such statements invoke ethical relationships defined by status rather than by expertise or ability. Such status may be formal or informal, and it may confer
considerable influence, authoritative opinion, and credibility. It is critical that leaders identify and involve group members who possess such status, and, when appropriate, defer to them as leaders in their own right.

**How Do You Manage Decision Making in Conciliatory Processes?**

In public contexts, arranging the steps necessary for decision making and implementation can be extraordinarily complicated. The multiple, overlapping jurisdictions involved in the process all have their own procedures, requiring multiple sets of meetings and forms of official ratification. At state and federal levels, administrative procedure acts dictate notice of proposed rules and widely varying procedures for conducting hearings and adjudicating disputes. These are explained in some detail in chapter 13. Limits may also exist on the degree to which public officials can delegate authority. This often conditions the circumstances for when and how to include others, and can easily stymie consensus-building dynamics. Local or community-based decision processes are generally more fluid, but are hardly bereft of their own procedures, rituals, and structures. In fact, the lack of standard procedural rules and the proliferation of special districts amidst county, city, and town governments makes the coordination of decision making even more difficult. The differences in urban and rural governance also present challenges. Rural governance activity is usually much more informal, downplaying (or even ignoring) formal legal standards and professional norms in favor of community ties that include friendships, clans, religious affiliations, fraternal clubs, and so forth.

The complexities of decision-making steps in a shared-power world can make specialized tracking and coordination a necessity. It may require establishment of a coordinating body with the expertise, and perhaps with some authority of its own, to effectively manage such processes. In Oregon, the establishment of Oregon Solutions (http://www.orsolutions.org/) provides a robust example. The Oregon Solutions approach to problem solving arose from the commitment of Oregon governor John Kitzhaber to address the challenges of finding community-based solutions to a range of problems. Oregon Solutions uses a community governance system that has the following elements: a community-defined problem or opportunity; a governor’s designation of the project and appointment of a community convener; creation of a solutions team of federal, state, local, or other government entities, businesses, nonprofits, and key citizens; development of an integrated solution; and a declaration of cooperation and commitment signed by the resulting solutions team. Oregon Solutions staff members facilitate projects addressing dozens of public problems, ranging from transportation planning disputes to alternative energy and job training initiatives.

We have emphasize the importance of conciliatory practices because we believe that for the foreseeable future sustainable development will be at the forefront of leadership priorities as the forces of globalization continue to heighten the challenge of mitigating the adverse consequences of economic development on the environment. This is not only an issue of managing scarcity and calculating the strategic consequences on the interests of communities and the socio-economic wellbeing of different parts of society, but with global
warming sustainable development has become an issue of the survival of the planet and the species who inhabit it. As Figure 8.3 illustrates, what is perhaps most notable about “leadership for sustainable development” is that there are no clear or final solutions and every solution produces adverse consequences in the short run, such as restricting economic development, increasing the cost of living, or disproportionately advantaging sectors of the population at the expense of others. This is why sustainable development has been characterized as a “wicked problem”. Wicked problems are defined by the list of characteristics summarized in Figure 8.4.

Figure 8.4: Wicked Problems Checklist

| Complex - difficult to analyze and understand all of the interrelated factors |
| Integrated – the parts are connected and combined |
| Interdependent – the parts are mutually dependent |
| Indeterminate – problems and solutions are indefinite, vague, unclear |
| Unbounded – the problem is not bounded, both physically and temporally |
| Polycentric – problems do not have one clear causal center |
| Unpredictable – problems are erratic, random, changeable |
| Intractable – problems are difficult to deal with or solve |
| Discontinuous – The factors making up the problem are broken, sporadic, irregular |
| Nonlinear – Problems undergo change due to unpredictable influences of individual factors |

Wicked problems like sustainable development require leaders who have the ability to:

- think in terms of “systems interdependency” (i.e., see the whole while working with the parts)
- realize and assess the potential for catastrophic risks
- think in terms of both the present and the future, balancing equally important but competing values
- manage trade-offs
- build authority in a power-shared world
- realize that “solutions” are only temporary approximations
- recognize unintended consequences and surprises
- act with prudence
- learn and adapt

For purposes of further elaboration we have grouped the above list of competencies into the following five core leadership competencies that are important in dealing with sustainable development issues.

- Systems thinking and action
- Deciding and acting to create “proximate” solutions
- Getting good at multi-level government and institutional leadership
- Getting comfortable with the responsibility to balance competing moral values
- A sense of urgency.

1. Systems Thinking and Action – Sustainable development places a premium on integrated systems analysis and action. It requires an “ecological mindset” where all of the parts are viewed as having an interdependent relationship with one another and with a larger organic whole. This approach stands in contrast to the traditional instrumental and management centered training that has been at the core of public service education for the last 75 years. That is why the Executive MPA Program has assigned readings and used pedagogical techniques that put your body and mind in “strange places” that defy deconstruction into meaningful traditional boxes. To assemble meaning in this kind of environment requires learning how to take advantage of multiple perspectives. And it requires participants who are willing and able to change their views in group-centered advisory and decision making settings.

2. Deciding and Acting to Create “Proximate” Solutions – Leadership for sustainable development requires leaders who are willing to decide and act in the face of large amounts of uncertainty about the results of their actions. While uncertainty is inherent to the task of public service leadership, especially in fragmented political systems, it is even more the case when dealing with sustainable development issues. This is because the web of interdependent factors that affect the desired outcome are “polycentric”, much in the way a spider web has many centers of interdependence. While a web may look to have a center, this is only an illusion, since intervention into any part of the web sets off a chain of interactive influences that are felt by every other part of the web. With this kind of organic relationship of the parts to the whole, the outcome of a given intervention at any one point along the web of interdependence cannot be known for certain. As a consequence, leaders have to take a “let’s try this approach” with enough confidence that if the course of action does not produce the desired result or actually makes things worse, they are willing to take responsibility for the outcome and have the courage and fortitude to rally support for the “next best solution”. In preparing you to lead in this kind of setting, the Executive MPA curriculum and faculty have frequently put you in settings where you are asked you to figure out “what is going on”, how to craft an agreeable path forward with partners in the exercise, and, in general to make you comfortable with “messes”.
3. Sustainable Development Requires New Competencies for Multi-Level government and Institutional Leadership – Sustainable development problems have many of the dispersed-power characteristics we have discussed above (see pp. 15 ff.) Economic growth, social equity and environmental stewardship require collaboration across multiple organizational, jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries. This is because resources to solve the problem may be dispersed, there may be competing interpretations of what counts for “economic growth”, “social equity” or “environmental stewardship”. There may also be conflicting priorities among those who can create and sustain a successful outcome. Whether it is preserving a watershed, meeting the social needs of a target population or advancing economic growth, there is a need to create agreement among conflicting views in order to harness the resources to advance the sustainable development agenda. Leaders need to know how to operate successfully in this horizontal set of relationship where power is dispersed and where authority has to be created, rather than assumed.

One of the characteristics of sustainable development is that it affects all individuals where they live. It is not an abstract notion held by a few leaders at the top and given expression in vague policy documents that are not viewed by many as having any daily impact on their lives of individuals. For this reason, there needs to be visible local examples where people see why sustainable development is important and how it can be done. When this occurs, it can inspire others to take advantage of the numerous opportunities for individuals at the local level to exercise leadership, whether it is in their formal governmental roles, in their individual and civic capacities or through their work.

However, the degree to which individuals become a “thousand points of light” in the service of sustainable development depends not only on visible signs of its importance where they live, but also on the kinds of examples that are set at the policy levels by political leaders at every level of government. Without active leadership on behalf of sustainable development by political leaders, the potential army of soldiers that can be enlisted into service will never realize its potential, a particularly lamentable outcome given the urgency and breadth of global action that is required.

4. Moral Balancing Becomes More Complicated – We have argued that one of the unique responsibilities of public service leaders is their need to balance a larger repertoire of moral values that are in tension than is the case for leaders in the market, civic and nonprofit sectors. In section IIC (pp. 9-11) of this review we summarized the dynamic tension among the following core values that are at the center of America’s multiple systems of democratic government: responsiveness, efficiency/effectiveness, protecting minority rights, and an engaged citizenry. Sustainable development adds to the complexity of this task of balancing competing and equally important moral values, as is illustrated by Figure 5 above.
As Figure 5 illustrates, sustainable development places in conflict the values of economic growth, social equity and the protection of the environment. How leaders manage this tension depends on a multitude of factors, including where a community is along the development continuum, the ability of a community or nation to extract raw materials from within and outside its boundaries, the confluence of international and internal political pressures, the overall stature of a nation within the international community and the contextual forces at work within a leader’s local sphere of authority and influence.

How success is defined in managing the sustainable development tensions varies widely. As Figure 5 indicates “bearable” impact on the environment, “equitable” social outcomes and “viable” economic development have quite different meanings to different people in the far reaches of the globe and at different points in their history. For example, there are parts of the world where sustainable development is a “way of life” as opposed to a public policy that is in competition with other policies that are in contention for the allocation of scarce financial resources.

5. Sustainable Development Adds a Sense of Urgency – Sustainable development adds a sense of urgency to the task of public service leadership, although the motivating factors for this urgency may be not always be the same. For global warming specialists, the urgency lies in the geometric impact that small temperature changes have on the planet’s flora, fauna and geo-political transformations. For political leaders the urgency is driven by a combination of internal and international pressures that can produce quite divergent outcomes. For example, the United States is being pushed by the less developed nations of the world to assume a disproportionate role in reducing its carbon footprint on the globe. These nations argue that the developed nations need to bear a bigger share of the burden in reducing global carbon emissions in order to allow the developing countries to “catch up”. In the short run, economic growth could be sacrificed in the more developed nations for the sake of protecting the environment and promoting greater global social equity. The sustainable development agenda, regardless of how it may be dealt with by individual leaders, has created a sense of urgency that makes it increasingly difficult for leaders to avoid taking responsibility for managing the problem.

Summary and Conclusions
The Legacy Leadership Model provides a strategic framework from which to organize specific leadership actions at all levels of an organization, at all places within a community and at every level of government. In structure and flow, the Legacy Leadership Model follows a three-phase process depicted in Figure 7: (1) identifying a problem that requires action and creating a vision that gives the problem meaning; (2) generating support for the vision; and (3) making the vision a reality through implementation and institutionalization.
The model is an iterative process, which requires that at multiple stages of the process, there are opportunities for the problem to be redefined as a result of enlarging the circle of support and learning from the experience of taking action. It is modeled after the theory of “double loop learning” in which participants in a problem-solving activity are encouraged to learn from what they have done by taking into account failures and mistakes as well as what has worked (Schon 1983). This learning is accomplished by asking participants to take time out to make explicit their theory in use (first loop) and then take time out again after applying what they know to capture the “lessons learned (the second learning loop) from the application phase of the process.

As Figure 7 indicates, the Legacy Model is understood as a political process that requires the mobilization of political support, the arbitration of competing values, and the transformation of these values into an agreement that is given institutional form. Without creating an institutional framework for holding these values and giving them meaning over time, leaders cannot create legacies; they can only create projects.

Legacy Leadership is hard work and not for the lazy or faint-hearted. It requires the development of a complex array of leadership competencies and the personal courage, perseverance and selfless service to others that is more akin to a “calling” than a job or profession.
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How do Leaders Learn: Adult Learning Theory

Role of Training and Professional Development

The Cultivation of Practical Wisdom and Judgment

We believe successful leadership requires the development of what Aristotle called practical wisdom. It is a necessary leadership ability that is equally required for a social service caseworker, an agency head responsible for regulating environmental pollution or a party leader trying to determine the best strategy for sustainable development. Practical wisdom is the capacity to apply the right principles appropriately to the unique circumstances of a setting to accomplish the right thing. This capacity is not acquired by getting a better “scientific understanding” of a given situation or “getting the principles right”. While having the “right science” is necessary, it is hardly ever sufficient. Instead, practical wisdom is acquired in the same way professionals acquire “tacit knowledge” over a long period of practicing their craft. Whether one is a stone mason, a doctor, a soccer player or a public official, tacit knowledge is acquired by doing, reflecting on the consequences and using the “lessons learned” to inform your next leadership action (laying the next stone, assessing a patient, kicking the next field goal or deciding on the next policy steps needed for sustainable development).

(From Morgan, et al. 2008, chapter 1, 17-18) Over the last several decades, the theoretical knowledge of the sciences has undergone serious challenge from critical theorists (Habermas 1985), humanists (Hummel 2007), feminists (Gilligan 1993), and organizational theorists (Lipsky 1980; Argyris and Schon 1974). As part of their critique, these theorists have recognized at least three forms of tacit knowledge that can only be derived through action rather than through formal scientific analysis. These forms stand on a separate, if not equal, footing with theoretical knowledge (Jonsen and Toulmin 1988; Vickers 1965; Weick 1979). More importantly, in the world of administrative practice they overshadow scientific knowledge as the most common bases for making judgments about the what, where, when, and why of public policy and decision making.
There is, first, the prudential understanding that is acquired by undertaking an activity over a long period of time. The subtle nuances and complex interactions among materials, people, and settings acquired by master artisans and craftsmen through a long period of “hands-on” experience exemplifies this kind of tacit knowledge. Police officers, case managers, and city planners rely on it routinely to make decisions under conditions of limited resources, short time frames, significant uncertainty, and political conflicts that often make systematic analysis impossible.

A second kind of tacit knowledge can be described as a “feel for the whole,” and it is critically important to successful administrative practice. For public servants, knowledge of the whole tends to accrue through experience in a variety of positions, and by moving to higher-level administrative roles that require an increasingly broad or “strategic” sense of their institution. As they do so, they become more aware that their work forms part of the larger process of democratic governance. They develop a sense of proportion among priorities, and of balancing competing demands. They learn how to weave together people and programs and how to mobilize interests into new missions and institutional arrangements. From this point of view, knowledge of the whole is transitory in nature (Schmidt 1993, 527)—about managing change for the common good—and is thus inseparable from democratic statesmanship (Green 1998). We will develop this point more fully throughout Part I of this book.

Third, there is critical knowledge that gives skilled practitioners a sense of when things are not quite right, or when things do not add up. In these situations their judgments often run against perceived facts and guiding principles. They also often run against the tide of opinion among colleagues, or in the general public, which then invites conflict. The capacity to preserve and protect critical knowledge for the public benefit requires institutional safeguards such as secure tenure for key positions and careful staffing of critical workgroups to avoid problems with “groupthink” and related organizational pathologies. Critical knowledge comprises a “sixth sense” for public servants who know that good administrative work cannot always follow prescribed formulas or seemingly convincing data.

These three types of tacit knowledge contribute to the vital capacity for making judgments where other types of rational or systematic decision making fail because they lack conditions sufficient for their application. Our goal in elevating the status of tacit knowledge is not to denigrate theoretical or scientific knowledge. Instead, we want readers (1) to recognize that tacit knowledge is central to successfully managing public affairs, and (2) to connect it to the larger purposes that administrative work is intended to serve. While it is important to capture what our public servants know, it is equally important to assist them in better understanding how their work fits into the enterprise as a whole…. This includes responsibility for more than just one’s own job. That job is conditioned by an “encompassing web of offices, processes and institutions” that require implicit
obligations which transcend the boundaries of any given position (Burke 1988, 42; also see Rohr 1986; Elkin and Soltan 1993; Richardson 1997; Spicer 1995; Terry 1995; Lawler et al. 1998; Wamsley et al. 1990).

**How to Incorporate Regime Characteristics into Professional Development**

*Figure 9.1*

**How Regime Characteristics Influence Public Sector Leadership Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime Values:</th>
<th>Impact on Training Programs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual liberty &amp; rights of privacy</td>
<td>Understanding of the foundational purposes of the American political system and its implications for administering programs that regulate private property, freedom of association, religion and the civil rights of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private property rights</td>
<td>Understanding of the competing views on what is needed most to preserve a regime of “ordered liberty” (The Federalist-Antifederalist debates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of association and religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime Structures:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federalism: “state’s rights” and multiple local governments</td>
<td>The multiplicity of local governments in the U.S. and implications for successful administrative work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of powers</td>
<td>The role responsibility of administrators in different forms of government: federal, state, council-manager, strong mayor, weak mayor, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks and balances</td>
<td>The “trade-off” of values that administrators undertake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral relationships (political, nonprofit, market economy)</td>
<td>The role and function of the three sectors &amp; the implications for administrative leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime Processes:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due process</td>
<td>Why “due process” is important and its implications for leadership success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative rule-making</td>
<td>The role and function of administrative rule-making at various levels of government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime History:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding: Federalist/ Antifederalist debates</td>
<td>The origins and purposes of American government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonian democracy</td>
<td>How the original purposes have developed historically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td>The impact of major historical periods in shaping administrative leadership roles and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressivism</td>
<td>The importance of acquiring the skills to lead in a “shared-power” context, which is an artifact of American values, structures, processes and history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal</td>
<td>The impact of globalization on the leadership role of administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Reinvention of government”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues of Pedagogy and Curriculum Materials**

**Co-Production**

Over the past 20 years of doing leadership development in a variety of organizations and countries and through a process of trial and error we have developed an approach we call “co-production” that addresses the challenges of developing leaders who have the capabilities to deal with “wicked problems”, quickly fill the growing leadership vacuums in our public organizations, increasing the public performance of leaders and
organizations and motivating public servants with leadership potential to prepare themselves for leadership positions. At its simplest level the strategy means joint planning and joint delivery of leadership programs with our organizational partners and with the students we teach.

**Principle #1: Co-production and Co-delivery**

Our Executive Leadership Institute (ELI) gives priority to clients who are prepared to participate as an equal partner in the design and delivery of our leadership development programs. This usually takes the form of having 1-2 senior leaders in the organization designated to work with our institute faculty to design the curriculum as well as deliver it to participants.

**Principle #2: “Active Learning Pedagogy”**

Our Co-production model not only includes the active participation of agency leaders in the design and delivery of the curriculum. It also includes the active participation of trainees throughout the duration of the program. What “active learning” means is that participants are asked at every stage of the program to apply what they are learning to their organizational work setting. This requirement is based on well tested studies of what and how adults learn.

**Principle #3: Multi-level Leadership Focus**

It is important that leadership development be multi-level in its focus, giving appropriate attention to 1) individual leadership strengths/styles, 2) leading groups and teams, 3) leading organizations (i.e., managing budgeting, personnel, MIS and other systems) with a focus on “change management” and 4) leading in the larger community setting which shapes the environment of the organization. It is common knowledge that some leaders can easily inspire followers but cannot run organizations or facilitate group and team-oriented activities. Others are good at interacting in large community settings while others become nearly incapacitated when facing hostile groups, the media or any kind of larger public limelight. In short, it is important for participants to understand that leadership at all levels of the organization plays a critical, but slightly different role in promoting the public good, starting with street level leaders who deliver the service to those at the other end of the leadership spectrum who are responsible for the strategic direction of the organization.

**Principle #4: Public Service Leadership Requires Balancing Competing Moral Values**

Co-Production is not only an effective curricular design and delivery strategy for quickly teaching applied leadership principles to emergent leaders, it also models the real-life practicalities of public service leadership. One of the major differences between public and private sector leaders is that the former lead in an environment
of murky, grey and often contested values. There is not a financial “bottom line” profit & loss target that serves as a common denominator for measuring success. For public officials, success is in the “eye of the beholder” – the party, the business community, the environmentalists, the religious/ethnic community, the press, the internet, leaders of other nations, etc. As the eyes of the beholders expand in number and increase in diversity, public sector officials have the problem of mediating competing values or competing interpretations of the values at the center of the political system.

Given this unique challenge faced by public sector leaders, ELI’s programs explicitly promote the view that public sector leadership carries with it unique moral obligations that are distinctive to a particular political/legal setting.

**Principle #5: Adaptability over Time**

It is important that leadership programs have the capacity to quickly adapt to the changing context of the organization. For example, if an organization suddenly finds itself facing a major challenge as a result of a natural catastrophe, a sudden economic reversal, an unexpected court mandate, or a political change in direction, the program needs to have the flexibility to incorporate these “surprises” into the design and delivery of the training. The Co-Production Leadership Model we have outlined facilitates this adaptability extremely well. Agency co-instructors can make suggested change in the design of the curriculum or last minute changes in each session to incorporate the latest “surprise of day” that may require organizational changes by the top leadership to accommodate the new contextual forces at play in the external environment.

One technique we have found especially useful to accommodate this need for flexibility is a final “capstone case” at the end of the program. This case is used both as an integrative group project to further hone the leadership principles learned in the program as well as an organizationally relevant problem-solving exercise that can add additional information to the decision-making process of senior managers. These cases are generated by the agency co-instructors who team-teach with our institute faculty.

Figure 9.2 below provides a pictorial representation of the Leadership Co-Production Model we have developed, with the specific content being shaped by the needs of our clients. It is still a “work in progress”, but through testing over time and in different cultural settings, we believe it captures some of the essential elements for successfully and quickly preparing the next generation of public service leaders to meet the daunting challenges of globalization and the expectations for ever-higher levels of performance.
Figure 9.2 Leadership Co-Production Model
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Chapter X – Bringing it All Together

-Drivers of Change
-Implications for Leadership

21st Century Drivers of Change

1. Workforce changes

Public sector organizations are undergoing major issues of workforce transition and succession planning, which will continue to remain an issue for the next several years. The General Accounting Office reports that 53 percent of the middle managers in the federal workforces will qualify for retirement by 2004 (GAO April 2001). Because five out of eight public sector employees work in local government, city and county governments are particularly at risk (Ehrenhalt 1999, 19-22). These large numbers of changes in the leadership of public organizations pose obvious problems of preserving institutional memory, sustaining best practices and transferring to successors the subtleties of local knowledge that has enabled agreements to be reached and sustained over time. This is especially the case at local government levels where career administrators do the “heavy lifting” in crafting solutions to problems that work. Implied promises made to stakeholder groups, expectations of the sequencing of public service projects when funding becomes available, and similar kinds of agreements make it possible for social capital to be built and sustained over time. Without continuity of leadership this capital is in danger of being lost, or worse, unintentionally being destroyed.

In addition to the issues of succession planning resulting from high turnover rates in the middle and upper ranks of the public service, there is the additional issue of recruiting for the kind of qualities that will be increasingly needed in the future. While high levels of technical competence are assumed, they are not going to be sufficient. The flattening of public organizations, increased emphasis on “customer service” and the need to build collaborative partnerships at the lower ranks of the organization place much greater emphasis on recruiting individuals who have the capacity to make sense out of muddles, deal with ambiguity, and keep their cool in conflict-ridden settings. This has always been the case for those occupying leadership positions in the upper ranks of the public service, but these qualities are going to be needed in increasing abundances at the lower ranks as well. These qualities reside in those whom Robert Reich calls “symbolic analysts”.

Symbolic analysts solve, identify, and broker problems by manipulating symbols. They simplify reality into abstract images that can be rearranged, juggled, experimented with communicated to other specialist, and then, eventually, transformed back into reality. The manipulations are done with analytic tools, sharpened by experience. The tools may be mathematical algorithms, legal arguments, financial gimmicks, scientific principles,
psychological insights about how to persuade or amuse, systems of induction or deduction, or any other set of techniques for doing conceptual puzzles. (Reich 1992, 178)

It would be a mistake to assume that these symbolic analysts are trained in some kind of new specialty. They are the liberal arts majors who have been recruited to create and manage the computer network infrastructures of most public and private sector organizations. The bad news is that public organizations must compete for the same skill-set that the private sector increasingly finds necessary to maintain a competitive market edge. Since the skills of the symbolic analyst do not enter the world of commerce as standardize things, they “can be traded worldwide and thus must compete with foreign provider even in the American market” (Reich 1992, 175). The good news for the public sector in the globalized economy is that it is hard to contract out public service to third parties located in foreign countries, especially for citizens who expect their service to be informed by local knowledge. This may give the public sector an edge in the recruitment of symbolic analysts, but only if they are prepared to aggressively market the unique challenges and opportunities of public service work.

2. Growing ethnic diversity and aging population

In the years ahead most local communities grow in size and will be composed of an older and more diverse group of citizens. Between 1990 and 2000, nearly 33 million people were added to the national population. This was the largest 10-year increase in U.S. history. The fastest growing regions were the "sunbelt areas" of the West and the South. Projecting to the year 2015, the U.S. Census Bureau suggests that America will still remain predominantly "white" but that other groups will continue to increase disproportionately. Perhaps the most dramatic result of these changing population trends during the last few years has been that African Americans were replaced by Hispanics as the largest minority group. This change is a result of large numbers of immigrants entering the country from Latin America and high birth rates among Hispanics.

The patterns of diversity are not the same throughout America. Most ethnic and "racial" minorities are concentrated in major urban centers and in particular states. For instance, Hispanics of Mexican ancestry have their highest frequency in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. While they make up only 12.5% of the U.S. population, Hispanics now are 32.4% of California's population and 77.1% of them have a Mexican heritage. Greater Los Angeles is, in effect, the 2nd largest Mexican city--only Mexico City has a larger Mexican population. Half of all U.S. Hispanics live in California and Texas. However, the presence of people with Hispanic ancestry is now growing rapidly outside of the Southwest as well. This is particularly true in New York City, Chicago, and major farming regions such as the Yakima Valley in Washington.
In June 2003, the U.S. Census Bureau announced that the Hispanic population in the country had grown to 38.8 million people by July 2002. That is a phenomenal increase of nearly 10% in only two years (since the 2000 U.S. Census). It amounts to half of the growth in population for the entire U.S. during that period. Higher Hispanic birth rates and immigration are primarily responsible for this trend.

The impact of this diversity on local communities will vary, but the issues of “race” and “ethnicity” will remain an issue for public administrators for the foreseeable future. There are two visions that have governed the debate over the relevance of minority group identity in the United States. One vision begins with an “assimilation” normative framework, which assumes that the “melting pot model” experience of European immigrants is the preferable public policy objective. However, this model is challenged by a “multicultural” alternative, which argues that the assimilation is neither possible nor desirable for the kind and character of diversity present in many American communities. First, most European immigrants have been able to assimilate within 1-2 generations due to their similarity in physical appearance to the majority population. However, people with darker skin color have not been able to assimilate as readily or at all in some cases. This has been particularly true of African Americans and some Hispanics. As a result, assimilation now is often rejected as a goal by "minorities of color" in favor of gaining respect and acceptance as economically and politically equal but separate ethnic groups.

Second, many point out that the assimilation model works best when the size and concentration of ethnic groups is small. However, when the ethnic group is large and when it insulates its members from the dominant cultural patterns of the national society, the assimilation model does not work. This has been the case with many African American communities, Mexicans and Central Americans in East and South Los Angeles, and the Vietnamese boat people who arrived in the 1970's and settled in urban areas rather than in small towns and rural communities. In this situation, pressures to assimilate can be greatly ignored.

Those Americans who favor a society, which acknowledges the permanent existence of unassimilated or only partially assimilated ethnic/racial minorities, generally advocate multiculturalism (or pluralism). This is essentially a celebration and encouragement of continued diversity, similar to the policy introduced by Canadian Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, in 1972 to describe the acceptance of a permanently unassimilated French speaking society in Quebec Province. Today, multiculturalism in Canada is a deep-rooted policy at every level of government and has been expanded to cover all ethnic groups. For many this serves as the aspirational model for the United States in the decades ahead.

There are those like Richard Rodriguez, a leading American essayist and social commentator, who argues that the debate between the multiculturalism and melting pot models is largely irrelevant. Constant close contact between people of different ethnic/racial groups in the U.S. is progressively resulting in a blurring of the differences between them. Rodriguez suggests that Americans are melting into each other genetically and
culturally. More and more children are being born with two or more different ethnic/racial backgrounds. He refers to this as the "browning of America." However, he is not only referring to skin color, but to the development of a distinct national culture by borrowing from each other and creating a new cultural synthesis. He points to the recent experience of Hawaii and the southwestern states as examples of this homogenizing of people and their cultures into something distinctively new (Rodriguez 2003).

In addition to browning, local communities will also grey. By 2025, the baby boomers born in 1955 will be 70. Just less than 20 percent of the U.S. population will be younger than 15, slightly less than today, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The middle of the age spectrum will hollow out, and the number of those 65 and older will swell from 12.4 percent of the population to 18.2 percent. The nation in 2025 is projected to have 43 Social Security beneficiaries for every 100 workers. The “graying of America” will result in important changes in the configuration of local communities as resources in all sectors are shifted toward health care clinics, home health services, hearing aid providers, hospitals and hospital equipment stores, physical therapists and residential care facilities and more public services especially targeted to the aging population.

Future public servants will be challenged by the “graying” and “browning” of America to craft and implement policies that take into account the unique age, cultural and language needs of various subpopulation groups. This will be especially the case in the delivery of social services and public education, where scarcity of resources is already straining the capacity of public service systems to meet existing needs.

3. Permanent Fiscal Crisis with Increased Emphasis on Managing for Results.

We agree with those who argue that governments in the United States will face a fiscal crisis for the foreseeable future (Osborne & Hutchinson 2004). Part of the reasons we have summarized in Chapter 9 on local government finance. There has been a taxpayer revolt that is part of a much larger disaffection on the part of citizens with the capacity of government to meet the expectations of those it serves. This taxpayer revolt and the larger disaffection are not likely to disappear in the years ahead. The proliferation of local government jurisdictions and special districts that occurred in the closing decades of the twentieth century has further exacerbated the fiscal crisis faced by local jurisdictions. Not only are resources scarce, but also there is more competition for the taxpayer’s “willingness to pay”.

The constrained fiscal environment will result in increased pressure on professional career administrators to coordinate with other jurisdictions for tax levies, for service consolidation and for educating citizens on what they are getting for the taxes they pay. There will also be increased pressures on administrators to do more for less or continuing to provide the same levels of service while cutting expenditures. At some point, it no longer becomes possible to continue with programs that cannot be made to work with the dollars
available. Who is going to be the “chicken little” that proclaims the sky is falling? It is not likely to be the elected officials. Instead, career administrators will need to take a leadership role in working with the public and elected officials to educate the citizens on what it is possible to accomplish with the funds available.

4. Proliferation of governmental jurisdictions and overlapping structures of authority.

There has been a dramatic growth in local jurisdictions since the 1960’s (Morgan, et. al. 2008, chapter 4). The willingness to accommodate the desire of citizens to live in enclaves that protect them from the perceived adverse consequences of growth, increased taxes and undesirable diversity (socio-economic, ethnic, racial) has resulted in the creation of a complex array of local governing institutions. The pressures that have created these governing entities are not going to dissipate in the foreseeable future. In fact, we predict they will increase.

The question is not whether the array of local governing institutions will be more complex than is the case today. The more important question is what kinds of controversies will occupy the public agendas in the future. Over the last several decades local jurisdictions have for the most part been preoccupied with issues of taxes and tax bases, eminent domain annexation, infrastructure provision, land improvement, zoning, and provision of services. These issues have placed a premium on managing interjurisdictional relationships. These relationships will grow in importance as jurisdictions are forced to cooperate to manage shrinking resources, increased demands from citizens for accountability and documented results before obtaining voter approval for additional funding. Alongside these traditional issues, government officials will face increasing demands for openness in reaching decision and for accountability for results. These pressures will produce consolidations of administrative functions to increase efficiencies and to reduce the overhead functions of maintenance, information technology, purchasing and similar centralized administrative activities.

5. The growth of income inequality

The gap between the rich and the poor in the United States has been growing increasingly over the past several decades. Between 1979 and 2000 “the real income of households in the lowest fifth (the bottom 20% of earners) grew 6.4%, while that of households in the top fifth (the top 20% of earners) grew 70%, with the top 1% achieving real income gains of 184%. In contrast to this unequal pattern of growth, in the 1950’s and 1960’s real income just about doubled for each income fifth” (Mishel 2005, 2). In its recent report The State of Working America, 2004-05, the Economic Policy Institute estimated that the bottom 80 percent of American households control only about 16 percent of the nation's wealth. Meanwhile, wages, benefits, and working conditions for workers at the bottom continue to decrease (Mishel 2005, 12). The United States ranks last
among the OECD nations in terms of income equality, yet in 1993 the poorest 10% of the U.S. population was still wealthier than two-thirds of the rest of the world (Forster and Pearson 2000)

On average, one out of every three Americans in 1999 (34.2 percent) was officially classified as living in poverty at least 2 months out of the year (U.S. Census July 2003). Since 2000 the poverty rate and the number of Americans living in poverty both rose from the prior years. Since 2000, the number of poor Americans has grown by more than 4 million. The official poverty rate in 2003 was 12.5 percent, up from 12.1 percent in 2002. Total Americans below the official poverty thresholds numbered 35.9 million, a figure 1.3 million higher than the 34.6 million in poverty in 2002. (U.S. Census Bureau August 2003). The official poverty rate in 2000 (11.3%) was about the same as 1973 (11.1%) despite the fact that real capital income grew 66% over the same period (Mishell 2005, 12). Any changes in the poverty rate since 1981 are almost entirely the result of market-place forces, not the result of any changes in the tax system or transfers payments to the poor (Mishell 2005, 339-340)

While the Census figures reveal a significant number of Americans living in poverty, many experts feel that the measures used by the federal government drastically underestimate the real scale of poverty in America - primarily because the official poverty thresholds are considered "too low." The Economic Policy Institute believes a more realistic poverty threshold for a family of four would be in the area of $30,000 a year - and that a more accurate estimate of the poverty rate in America would be 30% of the total population. (Mishell 2005, 12).

There are clear implications for administrators of the growing income gap between the bottom and top of the economic spectrum. In a time of strained resources, the social service needs of the community are competing for other basic services like education, police, fire, water, prisons, etc. Even when some of these services are provided by a “cost of service” approach, the customers paying these costs do not clearly separate their tax bill from their water, sewer or other bills for a designated service. Citizens experience an undifferentiated increase in the costs of government. This places public servants in the unenviable position of finding more efficient and creative ways of meeting the expectations of the citizens they serve.

6. Confounding the Lines Between the Public, Nonprofit and Private For-profit Sectors

The United States was founded on a rule of law system that drew a fairly clear bright-line distinction between the authority of government and the freedom of individuals to pursue their own life course. Civil society and the private market economy is the product of individuals freely choosing to associate and to organize with others without undue interference from government. This principle is memorialized in the first amendment right of individuals to worship, to assemble and to be free from government regulation based on the views and
beliefs they hold. Government is free to regulate the time, place and manner of the exercise of one's liberty, but not the content. This right has been extended to businesses as well as individuals, which has made it legally difficult for government to regulate commercial speech differently than noncommercial speech or to treat the property rights of individuals differently than the property rights of corporate entities. After all, corporate entities and associations are composed of individuals whose freedom becomes meaningful through the aegis of organizations.

The popularly held view of a bright-line distinction between government and the other sectors is more myth than reality. As we have argued throughout this book, the various sectors are mutually interdependent and have become what they are largely through a codependent and mutually interactive process of development. For example, the subsidized infrastructure developed by government has made it possible for commerce to thrive. Government uses its contracting authority to enhance the private sector by forbidding public bodies from competing with the private business sector, giving preferences to minority and small businesses, or imposing other restrictions to enable the private and nonprofit sectors to prosper. But government can also use its authority in ways that undermine both the business and nonprofit sectors. It can also use its authority to obscure public accountability. These concerns have been at the center of much of the debate over the decline in legitimacy of the administrative state in the last decades of the twentieth century (See Morgan, et. al. 2008, Chapter 4, section VI), as public servants have been called upon to rethink the relationship among the sectors. The concern over what kind of “bright-line distinction to draw between the sectors is likely to grow rather than decrease in importance in the decades ahead.

The New Public Management and Reinvention of Government Movements in the last decades of the twentieth century have fundamentally and permanently altered the assumptions about the role of government in organizing and delivering public services. Most governmental entities have accepted the argument that the for-profit and nonprofit sectors can play an increasingly important role in taking over some of the services provided by the public sector or can participate in the co-production of these services. As a result, there have been dramatic increases in the reliance on third parties to provide public services (Smith and Lipsky 1993, 1-11; Salamon 1993, chapter 5).

One of the less well-known developments in recent years is the deliberate creation of hybrid organizations, what are sometimes called quasi-governmental organizations (“quagos”) and quasi-nongovernmental organizations (“quangos”). Nearly the federal government has created 300 of these in the last several decades (Moe and Kosar 2005). While these agencies carry out government supported or sponsored activities and provide money or mechanisms for funding government activities, they operate outside the legal authority of Title 5 of the U.S. Code. This means that they cannot be held accountable through the traditional tools of executive oversight such as the budget and general management laws. The
supporters of this trend argue that the goal is “to maximize performance and results”, while critics argue that these organizations contribute to a weakened “capacity of government to perform its fundamental constitutional duties, and to an erosion of political accountability” (Moe and Kosar 2005, i).

The debate over the reliance on third parties to provide governmental services has resurfaced questions at the heart of the Constitutional Convention Debates in 1787: What should be the role of government in a democratic society? How can that role be assured under a rule of law system? For the foreseeable future public administrators will participate in answering these questions at every level of American democratic government, particularly as they are called upon to use the nonprofit and private sector for the delivery of public services. In doing so, it is important to keep in mind the questions that need to be kept at the forefront of consideration.

a. How to ensure the healthy viability of nonprofit organizations. In the concluding section of Chapter 2 we reviewed the growing importance of relying on the private and nonprofit sectors for carrying out public services. Perhaps one of the most durable concerns of this development is the adverse consequences for nonprofit organizations. In order to comply with government accountability standards, nonprofits may have to fundamentally alter the structure, staffing, and operations of their activities. In the process, nonprofit organizations may lose their capacity to carry out the role we traditionally expect them to perform in civil society. Instead of being composed of passionate volunteers who devote their entire energy to the service of a single clientele group, nonprofits get transformed into co-dependent businesses operated by professionals. This co-dependency generally moves over time in one of two directions, neither of which bodes well for the autonomy of and independence of either party to the contract. On the one hand, nonprofits may begin to resemble some defense industry subcontractors who manage their business and their relationship to government as a foster child of a court supervised parent. Or, on the other hand an opposite possibility can occur where an increasing smaller number of contractees become so powerful that they effectively co-opt public agencies, thus undermining their capacity to serve as “potential sources of meaningful social and institutional change” (Box, et. al. 1999, 5).

b. How to insure deliberation over the public interest. One of the less noticed consequences of using the contracting process to deliver public services is that it removes the debate over the social service needs of the community from public view during budget deliberations and transfers it to the “Business Agenda”, a technical issue governed by the legal complexities of contracts. Critics of this approach remind us that the purpose of public deliberations is to engage the community in a debate over the multiple, competing and complex political goals of meeting the social needs of the community. This deliberative process requires balancing competing values: meeting the needs of the most vulnerable members of society (Smith and Lipsky 1993), maintaining legal accountability to both legislative and executive structures of authority, balancing the need for individual
citizen access and responsiveness with the need for collective action, and facilitating citizen-centered governance that is informed and guided by wisdom and expertise (Moe 1994; Moe and Gilmour 1995; Box, et al. 1999). Relying on the contracting process to deliver public services obscures these trade-offs and frequently may push them entirely into the background where they never get fully discussed by the community in an open form. Those served by the contracting process become an invisible part of the community, out of sight and out of mind.

c. How to maintaining public accountability. A final concern of the reliance on third parties to provide public services is the lack of public accountability. When public bodies decide to contract out for services or establish quasi-governmental bodies to perform these services, oversight is shifted away from elected deliberative bodies to contract specialists in accounting and law. This concern for accountability is especially important when the state is giving its power over to providers who administer to the needs of the most vulnerable populations: prisoners, juveniles, drug addicts, foster children and the like.

Government control and manipulation of vulnerable populations proceeds properly only when sanctioned by deliberate democratic processes and safeguards. Contracting gives away responsibility for important authoritative decisions about vulnerable people. Program monitoring and auditing are often rudimentary and inadequate for assuring program compliance and maintenance of standards. The policy system interposes courts as institutions that alone can make the most important decisions – to deprive people of their liberty or take children from their homes. But in a thousand ways service workers act at the margin to make fateful decision about people; or their reports constitute the primary evidence on which judges rely. (Smith and Lipsky 1993, 11-12).

In the years ahead, public administrators will play a decisive role in determining whether reliance on third party organizations to undertake public services is carried out in a manner that meets the multiple tests of democratic governance: responsiveness, accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, and equity (Cooper 2004).

7. The Balkanization of Public Life and the Search for Community

Public life has become increasingly fragmented through the use of special districts, the formation of gated communities, and special efforts by public servants to treat various groups within their community as customers. Under such circumstances it is difficult for residents to experience or see the work of the commons. The whole is lost as the parts of the community get treated as a “tub on their own bottom”. This concern has given rise to two movements in public administration that we believe will become increasingly important to the success of public service in the future. One is called the "social capital movement" (SCM), which emphasizes the need for administrators to identify the multiple assets of the community that can be assembled in the service of the public good. The other movement is called the “dialogical movement”, which emphasizes the importance
of public deliberation to discover and sustain a commonly shared sense of public purpose. Both movements put administrators in the role of “educating for citizenship”.

\[a. \text{The Social Capital Movement (SCM).} \] In Chapter 1 we discussed in some detail the multiple factors that have resulted in the decline of what has popularly been referred to as social capital. The term “social capital” refers to the collective pool of skills and habits of sociability that get created over time as a result of citizens working together with one another in a variety of activities, whether it be in clubs, churches, schools, neighborhood associations, political campaigns. These activities build a civic infrastructure of mutuality that has social importance that is analogous to the importance of the physical capital represented by the infrastructure of roads, sewers, water, etc. that exists within a community. Social capital makes cooperative action easier and reduces conflict. When citizens balkanize into increasingly smaller and more private communities, social capital declines along with a shared sense of communal purpose. When this occurs, critics argue that public administrators must play a key role in building social capital and in gluing the separate parts of the community together into a shared whole. Proponents of SCM draw on a very old notion in comparative politics and democratic theory, which assumes that the health of democracy depends on the health of civic institutions (Fukuyama 1995; Putnam 1993 and 1995; Symposium 1999).

The Social Capital Movement is composed of an unlikely confluence of social critics from the right and left wings of the political spectrum. Conservatives use the social capital movement to argue for less government and more reliance on the “thousand points of light” that exist within the voluntary and nonprofit sectors of local community life (Etzioni 1993 and 1995).

I have spoken of a thousand points of light, of all the community organizations that are spread like stars throughout the Nation, doing good. We will work hand in hand, encouraging, sometimes leading, sometimes being led, rewarding. We will work on this in the White House, in the Cabinet agencies. I will go to the people and the programs that are the brighter points of light, and I will ask every member of my government to become involved. The old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in. (President George Bush, \textit{Inaugural Address}, January 20, 1989)

The left end of the SCM spectrum argues that professional career administrators have a major role to play in local institution building. In fact, some believe that the primary role of career administrators is to use their discretionary authority to assist local communities in identifying, assembling and using their institutional civic assets for community development purposes (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993; Symposium 1999).

Whether one falls at the strong or weak end of the government interventionist spectrum, SCM has three important implications for the role of public administrators in shaping the public interest. First, it has refocused
attention away from individual citizen participation to the symbiotic consequences of institutional activities within the community. Second, it has broadened the notion of citizenship so that it includes almost any activity that affects the well-being of the community. Finally, it has deepened the meaning of citizenship so that it includes more than just the knowledge and skills to make the formal institutions of government work. It also includes the knowledge and skills necessary to make communities work. Taken together, these consequences of SCM require administrators and citizens together to refocus attention on the larger democratic ends that local institutions serve. When viewed in this way, the role of public administrators is redirected back to its Athenian roots where collective governance is hardly distinguishable from the task of living together as a whole (Morgan and Vizzini 1999, 51-9).

b. The Postmodern Challenge to Public Administration: The Discourse Movement. – Another impetus to the community-building role has been provided by what has come to be called the "discourse movement" in public administration. This movement draws its intellectual raison d’être from the work of postmodern public administration theorists (Fox and Miller 1994; Farmer 1995; McSwite 1997 and 1998). Using the assumptions and tools of continental critical theorists and phenomenologists, members of the discourse movement deny the possibility and legitimacy of using the "public interest," “the constitutional legacy,” or any other normative framework as a meaningful category of initial analysis. This claim is based on a combination of the following assumptions.

- Human beings acquire meaning only through direct experience in the world.
- To the extent that direct experience is mediated by universalisms, canonical metanarratives, institutional and natural law-like symbols, at best individual liberty/freedom is impaired both in terms of understanding and action. At worst, individuals are oppressed through the use of these "trumping categories" (Fox and Miller 1994; McSwite 1998).
- Language is the only accessible and legitimate medium for creating shared experience, understanding, and action.

Perhaps the most important consequence of these assumptions for administrative practice is that the public interest has to be socially constructed through a dialogical process that is open and free from all forms of oppressive constraints. To start a dialogue with any assumptions about what the "public good" means undermines the only source of legitimacy, namely, agreement through open discourse. The goal is to create a dialogue “in which we all talk, and we all listen, and we all get to be in on coming up with what we do next” (McSwite 1997, ix). To make this happen requires some basic rules of dialogue that include the following kinds of simple "warrants for discourse": people must speak sincerely and authentically; they
must address what is relevant to the current focus of the discussion; they must be attentive and feel no sense of coercion; they must be willing and able to make a substantive contribution to the dialogue (Fox and Miller 1994, 10).

Some advocates of the discourse movement are trained political scientists who are primarily interested in the policy consequences of their position. Others are trained psychologists who are more interested in the interpersonal consequences of dialogue for building agreement at the small group and organizational level (Compare McSwite 1997; Fox and Miller 1994; King and Stivers 1998). Both groups place a high value on membership in communities of shared meaning. Both groups concede an important role for administrators in initiating, facilitating and maintaining the rules of proper civic dialogue. But by comparison to "stewardship theorists,” discourse theorists concede a more limited role for administrators in creating and maintaining a community of shared meaning.

8. The increasing reliance on technology.
The rapid growth of the information age has contradictory consequences for the work of government. On the one hand, it arms everyone with access to information they never had before. The opportunity exists for individuals both inside and outside government to be more knowledgeable than they have been in the past and to share this information more widely with one another. But more information does not mean more knowledge and better-informed decision-making. The abundance of information creates information over-load and poses increased challenges for sorting and ordering the array of information in ways that create relevance and meaning for the common work of the community.

More information that is widely available can also exacerbate the problems of deliberation over the common good in other ways. As groups organize around ever-narrower agendas and mobilize support to make their interests a reality, it can make the work of creating a working community consensus more difficult to develop and sustain. The challenge is to use the technology in ways that enhance the possibility of creating a shared sense of community rather than having it used to further divide the community into ever-narrower interests. From a Madisonian viewpoint that favors a multiplicity of interests, one might argue that the proliferation of information-centered technology further ameliorates the adverse effects of faction. As more and more groups organize around ever-narrower interests the dangers of tyranny of the majority grow less. But the Madisonian vision of interest group pluralism also assumed that the work of government itself would require the “regulation of these various and interfering interests”, which Madison argued, “forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of part and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of government…. It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests and render them all subservient to the common good” (Federalist Papers, no. 51, 79). An important, if not necessary
ingredient to making the regulation of the clash of interests work is “to refine and enlarge the public views by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of the county and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations” (Federalist Papers, no. 51, 82).

**Framing the Future: Preserving the Continuities in Conflict**

What does the future hold for public service in the face of the drivers we have identified in the previous section? We cannot know an answer to this question with any degree of certainty. But using the “continuities in conflict” that are deeply imbedded in the role responsibility of public servants, we can with confidence identify some of the major elements that will necessarily comprise the reconstitution of public service in the decades ahead. From these elements we can forecast the emergence of some likely scenarios that can serve as a planning guide for the future.

Scenario thinking is an increasingly popular technique that is designed to assist strategic decision makers “see around the corner”. This “seeing” relies on the identification of “key drivers” at work in a given setting. The process begins with the collection of data and the evaluation of the impact of long-term trends on the given work of the strategic decision makers. Scenario thinking assumes that once the key drivers have been identified and assessed, it is possible to sketch the outlines of some logically unfolding scenarios that are inherent in the constellation of contending forces at play in the external environment. We will use this process to identify some key scenarios that we believe public administrators of the future will be responsible for reconciling.

1. **Place-based versus Interest-based Communities**

Governance in the United States has always been simultaneously pulled in two opposite directions. The Jeffersonian and New England town hall models of “place-based” governance continues to be a powerful galvanizing influence on the hearts and minds of the citizenry. This model stands alongside the Madisonian world of interest-group liberalism and its modern extreme, single issue politics, where communities of common interest come together to advance mutually common goals that span time and space. It is difficult for these two models to be successfully reconciled, as we argued in Chapter 3 (see figure 3.1).
The place-based model is part of the civic republic tradition, which measures the legitimacy of government work by the extent to which each individual in the community is willing and able to sit at a metaphorical public table and to deliberate with others about what constitutes the public interest for the space they all inhabit in common. This is face-to-face democracy, which requires a higher level of skills, knowledge and inclination for public engagement than is possible under many circumstances and is deemed necessary by many citizens.

The one-on-one model of “place-based” governance stands in contrast with the procedural republic tradition, which measures the legitimacy of government by the extent to which interest groups, associations, and the formal processes of government are able to reflect the interests of the citizenry and by the extent to which the citizenry at large accepts the results of these efforts as legitimate. The “interest based” model of governance is far less demanding. It is enough that citizens vote, care enough to pay attention to general, but not specific issues, are tolerant of diverse differences of opinion, and defend the principles of procedural fairness. The burden of democratic governance in the procedural republic model is born by formal institutions and knowledgeable, interested and self-appointed citizen experts citizens rather than by the citizenry at large.

One of the consequences of these two traditions of civic engagement is that it gives rise to a wide range of motivations and purposes for participating in public affairs. It is important for career administrators to understand these motivations and purposes, especially as they seek to develop and implement various kinds of public programs that depend on citizen support. We have attempted to capture these polar dimensions in figure 15.1, where the Y axis represents the primary source of identification of citizens. The problem for public servants is that the two poles of this citizen engagement axis do not represent “either/or” choices but “and/and” choices. As citizens we judge the legitimacy of government activities by both sets of criteria, depending on a given issue and set of services. For example, if there is a proposed zoning change in our neighborhood, we are galvanized around issues of place. But if the same planning commission decides to change the zoning mix for the city as a whole, our focus may shift away from our focus on place to the comparative weight that should be attached to “commercial” v. “residential” interests. We may even find ourselves lining up on the side of commercial interests at one level and realigning ourselves again with a place-based focus when a specific zoning change is proposed in our neighborhood.

2. Face-Based v. On-Line Governance

I addition to our orientation as citizens, we also bring a set of “service delivery” set of expectations to the work of government. These expectations are less about our sense of citizenship and more about our
personal expectations of getting what we want in the most efficient and effective manner possible. It includes all of those activities having to do with receiving information, regulating, paying and receiving, registering, participation in policy formulation and citizen input. You may recall in Chapter 4 that Alexander Hamilton argued that the government, which administered its work in the most efficient fashion possible, would become the government that would have the highest level of confidence and legitimacy in the eyes of the citizens. But what counts for efficient delivery of service from the standpoint of the citizens?

There are two different sets of service expectations on the part of citizens. At one end of the spectrum are the face-to-face experiences, what we might call in-line, over the counter, Monday through Friday, 8-5. This approach captures much of the human experience, which is often direct and personal. But this is not the case for every service and for every citizen. Some would like to do their interactions with government the way they do their shopping on-line with Amazon.com, Lands End, Eddie Bower, etc. “Avoid the hassle and get what you want “just in time” by avoiding face-to-face encounters that take up more time than is needed to get the job done. The two ends of the service mode spectrum are represented by the X-axis in Figure 15.1.

The problem for public servants is that the two poles of this service mode axis, like the two poles of the citizen engagement axis, do not represent “either/or” choices but “and/and” choices. As citizens we judge the legitimacy of government activities by both face-to-face service delivery as well as by the efficiency of undertaking our transactions using the state of the art technology. And like civic engagement our preference for these service delivery modes varies depending on a given issue or set of services. For example, some of may prefer using on-line monthly deductions from our checking account to pay our monthly water bill, until we run into a problem that we want solved now, face-to-face. Others may never prefer this mode of service transaction and want to pay our bills in person at the counter. The challenge of public service in the future is to accommodate these “and/and” options.

3. Four Scenarios

From these two dimensions of service delivery and citizen engagement expectations, we have constructed four future government scenarios: City Hall, Civic Engagement, Electronic Government, and Information Portal. We present these as simultaneously functioning models that are necessary to secure the legitimacy of government work in the future.

City Hall. The metaphor of City Hall conjures up the classic image of a place where citizens can go to get answers to their questions and solutions to their problems. It is a place that validates their membership in a community that values face-to-face communication. It is a location that is viewed by everyone as the center
where the final political authority of the community is lodged and where it is always exercised in a sympathetic fashion to meet the needs of the citizens it serves. City Hall represents the attachment of citizens to the place they inhabit and the desire to “do what is right” by this place through face-to-face interaction. This scenario does not mean the City Hall of New England democracy or the City Hall of small town American in the 1950’s. This nostalgia-centered view would misrepresent the aspirational goals of those who are advocates of the City Hall scenario in the 21st century. The contemporary vision of City Hall may be a decentralized version in the form of a neighborhood office or a “one-stop-shopping” service permit or general service center. There may be more than one city hall that serves as a point of regular contact in the community with citizens who wish face-to-face interaction with public servants who are expected to address their needs and concerns.

**Civic Engagement.** The Civic Engagement Scenario represents all of those models of governance that seek to deliberately construct a shared sense of public purposes through some combination of dialogue, cooperative civic action or community envisioning processes. Because of the “porous nature” of community challenges (clean water and air, education, homeland security, crime) and the inability in many cases to act alone, governments will increasingly look outward to enlist partners and to participate in coalitions, cooperatives, consortia, and collaborative arrangements with other governments, not-for-profits, and the commercial sector. Policy and services under this scenario get done through institutional networks of “super communities”, which leverage resources, pool assets, and simply increase the efficiencies of interaction across multiple organizational boundaries in the public, private and nonprofit sectors. But these arrangements pose interesting challenges of accountability, authority, control and coordination. For example, in pooling public, private and nonprofit sector dollars to treat the mentally ill, who has accountability for performance of the expenditure of funds and the performance of work? What kind of authority do the participating partners have in deciding who gets what, when and how? Finally, the fluidity of collaborative arrangements also creates challenges of control and coordination.

**Electronic Government** - Electronic government (E-Gov) has emerged as an increasingly common practice throughout the world. For example, the World Bank is using E-Gov as a major part of its strategy to assist developing countries in making more rapid progress toward economic and political reform (http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/egov/). E-Government refers to the use by government agencies of information technologies (such as Wide Area Networks, the Internet, and mobile computing) that have the ability to transform relations with citizens, businesses, and other arms of government. These technologies can serve a variety of different ends: better delivery of government services to citizens, improved interactions with business and industry, citizen empowerment through access to information, or more efficient government management. The resulting benefits can be less corruption, increased transparency, greater convenience, revenue growth, and/or cost reductions. Traditionally, the interaction between a citizen or business and a
government agency took place in a government office. With emerging information and communication
technologies it is possible to locate service centers closer to the clients. Such centers may consist of an
unattended kiosk in the government agency, a service kiosk located close to the client, or the use of a personal
computer in the home or office.

The increased use of E-Gov is largely in response to the same factors that have caused business and
commerce to invest heavily in electronic access to information: efficient transmission of information to a larger
number of people, greater choice in accommodating client needs, quicker responsiveness, reduction of
paperwork, and better coordination of activities across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries. The July
2003 survey by the Pew Internet & American Life Project shows that 97 million adult Americans, or 77% of
Internet users, took advantage of e-gov in 2003, whether that meant going to government Web sites or emailing
government officials. This represented a growth of 50% from 2002. At the same time, citizens who contact
government said they are more likely to turn to traditional means - either the telephone or in-person visits -
rather than the Web or email to deal with government. Of the 54% of Americans who contacted government in
2003, the telephone or in-person visits were preferred to the Web or email by a 53% to 37% (Horrigon 2004). This
ersuggests that for the foreseeable future electronic technology cannot be used by government as a substitute
for face-to-face and other forms of more personal interaction.

Perhaps the greatest impact of E-Gov will be on the management structure and process of public
organizations. Electronic information will be increasingly used for the strategic management of human capital,
budget and performance integration, competitive sourcing, improved financial management and performance
evaluation. The dual values of responsiveness and efficiency will provide the justification for increased reliance
on technology to deliver government service, communicate with citizens, improve management processes and
perhaps alter the governance relationship with citizens.

Information Portal.

Most by now are familiar with Internet portals. They started to become popular in the late 1990’s in the
business world as software companies created points of entry (or gateways) to a wide variety of information on
the Internet. Examples include MyYahoo (Yahoo), NetCenter (Netscape), MSN (Microsoft) and AOL. Portals
can serve a variety of functions. Some can be information portals, which connect people to a common point
source of shared information. Others can be people-centered and connect individuals with one another based on
the basis of abilities, expertise, and interests. Finally, information and people-centered portals can be combined
to deliver personalized content based on what each user is actually doing. A familiar example of a portal is the
desktop function on each of our computers. The “Desktop” links us instantly to all of the information we need,
to everyone with whom we need to communicate, and to all of the process functions necessary to make the most
of what and whom we know in order to get our work done in the most efficient and effective manner possible.
What does this model of interaction look like when applied to government?

The most popular non-electronic versions of government portals are the “Blue Pages” found in most
local telephone books. These pages organize the services where one lives around logical clusters. The
electronic version allows government to go beyond simply organizing services around a variety of logical
clusters that are tailored to the specific geographic area or neighborhood where one lives, but it also offers the
opportunity to co-locate these services, providing access via a variety of networked devices. This electronic
version of a portal can be recreated physically by locating “Portal Kiosks” in libraries, popular businesses, and
government buildings. The portal model reflects the desire of citizens to have their cake and eat it too. It
provides them with access to information that is tailored to their place and their personal needs, but does so in a
manner that is more efficient than face-to-face interaction.

There are at least two major challenges for public servants as they look toward better ways of
legitimating the work of government through a combination of the four bureaucratic governance models we
have introduced above. First, administrators will be expected to provide citizens with all four choices of using
city hall, a portal, electronic governance and civic engagement, rather than simply substituting one for the other.
The larger challenge is to make use of these newly emerging possibilities in ways that enhance citizenship
rather than simply increase customer satisfaction. Citizenship involves the creation of greater understanding of
ones role in governance and a willingness to act on that understanding. This includes creating a heightened
sense of civic obligation, generating more ownership in the collective decisions that are made, engaging citizens
in the problematic of democratic governance, and developing an appreciation for the “tradeoffs” that are
inherent in the ongoing process of making democracy work. These are the more enduring challenges, but they
are the ones that have existed since the founding of the democratic republic in 1787.

Transforming Scenarios Into Legacies: Making Democracy Work

We end this book on the theme with which we began: career public servants make democracy work. They
occupy unique positions that enable them to maintain continuity over time and to provide the institutional
support necessary for making democracy meaningful in the daily lives of citizens. Public administration is the
only governing institution that focuses primarily on the future with an eye to both the present and the past (see
figure 3:4 in chapter 3). With this unique position comes a special moral obligation to connect the future with
the present in ways that preserve the integrity of America’s unique rule of law system. This system requires
balancing competing values, which is a daunting task. This is especially the case at a time when the forces of
economic, social, technological and political change obscure a clear sense of the future, blur the boundaries of
responsibility among the sectors and constrain the possibilities for successful action. Under such circumstances
public service requires individuals who have the patience of Job, the perseverance of Sisyphus, the strength of Atlas and the courage of Richard the Lionhearted. But there are few positions of responsibility where great work can be done in the service of the community, as the following story of the Vision Action Network illustrates. This case was more than 15 years in the making. It started as a dream that was memorialized in writing as a final project for a masters degree in public administration. The authors carried the dream, gradually transforming it into a reality as they guided the work of a local jurisdiction as senior administrators.

Doing “What is Right” for Juan Gomez

Juan Gomez is a 14 year-old boy who has lived in Lewis and Clark County his whole life. He comes from a single-parent home with a mother who has a history of alcohol abuse and of choosing abusive partners. His father returned to El Salvador when Juan was very young. Mother’s current boyfriend is physically abusive to Juan, his siblings, and the mother. The mother has extensive local family members who have been concerned about Juan’s situation and expressed this concern to all who will listen, including: social service workers, school officials, those who run the local housing authority where the family lives, members of their Catholic parish, the local Virginia Garcia Health Clinic, and a local shelter for run-away teens. Despite the family's best efforts, Mother says Juan will no longer submit to parental authority without the threat of physical punishment from her boyfriend.

While English is Juan's second language, he has always done well in school. But at the age of 13 Juan's grades began to decline and he started developing gang associations. He acknowledges being a member of the “Barrio Riders” and displays numerous gang tattoos. On several occasions, Juan has not returned home in the evening and has been reported to the police as a run-away on several occasions. Each time, the police have found Juan and taken him to a shelter operated by a local church, where he has remained temporarily until he is returned to the custody of his mother.

Juan was diagnosed in 1998 as diabetic and has been treated at the local nonprofit Virginia Garcia Clinic and twice at the Emergency Room of two of the local hospitals. Since Juan and his family do not have health care, systematic treatment of Juan’s condition has been problematic, especially since it has been unclear what Juan’s status is under the state-sponsored Health Plan.

On April 20, 1999, Juan encountered a boy at school (Javier) who was affiliated with a rival gang and who has been seen with Juan's girlfriend. Juan confronted Javier in the school bathroom. A fight ensued, but no weapons were used. Subsequent reports indicate that Juan threw Javier against the wall, punched and kicked him. Juan then fled the scene, stealing Javier's backpack and pager. Javier suffered abrasions and a badly swollen face. Juan was arrested soon thereafter at a shopping mall. He was taken to the local police station,
booked, given a cursory physical examination in his response to complaints of dizziness. At the time he told officials of his diabetic condition and that he had run out of insulin.

Juan was charged with several counts, including Robbery III (class C felony), Assault IV (class A misdemeanor), Possession of a Controlled Substance II (class C felony) and Carrying a Concealed Weapon (CCW, class B misdemeanor). The drug and CCW charges resulted from the police finding a small amount of marijuana and a 7” hunting knife in Juan’s backpack.

During the arrest, Juan was hostile and uncooperative with the police, and made threats to “kick Javier’s ass” if he cooperated with the prosecution. By the time Juan had reached the detention facility, he had calmed down and indicated to the police that he wanted to go home. Juan has had limited prior juvenile court contact and has neither been on probation nor has any delinquency court appearances. He has had no prior expulsions from school. At the time of this incident, he had a Theft II (shoplift) and Assault IV pending (both class A misdemeanors), and is in warrant status for being unable to locate. The warrant indicated that the Judicial Officer did not oppose release. This is Juan’s first warrant and he and mother both advise that they had recently moved and had no idea that the warrant had been issued. But Juan is facing expulsion from school over this incident.

How can the family, the school, the juvenile justice system, nonprofit social service agencies, churches and local public officials work together to determine “what is right” for individuals like Juan Gomez? More importantly, what can be done before the fact to prevent the escalation of adverse circumstance to the point that no one is able to do anything that really matters? Whose responsibility is it to glue together the pieces of the fragmented systems described above into a more integrated and community-centered social service system? What is the role of elected officials, local businesses, nonprofit service organizations, churches, schools and career public officials who have stewardship responsibilities for the agencies and the communities they serve?

Thanks to the VisionAction Project described in this case study, the citizens of Lewis and Clark County are luckier than most other communities in the United States. The parties necessary to “do what is right” for the Juan Gomez’s within our midst have a mechanism for mutual collaboration and decision-making. Juan and his family have access to a variety of better-coordinated programs to assist them in dealing with the complex interplay of schools, families, businesses, churches, and community social service agencies. This reversal of fortune not only provides better service to Juan and his family, but it enables the taxpayers of the county to leverage their tax dollars to achieve far greater results for their fellow-citizens than has ever been the case in the past. This case study tells the story of how this collaborative process came into existence and is being transformed into a permanent institutionalized process of a local system of democratic governance.
Appendix A: Leadership Case Challenges

Case Study I: The VisionAction Project

VisionAction is a Lewis and Clark County community collaboration process involving businesses, churches, nonprofit service providers, and a very broad range of government agencies. The goal of the collaboration is to organize and distribute all of the resources of the community on some commonly targeted objectives. In observing the changing demographic trends of the community, the County Administrator and his staff saw some ominous signs of trouble on the horizon. Lewis and Clark County has had a long-standing reputation for being one of the fastest growing regions of the state, offering its citizens excellent levels of service at modest levels of tax increases. As the home of the state’s high tech industry, the citizens of the county have enjoyed the benefits of good jobs and high levels of service. The community has traditionally been viewed as a relatively homogeneous community of middle class and professional working people who use the county as a bedroom community to commute to work elsewhere and increasingly to high tech industries located within the county.

But long-term trends indicated some disturbing signs. There were the obvious problems that come with the kind of steady growth that the county has experienced: traffic congestion, school crowding, concerns about the environment and open space, and a serious shortage of affordable housing. But other, less visible issues threaten the common quality of life: mental illness, homelessness, hunger, lack of living alternatives for seniors and the disabled and access to affordable health care. The relative affluence of the county obscured the fact that one in fifteen county residents (and nearly one in ten children) live below the poverty line. In fact, the state was determined by a U.S. Department of Agriculture study in the 1990’s to have the highest rate of hunger in the nation. Particularly as the recession of the 90’s fueled layoffs across the economy, many new people found themselves looking for assistance. They faced an uncoordinated network of public and community-based organizations to provide a safety net for themselves and their families. But despite the exceptional work done by those in the faith community, nonprofits, and government agencies, gaps in the community safety net persisted. People eking out a living on fixed income or very low wages, those whose lives have been disrupted by domestic violence, catastrophic medical problems, or just bad luck are at the mercy of a helping network that is chronically under-funded, only very loosely coordinated and too often unnoticed.

All of these issues had two things in common: they were certain to become increasingly challenging for the citizens of Lewis and Clark County in the next twenty years, and no single institution would be able to handle any of these emerging issues on its own. In 2000, the administrative leaders of Lewis and Clark County set in motion a series of conversations about what makes the county a great place to live, work, and do business, and what it will take to make certain the county has the capacity to sustain and enhance its ability to meet the
emerging challenges. The community took up the challenge, and made VisionAction successful as an inclusive, relationship building and problem-solving effort built on the belief that the community can more efficiently and creatively address its common issues by pooling its expertise, resources and energy. Several things are remarkable about this community-building effort, including the large number of stakeholders who participated, the creation of a new nonprofit organization to institutionalize the process and the involvement of the faith community.

a. Widespread Support from Ordinary Citizens and a Complex Array of Formal Stakeholders. The community dialogue involved more than 2000 citizens and organizations representing all walks of life. This initial process was transformed into a formal community-envisioning plan, where multiple stakeholders worked together to identify common issues and produce a set of white papers with specific recommendations to ameliorate the problems identified.

b. Creation of New Nonprofit Organization to Sustain the Planning Effort into the Future. To carry the results of the VisionAction Project forward into the future, the leaders of Washington County recognized the need to form a freestanding nonprofit organization. The county administrative staff and elected officials took the lead to provide the seed money and organizational support necessary to make this happen. In March 2001, Lewis and Clark County created the Vision Action Network, a new 501(c)(3), the purpose of which is to coordinate activities among the public, private and nonprofit sectors in ways that maximally serve the needs of county residents.

c. Creation of an Inter-Religious Action Network. The county administrative staff took the initiative to organize the dozens of churches and religious groups within the county. For the first time in the history of the faith community, they all met under the aegis of the county’s organizational efforts to discuss ways in which they could mobilize their resources to better meet the social needs of county residents. It is unusual for government officials to bring the faith community together. It is even more unusual that these efforts resulted in the formation of a separate organization, operating under the umbrella of the Vision Action Network.

1. Obstacles to Success

The changes outlined above in the provision of community services is a remarkable achievement, especially when considered in the light of the amount of change that occurred over a relatively short period of time. It is even more remarkable when viewed in the light of the multiple obstacles this reform faced, each one of which was sufficient to stop the initiative dead in its tracks!

a. Complex Array of Stakeholders Operating Under Separate and Independent Sources of Authority. Consider for a moment the difficulty of attempting to bring together more than 2000 participants, including churches,
nonprofit organizations, the business community, agency directors, and elected officials. Many of these stakeholders were beholden to entirely different constituency groups and, consequently, measured their success by different criteria. For example, the pastor of a congregation has a different kind of accountability than a social service worker, or an elected official.

b. Creating and Using Data for Objective-based Decision Making. Participants in the process were being asked to create a vision for the future, based on data that did not correspond to their current experience. For example, it was hard for many to believe that beneath the patina of economic prosperity, there was a large and growing core of residents who were poor and in need of a wide variety of social services not currently available.

c. Using Community Envisioning Process To Create Community Priorities. Community envisioning processes can produce a working consensus where none had existed before. But they can just as easily produce lots of trouble, especially for elected officials. For example, these processes can generate unanticipated conflict that can make the life of elected officials even more difficult than is normally the case in an era of scarce resources. Equally problematic is the likelihood that the process will produce a list of needs and a much better organized array of constituency groups who will become advocates for an ever-larger share of the jurisdiction’s budget. How was it possible in the short time span of one year to generate and sustain the support of the elected officials, while successfully mobilizing the residents to fundamentally alter their thinking and approach to the delivery of social services? The following pages provide a summary of the key steps that produced a working consensus in the community, which made it difficult for elected officials to resist.

2. Early Beginnings: Creating a Vision

Much is made today of the importance of having a compelling vision as a necessary first step in galvanizing large-scale support for a plan of action. Strategic plans seldom generate the passion necessary to move multitudes to common action. Instead, the road to collective passion is paved one brick at a time. It seldom is the result of an epiphany, but emerges from the accumulation of information that increases the significance of an issues to an enlarging body of supporters.

a. Step One: Transforming Problems into Issues Through the Use of Data. For more than ten years the County Administrator and his Senior Deputy had been thinking about how best to harness the array of social service resources within the County to better meet the needs of residents. As students in an Executive MPA Program, they had written their final Masters Degree Capstone paper on how this might be done. Their thinking was inspired by an article by Charles Levine who emphasized the important and growing role of career administrators in generating civic capacity through processes of co-production, processes that linked the public,
private, and nonprofit sectors to increase the impact beyond what is possible with any one service provider (Levine 1984). But where, how and when do you give this kind of idea some legs?

The administrative leaders of the county began in small ways by encouraging collaboration among nonprofit social service providers within the county and rewarded them through the budget process when this cooperation and collaboration occurred. But these small steps were unlikely to achieve the kind of fundamental transformation needed to deal with the growing demographic trends on the horizon. How do you get the attention of local citizens who are mainly concerned about protecting their life-style from the adverse impacts of growth and who are quite oblivious to the needs of those less fortunate? Equally important, how do you make the citizens aware of the demographic changes within their community and the need to anticipate dealing with the consequences of these changes now rather than later?

One answer to these questions is that you do what good administrators are expected to do. You collect the data and make citizens and elected officials aware of the changes that are occurring within their midst. The administrative staff gathered lots of data and made it easily available to everyone on the VisionAction website. This data surfaced some impressive changes that were occurring, the kinds of changes that no one could really ignore.

Over the 25-year period from 1970-1995, the population of Lewis and Clark County more than doubled, creating large pressures on roads, sewers and other infrastructure services. This growth is expected to continue into the foreseeable future. The percentage of people over 55 was expected to grow from approximately 16% in 1990 to 26% of the total in 2020. During the same period, the percentage of younger adults (20 - 54) was expected to decrease from 54% to 46% of the total population. The relative percentage of Hispanic residents increased significantly during the last decade, from 4.6 to 11.2% of total population in 2000. One in fifteen county residents (and nearly one in ten children) lived below the poverty line.

b. Step Two: Transforming Issues into Public Policy Goals that are Supported by Elected Officials. Issues cannot be transformed into policy goals until the elected officials are willing to entertain discussions about possible new futures that may well differ from the vision they currently are using as the basis for their decision-making. One of the first steps the administrative staff took in the process after some exploratory discussion was to make certain the elected officials were willing to support the community envisioning effort and were fully briefed on the political and resource implications that such an effort would require. Even with the best estimate of the timing and outcome of the process, there are obviously large amounts of uncertainty that no amount of planning can anticipate.
c. Step Three: Getting the Support of Community Opinion Leaders. Once the elected officials had given their approval to proceed, the County administrative staff contacted key opinion leaders within the community to obtain their support and participation in a community-wide dialogue.

d. Step Four: Identification of Key Issues. An initial round of community wide discussions were undertaken to identify the key issues of concern to citizens. The following list of issues were identified and served as the template for the rest of the community envisioning process.

- Aging & Disabilities
- Basic Needs
- Behavioral Health
- Children & Families
- Education
- Environment
- Housing
- Primary Health Care

e. Step Five: From Issue Teams to Policy Papers. Most community envisioning processes end with the identification of key issues of concern to the citizens. But since the purpose of this process was to create community-wide ownership and to identify resources that could be leveraged from the private, public and nonprofit sectors, the county staff emphasized the importance of creating problem-solving teams organized around each set of issues. These teams held meetings to develop an in-depth survey of the outstanding challenges and most promising opportunities in their respective areas of responsibility. Each Team was charged with the responsibility of producing an Issue Paper that included the following: an Overview of the trends and conditions pertaining to that issue, specific Issues & Strategies identified by the Issue Team, and a short list of Key Recommendations that participants felt were significant initiatives that could be implemented in the next couple of years. These issue papers were made electronically accessible to all of the citizens and organizations within Lewis and Clark County. The goal was to have the Issue Papers serve as a starting-point for everyone in the county grappling with these issues, and to use the papers to inform a variety of public, private and nonprofit plans and initiatives.

3. CREATING SUPPORT BY WIDENING THE CIRCLE

Early on the Lewis and Clark County staff knew that it was important to involve the faith communities in the countywide envisioning process. The churches provide an untold amount of both formal and informal social services to the citizens of the county. They have the loyalty and confidence of the citizens. And they provide connective linkages to the citizenry that are not available through other organizational activities undertaken by the county, businesses or nonprofit service providers.
But how was this support and network of trust among religious organizations to be enlisted in the service of the larger needs of the county? The county staff decided to use the same model they had followed in their other outreach efforts: contact the key opinion leaders of the faith community who are most likely to be supportive of the county efforts; build relationships of personal trust; and then call a more formal meeting to set forth the agenda and ask for the participation of faith-based organizations. This simple model produced surprising results. Not only did the faith community respond with great enthusiasm, but also members expressed both surprise and gratitude that county officials would expend the effort to do what they had never done on their own! For the first time in the history of Lewis and Clark County, the church leaders began meeting to discuss how they could contribute to the community-building efforts being undertaken by the county leaders. What kind of social services were they each providing? What were the groups who were falling through the cracks? How might they pool and coordinate their efforts? These are the kinds of questions that were generated by the meetings.

The experience of working together for the first time was so productive and exhilarating that a core group of faith leaders decided to form the Inter-Religious Action Network, which would operate under the umbrella of the larger Vision Action Network. This new organization is a collection of Christian, Jewish, Muslim and other faith traditions, brought together to achieve the following goals:

- Provide a forum for ongoing relationship building, information sharing, inter-religious dialogue and community problem solving.
- Develop sustainable relationships with other community leaders and participate in efforts to identify, discuss and mobilize around concerns of mutual interest.
- Provide a network of faith leaders that can be accessed easily and efficiently.
- Create settings where new and innovative expressions of community leadership by faith based organizations or individuals may be freely offered.
- Provide opportunities for group information sharing, programs and other activities.
- Assist in securing funding and/or other resources in support of the collaborative agenda.

4. TRANSFORMING VISIONS INTO REALITY: ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Significant changes cannot occur without the efforts and enthusiasm of individual people. However, if the changes are to be truly effective, they must outlast individual participants. A major goal of VisionAction was to create an environment that would sustain change and immortalize those changes in the form of new policies.
Early on county administrative recognized the need for a vehicle distinct from a governmental body to carry on the work of VisionAction – a forum for the community to talk across jurisdictions, across sectors, and across issues, to discuss, strategize and mobilize around community priorities. A resonating theme from most of the nearly 2,000 county residents and institutions that participated in VisionAction was that collaborative planning and mobilization should not be a one-time event. Instead, it should be part of a new, on-going way of doing business in Lewis and Clark County. In March 2001, a freestanding nonprofit organization, called the Vision Action Network, was incorporated to be the ongoing focus of the energy and commitment generated by VisionAction. Those behind the incorporation effort expected that the Network would become the forum for multiple institutions and organizations to contemplate future trends and opportunities; build on, and expand existing relationships and collaborations; and develop plans to respond to challenges as a broad community of interests and as interconnected and informed mission-driven organizations. The Vision Action Network is simultaneously a gathering place, network, support-group, incubator, information sharer, community organizer and broker. The specific goals of the Network include the following:

- Provide a forum for ongoing relationship building, information sharing, community dialogue and problem solving.
- Serve as a clearinghouse for accurate and timely information.
- Establish linkages between individuals, organizations and sectors and provide information to planning and implementation efforts.
- Develop collaborative action plans that seek to coordinate efforts and mobilize action towards community-based strategies and interventions.
- Increase awareness of the Vision Action Network to accomplish mission and goals.

The Network’s Board of Directors represents all sectors of the community: small and large businesses, K-12 and higher education, local governments, social service not-for-profits, religious institutions, and health care. Funding for the organization comes from partners in each of the sectors. The Network hired its first Executive Director in Spring 2002. The Vision Action Network established a small number of broad Community Councils to engage the recommendations of the Issue Papers in depth and work on implementation of the most promising strategies.

**Exercising Administrative Leadership in the Service of a Democratic Legacy**

This case raises a variety of issues and questions that have been at the center of public service since the framing of the American constitutional system of governance in 1787. What is the proper role of administrative
leadership in the community and how can this role be successfully carried out in partnership with elected officials and the citizens of the community?

Administrative leadership in its most encompassing and enduring form, as we have argued in Chapters 11 and 12, requires one to think strategically in terms of creating a commonly shared vision, building support for that vision and transforming the vision into institutional forms that can endure after the individual agents of change have left the scene. The Lewis and Clark VisionAction Project used the model in Figure 14:2. This model begins by assessing where the future is taking the community. It involves “seeing around the corner”. This “seeing” relies

1. Collaboration
2. Policy Consensus on Authorized Purposes
3. Capacity Building

heavily on the collection of data and the evaluation of long-term trends. It also relies heavily on an evaluation of the implications of these trends for the long-term vitality of the community. The assessment stage is followed by “reading the situation for action” or sizing up the logic of circumstances that is inherent in the constellation of contending forces at play in the community. What is it possible to do now, next, later? Every situation has a logic of possibilities, just as a constellation of gathering clouds on the horizon. Being able to decipher this logic is partly science and mostly art that is informed by local knowledge of stakeholders, circumstances, organizational capacity and political will.

Once a course of action is undertaken, managing it successfully over time becomes a major challenge. There are managerial, budgetary and political tradeoffs that have to be balanced at every step of the process. Finally, if there is a desire to transform the change into a lasting legacy, some way has to be found to institutionalize the initiative so that it no longer depends on an organizational champion or a few passionate individuals in the community. Finally, all of this has to be done in ways that maintain democratic accountability, preserve the role responsibility of elected officials and ensure some measure of responsiveness to citizens of the community.

**Seeing the Future: The Role of Data in Leadership.** The development of a process for collecting and using objective data for leadership played an important role in the success of the VisionAction Project. But how essential was this data compared to the judgment of deciding when and how to use it to enlist the attention and the support of the community? Sometimes the absence of reliable and valid information can actually allow the stakeholders to be more freethinking in their suggestions for reform, knowing that they have the luxury of later analyzing the suggestions with hard data and modifying their suggestions if called for by the data that was
collected. One of the central questions raised by the VisionAction Project is how can objective data and analysis be best used as a leadership tool to foster consensus and collaboration.

**Creating an Agenda Through Trust.** The VisionAction Project presents some useful lesson in terms of creating a commonly shared vision. In addition to collecting information and using it to educate the community, there is the need to create ownership of the results on the part of strategic stakeholders. This ownership occurred as a result of “shoe-leather” work by administrators. It involved walking the streets to introduce oneself to key stakeholders in the community. It involved building trust at an interpersonal level over time. Through this trust-building activity, an “issue agenda” was built in common with others.

**Widening Support for Our Visions.** The VisionAction Project required agreement from a complex array of stakeholders, most of whom had never worked closely with one another. For example, prior to the project the “faith community” never had access to a common forum, which allowed them to gather to discuss issues of shared concern. The creation of a new forum was made possible by building on the trust developed with key community leaders and data gathering to generate support for a larger collaborative process in the community. Once the legitimacy of the larger process was firmly in place, this legitimacy could be transferred to other complementary processes.

**Transforming Visions into Political and Administrative Realities.** Successful policy changes frequently require that those initiating the change know what it takes to make things work on the ground. This “street smarts” also includes knowing what it takes to attract the interest and ownership of elected officials and the larger attentive public served by these officials. The administrative champions of the VisionAction Project possessed these street-level qualities of practical politics in abundance. It is worth noting in this regard that the chief administrator for Lewis and Clark County was among the most respected local government public servants in the state and had the longest tenure for any jurisdiction of comparable size. This long-tenure is especially significant, given the need to hold and mature a vision over the course of many elections. But these elections can also be the occasion for instability and administrative changes in leadership. Instability is the norm in local government, especially when measured against an average tenure of 4-5 years for city and county managers nationally.

**Balancing Competing Democratic Values.** The VisionAction Project came into existence because the champions believed that career public servants have an obligation to be more than passive and instrumental caretakers of the policy choices made by elected officials. They took the initiative in creating an agenda to meet the needs of the growing number of weak and powerless members of the community. They did not draw a bright-line distinction between the public, private and nonprofit sectors. But in reaching out across boundaries
to create a new institution, they have opened themselves up to potential criticisms on a variety of fronts. For example, if the Vision Action Network becomes the functional equivalent of a single supplier, a Wall-Mart for the provision of social services to the community, then the jurisdiction has given up its authority for balancing the competing needs for efficiency, effectiveness, equity, responsiveness, and due process considerations.

The career administrators who championed the creation of the VistionAction project spent endless hours pondering how to avoid the worst case scenario where a new entity is created and in the process becomes the 800 pound gorilla in the room - a gorilla that has little accountability and places demands on the political system that results in the breakdown of a working political consensus in the community. To avoid this worst-case scenario, the administrators took several precautionary steps to preserve their Democratic Balancewheel role.

- They preserved the jurisdiction’s authority over the social service agenda and the county budget to support it.
- They resisted using the creation of the Vision Action Network as an excuse to reduce the county’s share of funding and they succeeded in getting this principle memorialized into the county’s agreement by elected officials to support the future operations of the Vision Action Network.
- They worked hard to establish the financial independence of the Vision Action Network and set a time certain when the county would no longer provide financial support.
- They made certain that social service groups with special needs could continue to seek funding through the county and would not be tied to any kind of monopolistic role of the Vision Action Network.

In short, the career administrators were consciously aware of the need to continuously monitor the county’s evolving role with the Vision Action Network with an eye to preserving the proper balance of competing values in the Democratic Balancewheel.
Case II
THE ANGRY LIBRARY PATRON

CASE DESCRIPTION

Cheryl Miller was quietly working on her monthly administrative report to her supervisor as she was doing double duty at the library circulation desk when she was suddenly confronted by an angry father dragging a six-year-old child by the hand.

“How is this kind of book on the children’s bookshelves? It clearly is unfit reading and should be removed immediately to another section of the library.”

This is not what you, the children’s librarian at a local branch library, need to hear at this time of day. Two of your clerks failed to appear for work today because of icy road conditions. That did not seem to stop the hoards of school kids who flocked to the library to pass the time of day. As a result of having to work without a break checking out books all day at the circulation desk, you will have to spend the evening completing your budget request for the next fiscal year in order to meet the 8:00 AM deadline set by your library director. As a professional children’s librarian, you deeply resent the endless administrative work that takes you away from what you most enjoy and have been best prepared to carry out: selecting and recommending good literature to children and their parents. You’ve been having second thoughts about whether you are really cut out for your current position. There is just too much time spent on keeping track of time cards, doing budget preparation, undertaking personnel evaluations, and responding to patrons’ complaints. As you think about what it might be like to work in a larger library system where you could make more use of the knowledge and skills for which you have been trained, you are suddenly jolted into the reality of this training by a distraught parent who insists that he, not you, should make the choices about the suitability of children’s library selections.

You notice that the book in question is a copy of Maurice Sendak’s In the Night Kitchen, one of the most popular children’s stories of the past four decades and a 1971 Caldecott Honor Book. You’ve dealt with this kind of situation before, so you politely give your standardized response:

“We encourage parents to help their children select material that is appropriate to their interests and level of reading skill. Could I help you find a more suitable book?”

“That’s not the point. Both the nudity and bizarre images in this book make it unsuitable reading for any kids under 10. I want it removed from the children’s section of the collection to the juvenile section.”

As the line of patrons waiting to check out books begins to build, you see that your efforts are not going to prevail. So you resort to another technique that has usually worked in the past. You give the angry patron a form to put his objections in writing, which usually ends the matter.
That did not happen in this case. The following week the director of the library hands you the following letter from the angry patron, Charles Jones, with a request to draft a response that can be sent out under the library director’s signature. She gives you a sample letter that was mailed last week to another library patron who had a complaint about the appropriateness of having the *The Joy of Gay Sex* in the library collection.

**CASE SUPPORTING MATERIALS**

**Patron’s Complaint Form for Library Materials**

Your Name: Charles Jones  
Your Address: 2004 SW Happy Lane  
Title: *In the Night Kitchen*  
Author: Maurice Sendak

1. What do you find objectionable about the material? (Please be specific and cite pages, etc.)

   *Specifically, the nudity of male genitals and the fanciful and unrealistic images.*

2. Why do you object to the material?

   *The nudity is not suitable for young children who will have access to this material in the library, especially when reading books unsupervised after school or on weekends. Many of the images frighten young children and encourage an unhealthy attitude toward the unreal and supernatural.*

3. Did you read the material in its entirety?

   Yes.

4. What do you believe is the theme of the material?

   *Magic is responsible for producing the things we most like in life, i.e., cake.*

5. Do you think that people who want to read this material should be able to find it in the Library?

   *Not paid for by public tax dollars.*

6. Do you think groups or other members of the community should have the right to keep you from having access to materials you want if they disapprove of your viewpoint?

   *Yes, especially when books like this are harmful to others.*
7. Do you believe that parents have the right and responsibility for guiding their own children’s reading and deciding what limits, if any, they place upon it?

Yes, of course, but they need the help of professionals and adults; especially when they cannot be supervised by their parents.

8. Do you think other people should be able to tell you what you or your children should or should not read?

Yes. This happens all the time. Schools and libraries don’t have money to buy everything. They have to make choices. This is what we pay our professional librarians and teachers to do. Some parents either do not pay attention to what their children are reading or do not understand the kind of harm that some books can have on the development of their children. That is why we trust professionals like you to assist us.

9. Are you usually able to find what you want in the Library? If not, what materials would you like to be able to find in the Library collection?

Yes.

Date: June 26, 2002
Signature: Charles Jones

Happy Valley Regional Library
2404 Happy Valley Road
Happy Valley

LIBRARIES to be proud of!

Draft Letter to Library Patron

June 9, 1991

Dear ____________:

Thank you for expressing your opinion of the book The Joy of Gay Sex by Dr. Charles Silverstein and Edmund White. The Library’s Selection Review Committee has reviewed the material and the issues you have raised.
As you have noted, the book is an illustrated manual on adult male homosexual practices. You have asked that the book be removed from the collection because it provides information on sexual practices that may result in the transmission of the AIDS virus.

*The Joy of Gay Sex* was published prior to the identification of the AIDS virus and, therefore, does not mention it specifically. However, it does include a section on the dangers of sexually transmitted diseases and the importance of practicing “safe sex”. It also recommends frequent medical examinations. Finally, when discussing potentially dangerous sexual practices, the authors provide explicit information on possible harm.

*The Joy of Gay Sex* has been in the library’s collection for over ten years. It has been useful to a variety of people in our community. It continues to be an important book for male homosexuals. They recommend that it be read along with more recently published materials on the prevention of AIDS.

In addition, this book has frequently been used by people seeking information on male homosexual lifestyles. A recent article published in both the *Conservative Review* (February 1990) and the *Journal of the American Family Association* (April 1990) offers an example of how this book has been used by people who are not homosexuals. Writing in opposition to the homosexual rights movement, the author, Gary Bullert, highly recommends *The Joy of Gay Sex* as one of the two best sources on homosexual lifestyles.

American democracy is dependent upon a free flow of ideas, many of which conflict with each other. The library’s responsibility is to provide information on as many points of view as possible. For example, we believe that those groups who strongly oppose homosexuality, like the American Family Association, as well as practicing male homosexuals and people who wish to inform themselves in order to make up their own minds should all have access to information about homosexual lifestyles and practices in their public library: *The Joy of Gay Sex* continues to fill this need. We have, therefore, decided to retain it in the collection.

The Happy Valley Regional Library, which serves three counties and 13 cities, has a number of books on AIDS and we will continue to add new titles as they become available. If there are titles you would like to recommend, we will be happy to consider them for inclusion in the collection.

We appreciate the concern that prompted you to express your opinion. The issues you raised are serious.

We are pleased that you usually find what you want in the library.
Sincerely,

Constance Harmony  
Library Director

Happy Valley Regional Library  
2404 Happy Valley Road  
Happy Valley

LIBRARIES to be proud of!

CASE ANALYSIS
What should Cheryl Miller do under the circumstances described above? This case raises at least four different levels of conflict that cannot be successfully resolved without taking into account one’s responsibilities as a steward of our constitutional system of government. There is first one’s responsibility to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of the services outlined in the Happy Valley Regional Library’s organizational mission. Second, there are one’s own personal values, which may be more or less consistent with the mission of the organization and/or the application of that mission to the circumstances at hand. Third, one is trained as a professional with a specialized body of knowledge and skills. Additionally, in this case, there is a fourth responsibility: to act in a manner that is consistent with the larger structure of constitutional procedures and values within which one works.

As a member of a hierarchical organization Cheryl must necessarily consider the impact of her response on other standard operating procedures and on the efficiency of the organization as a whole. How can she write a response that can be used in other similar circumstances? How might her response encourage or discourage other similar communications from angry parents? How much time and energy should be spent on this assignment at the expense of other activities that will improve the quality and amount of service to patrons in the local community? Is Mr. Jones’s letter part of an organized campaign by a local organization to obtain greater community control over the purchase of and access to library materials? The kinds of questions that Cheryl raises, and how such questions are answered, are influenced first by what will best contribute to the efficient and effective running of the organization, and second by the understanding she has of her personal, professional, and larger stewardship roles.
Cheryl has previously found herself in an uncomfortable position responding to teenage requests for appropriate reading material on birth control. Her personal religious views are very much opposed to making this material available, especially when the parents are not involved in the process. However, since the library has a policy of allowing children and teenagers to check out materials without the consent of their parents, her personal views have not had an opportunity to influence the administration of policy. In the case at hand, her personal views very much have an opportunity to shape the tone and structure of her response to Mr. Jones, the angry parent.

In some ways this may be the perfect opportunity for Cheryl to use her discretionary authority to encourage the library staff and governing board to revisit the library’s existing policy. The patron’s complaint can serve as a foil for her own personal views. However, she is given pause in taking this course of action because of the duty she has to the library profession whose code of ethics commits its members to “resist all efforts to censor library resources,” to “distinguish between our personal convictions and professional duties and . . . not allow our personal beliefs to interfere with fair representation of the aims of our institutions or the provision of access to their information resources.”

In the final analysis, this case also implicates larger values of our constitutional system of government. There is, first of all, some requirement to be responsive to the needs of those you serve. But what does responsiveness require in this case? What are the terms upon which discourse between Cheryl Miller and Charles Jones should take place? The complaint provides a unique educational opportunity for members of the library staff to engage citizens on issues that go to the very heart of our democratic system of government. Where should we draw the line between parental authority and public organizational responsibility? Yes, parents need the help of public organizations in carrying out their parental roles, but how far should this help go? Should it stop with the advice from professional librarians about the contents of a given book and the appropriateness of that content to the intellectual and social maturity of the potential reader? Even to be this minimally responsive requires an intimate knowledge of each individual client. In this respect, librarians must function as teachers, psychologists, members of the clergy, therapists, and others who administer to the needs of the public. But this kind of intimate familiarity with those being served is neither necessary nor possible.

It is not possible because organizations are constructed around abstractions. Cheryl functions in an organizational environment that has some notion of the average child, the typical parent, the presumed standards of acceptability within the local community, and so on. Books are purchased, collections are developed, and levels of service are defined based on considerations that abstract from the needs of this or that particular patron or client. This necessity for abstraction is made into a virtue, especially in the public sector, where organizations like libraries are purposely created to meet the needs of citizens, not simply individuals.
Thus, by starting with the need for a librarian to be responsive opens up larger questions about the nature of the community and the relationship of the library to its citizens.

These larger questions are troublesome for Cheryl Miller. She has thought about the possibility of other groups and individuals objecting to the choices the library has made about its collection and the access to it. She has wondered what might happen if the appointed library board is pulled into the debate by Mr. Jones. Given the existing membership on the board, Cheryl believes this would likely lead to a change in the existing library policy, making access more restrictive than it has been in the past. While this would bring the world more into conformance with her personal views, would it be a good thing for the library, for the community? Since the members of the Regional Library Board are appointed by the County Board of Commissioners in three separate counties, how adequately do the appointed Board members reflect the sentiment of the community? Even if they did, to what extent should minority views be held subservient to a dominant local majority that restricts the freedom to read either by placing limits on what is purchased and/or who can obtain access to it? These questions trouble Cheryl as she ponders her assigned task to respond to Mr. Jones’s letter.

In the chapters that follow, we will explore these issues in much greater detail. Chapter 1 examines the central role that career officials play in preserving the legitimacy of American constitutional governance through the exercise of their administrative discretion. Chapter 2 explores the distinct discretionary role that career administrators play at each level of organizational responsibility: first line supervisors, middle managers and executive leaders. Chapter 3 continues the discussion of administrative discretion by shifting the focus to an institutional perspective and the long debated relationship between democracy and bureaucracy. At the state and federal levels of government our systems are characterized by separation of powers and checks and balances, which create executive, legislative and judicial masters for career administrators. The issues are not so clear in local levels of government where authority may be divided across jurisdictional boundaries and where official policy making is in the hands of part-time appointed officials who are not directly accountable to the voters through the electoral process. This is the situation with Cheryl Miller who works in a Regional Library system that is controlled by three counties, but serves 13 separate cities. How should Cheryl Miller exercise her leadership role? Who does Cheryl Miller serve? How is the exercise of her discretion best held accountable?
Case III: The Peregrine Falcon

EAGLE ROCK: THE CASE OF THE PEREGRINE FALCON

CASE DESCRIPTION

Eagle Rock is a 600-foot outcropping located along Washington State Highway 14 in the Columbia River Gorge. Just under an hour’s drive from Portland, Oregon, the Rock is located in a state park operated by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Department. It has a trail access to the top where spectacular vistas are available to both hikers who use the trail and climbers who use the rock wall to make their ascent. In addition to being located along a well-traveled state highway within a popular state park, Eagle Rock is located within a few hundred yards of well-used railroad tracks carrying freight east and west along the Gorge.

First-Year Closure

In 1996 two climbers complained to Eagle Rock State Park officials that they had been attacked by birds on their ascent up the rock face. Upon further investigation, the park officials concluded that the birds were a pair of peregrine falcons, which are listed as an endangered species by both the state and federal governments. Park officials contacted the State Fish and Wildlife Department, which recommended closure of the rock to climbers. State park officials agreed to comply with this recommendation by the Wildlife Department; they closed the Rock to climbers but left the trail open to hikers.

During the first year of the closure of Eagle Rock to climbers, the State Parks and Recreation Department initiated a process to develop rules for climbing in parks throughout the state. The department hired a climber as a consultant, contacted users for their opinions, notified other state and federal agencies of their plans, and held hearings throughout the state. This process resulted in a conclusion by the State Parks and Recreation Department that conditions were so unique from one park site to another that each park should undertake a process to develop its own rules, subject to review and approval by the state park officials housed in the state capitol.

Second-Year Plan Development

The park ranger for Eagle Rock State Park initiated a process to develop a site-specific plan for access to the Rock. During this process, the ranger established the following guidelines for collecting and evaluating information:

1. Eagle Rock would remain closed to climbers until a plan was put into place by the State Parks and Recreation Department.
2. The State Fish and Wildlife Department would be required to participate in the process of developing the plan, but the final decision would be made by the Parks and Recreation Department.

3. The park ranger established an Eagle Rock Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from the local climbing organization (with a membership of over 3,000), the Access Fund (a group advocating maximum access to public lands), and other climbers not affiliated with any official organization.

4. State officials from the State Parks and the Fish and Wildlife departments agreed to hire a peregrine falcon consultant who was employed by the U.S. Forest Service in California and who also had climbing experience. The consultant took personal leave time to engage in his consultation work.

**Relevant Facts**

The following relevant pieces of information surfaced in the public hearings and testimonial process:

1. The Climbing Association suggested only a partial closure of the Rock to climbers on the grounds that:
   - No evidence had been presented to show why climbing at a distance far removed from the nesting site was any more disruptive to the nesting falcons than the noise from highway and train traffic or the presence of hikers using the trail.
   - Partial closure of the Rock would allow the Climbing Association to help enforce the regulatory requirements put in place by the State Parks and Recreation Department.

2. The Access Fund argued that partial closure would spread the burden of restricting access equitably across various user groups.

3. The climbing consultant advised the Parks Department to establish a “buffer zone” that would keep climbers away from the line of sight of the nesting falcons and at a distance that was at least equal to the distance of hikers on the trail to the top of the outcropping.

4. The peregrine falcon consultant from California supported a permanent closure of the Rock to climbing. He argued that we know too little about the kind of external disturbances that peregrines will tolerate to engage in “experiments” with partial closures to climbing.

5. Under the administrative rules governing state natural resource agencies, administrators have the discretionary authority to make exceptions to mandatory actions by creating “buffer zones,” but it is not clear whether the “buffer zone” exception was meant to apply in a case involving climbers and peregrine falcons.

**Recommendation**
Based on your review of the evidence and the processes that were followed, what recommendation would you make to the Eagle Rock park ranger? In reaching a recommendation, please take into consideration the following questions:

1. Would collecting more cost and benefit information be useful in helping to decide this case? If so, what kind of information would you suggest and what time frame would you need to carry out the necessary analysis?

2. What policy framework/models seem most applicable in making sense out of this case?

3. What is the best course of action to ensure administrative accountability?

4. What values should be given primary consideration in determining the best course of action to be taken?

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS: CONFLICTING ROLES AND PURPOSES

The Case of the Peregrine Falcon is typical of the kind of problems that public-sector managers are increasingly facing in the exercise of their discretionary leadership authority. Problems of scarcity have created an expanding regulatory environment where multiple stakeholders and competing authority structures must be successfully reconciled without fully adequate information, time, and money. Laws may be ambiguous, constituency interests conflicting, and organizational resources limited. Still, decisions must be made in a timely fashion, backed by justifiable analysis, and implemented in a manner that meets the multiple tests of democratic accountability.
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