

The American Review of Public Administration

<http://arp.sagepub.com>

Citizenship Behavior and the Spirit of New Managerialism: A Theoretical Framework and Challenge for Governance

Eran Vigoda and Robert T. Golembiewski
The American Review of Public Administration 2001; 31; 273
DOI: 10.1177/02750740122064956

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://arp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/3/273>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[American Society for Public Administration](#)

Additional services and information for *The American Review of Public Administration* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://arp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://arp.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 28 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://arp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/3/273#BIBL>

CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND THE SPIRIT OF NEW MANAGERIALISM A Theoretical Framework and Challenge for Governance

ERAN VIGODA
University of Haifa

ROBERT T. GOLEMBIEWSKI
University of Georgia

This article develops an integrative understanding of the relationship between citizenship behavior in and around organizations and new public management (NPM). The authors argue that recent theory of NPM underestimates the economic, symbolic, and educational contribution of many voluntary actions, here termed citizenship behavior, to public organizations as well as to modern society. Relying on this argument, the authors develop a multidimensional model of citizenship behavior that can be applied in the public sector. The model deals with micro-citizenship, midi-citizenship, macro-citizenship, and meta-citizenship. Citizenship is thus advocated as a vital construct for the formation of the new managerial spirit and at the same time as a major coming challenge for governance. Finally, several responsibilities are elaborated for social players in fostering values of voluntarism and spontaneous involvement. These can promote a healthier public service, a more efficient bureaucracy, and richer life in prosperous modern communities.

At first glance, citizenship behavior and new public management (NPM) may seem an odd couple. Citizenship in modern society draws its substance from ideas such as political participation, community involvement and communitarianism, social justice, humanitarianism, voluntarism, and shared responsibilities of individuals (Box, 1998; Fredrickson, 1997). By contrast, the NPM approach, which has become so important in contemporary public administration, centers on different forces and mechanisms: competition and business operation, effectiveness and efficiency of public organizations, and quality of services (Bozeman, 1993; Lynn, 1998; Perry & Kraemer, 1983; Pollitt, 1988). This article attempts to explain why

AUTHORS' NOTE: Address correspondence and reprint requests to Dr. Eran Vigoda, Department of Political Science, University of Haifa, Haifa 31905, Israel; fax: 972-4-8257785; e-mail: erav@poli.haifa.ac.il.

Initial Submission: October 27, 1999

Accepted: September 7, 2000

AMERICAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, Vol. 31 No. 3, September 2001 273-295
© 2001 Sage Publications

and how these two important streams in management thinking can and should be related.

Citizenship behavior is a powerful construct of human activity that deserves more attention in the study of public administration and management. Beyond the basic constructs of obedience and loyalty, constructive citizenship behavior in modern societies encompasses active participation, involvement, and voluntary actions of the people in managing their lives. Nonetheless, this idea has so far received scarce consideration in NPM thinking. Until the 1980s, only a few attempts had been made to develop a comprehensive analysis of citizenship behavior that could be related to general management science and especially to images of public administration theory and action. Studies concerned with exploring the citizenship-management connection took a relatively narrow perspective. One line of research focused on citizens' involvement, participation, and empowerment in the national and local environments (e.g., Barber, 1984; Pateman, 1970). More recent studies fostered the notion that voluntarism and spontaneous actions of individuals are useful tools for governments in their efforts to overcome budgetary difficulties, to advance stability, and to promote effectiveness in public arenas (Box, 1998, 1999; Brudney, 1990; Fredrickson, 1997; Rimmerman, 1997). Other studies, mainly in management and organizational psychology, emphasized a valuable self-derived contribution by employees that can lead to better efficacy and success inside the workplace. Prosocial and/or altruistic behaviors (e.g., Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (e.g., Morrison, 1996; Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) were mentioned as necessary for the creation of a healthy organizational atmosphere and particularly for promoting service quality and general outcomes of public organizations (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). In addition, a budding interdisciplinary approach elaborated on the possibility that higher levels of citizens' involvement on the state or community level are related to more involvement in the job and to enhanced organizational democracy that improves organizational outcomes (Peterson, 1990; Putnam, 1993; Sobel, 1993). Organizational democracy and participatory climate were found to be good predictors of employees' performance in private and public systems and thus received increased attention in recent years (Cohen & Vigoda, 1999, 2000; Cotton, Vollrath, Froggat, Lengnick-Hall, & Jennings, 1988). All the above studies pointed to the added value of citizenship behavior, in its many forms and settings, to management in general and to public organizations in particular. Regrettably, these efforts have not matured into a broader perspective on the overall relationships between characteristics of citizenship behavior and new trends in modern managerialism. Knowledge about different aspects of the citizenship-management connection have not been combined in an effective way that could lead to better understanding of both fields. Hence, the advantages of such mutual enrichment have been overlooked and left as "unfinished business."

Reviewing theoretical and empirical studies on NPM, citizenship behavior, and potential interrelationships between them, the present study elaborates on several questions: What is so important about the relationship between multidimensional

citizenship and new managerialism, especially in the public sector? What are the variants of citizenship behavior in and around organizations that can be used to enhance public management goals? On what theoretical grounding can we assume that citizenship behavior and NPM are, in fact, related? Who should be involved in fostering citizens' involvement and participation that may promote what we define as "a spirit of new managerialism," and what duties and responsibilities should each participant carry? Answers to these questions may contribute to a development of more responsive public administration and healthier democratic societies. Our theoretical discussion also leads to a model for understanding the territory. It suggests that planned strategic cooperation and a genuine partnership among players in the political, administrative, and social arenas are crucial and possible. In our view, it is a prime managerial challenge for the future.

CITIZENSHIP AND NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: A CRITIQUE

This article criticizes NPM for not doing enough to usher in the idea of citizenship behavior through the main entrance of modern managerial halls. Unlike traditional public management approaches, the NPM movement focuses on citizens as sophisticated clients in complex environments. Relying heavily on private sector management, citizens of modern democracies are perceived more and more as clients with multiple alternatives for consuming high-level services. Public authorities must treat the public well, not only because of their presumed administrative responsibility for quality in action but also because of their obligation to democratic rules, accountability demands, and transparency criteria, and sometimes even because of their fear of losing clients in an increasingly competitive business-like arena. Hence, NPM opposes the more classical approach to governance and public administration that used to see citizens as simple constituents or voters. However, NPM creates a different obstacle to productive citizenship behavior that must be recognized and isolated. We argue that NPM encourages passivity among the citizenry whereby citizens acquire a power of *exit* (which indeed was virtually unavailable in the past) but at the same time discourages use of the original power of *voice* by citizens who may have much to contribute to their communities.

To better explain our arguments and criticism on the current status of NPM, we focus on two major groups of players that are involved in governmental and administrative processes in democracies. Each of these has a special function and a unique set of duties. One group comprises rulers and public administrators who are responsible for the proper management of large organizations and bureaucratic agencies. The second is the public, i.e., the citizens, and mainly authentic citizen-leaders who agree to be managed by "others" and must develop and sustain the appropriate control, involvement, and participation in the administrative process. Hobbes argued that these groups are tightly bound in a kind of mutual agreement. According to Hobbes, the people and their government have a *hidden social contract*, which calls

for the people's obedience and loyalty to the government in return for government's commitment to provide for some of their basic natural rights. In its elementary configuration, this contract advocates bidirectional transactions of human resources, promoting the mutual interests of citizens, states, and society.

Recent developments in the study of NPM focused on the responsibilities of the first group (rulers and administrators), but they paid much less attention to the second (citizens). NPM favors a massive socialization of business management practices in the public sector to provide rulers with better tools for policy implementation (e.g., Lynn, 1998; Pollitt, 1988). The only problem is that these orientations and practices have, thus far, simply not been integrated with another key construct of healthy democratic systems. That construct is the active role of the public, its participation and involvement in running its own life more effectively, and the responsibility of administrators to encourage such a blessed public contribution. This underestimation of active and constructive citizenship behavior is a weakness in contemporary NPM theory.

For example, Box (1998) suggested that NPM takes a very clear and unfavorable approach to active citizenship involvement in the administrative process (pp. 73-74). According to Box, there are three types of citizens classified along a continuum of desire to affect the public policy process: (a) Free riders are considered consumers of public services who receive public goods for free and let others do the work of citizenship; (b) activists, in contrast, are deeply involved in public life and in citizenship actions for the community; and (c) "watchdogs," in the middle of the continuum, are involved only in key issues of relevance to themselves personally. Practically and theoretically, NPM mostly encourages the free riders and perhaps some of the "watchdogs." It does not, however, elaborate on the significance of activists. So far, NPM has not emphasized the need for better reciprocal linkage between rulers and citizens. At most, it has concentrated on only one direction of flow of influence, from rulers to citizens. In many respects, this position does not adequately consider the positive effect of citizens' action on (new) public systems.

Why and how has such a tendency occurred? Several answers can be identified within the evolutionary development of modern public administration. During the 1960s and 1970s, a growing number of observers perceived public administration as an old and declining discipline that no longer could provide the public with satisfactory answers to its needs and demands. The contract between rulers and citizens, once a fundamental principle of democratic societies, seemed to have lost its glory. Governments and governors in Europe and in America became unpopular in the eyes of many citizens as well as elites (Rainey, 1990, p. 157), and public administration seemed to have no adequate answers for problems in education, transportation, employment, crime, natural resources, and other salient social issues. All these evinced a declining image of public administration. Theoreticians and practitioners were left with epidemic social dilemmas waiting for new solutions.

In the search for alternative answers, business management theory was proposed as a source for new and invigorating ideas (Bozeman, 1993). It was suggested that *public management*, rather than public administration, could manifest a new

understanding of how to run governments more efficiently, how to improve their relationships with citizens as clients, and thereby to surmount some of society's pandemic ills. This process of "liberalization" in public administration, which is recognized today as NPM, was elegantly defined by Garson and Overman (1983) as "an interdisciplinary study of the generic aspects of administration . . . a blend of the planning, organizing, and controlling functions of management with the management of human, financial, physical, information and political resources" (p. 278). Focusing on different resources that may contribute to better performance of public organizations, NPM has emphasized strategies successfully applied in private sector firms. Drawing on the business sector's experience, scholars expressed a more demanding attitude to dynamics, activities, and productivity of public organizations (e.g., Thomas, 1999). Demands for more consideration of proper managerial tools and principles were directed mainly at policy makers and public administrators. The public sector was urged to treat citizens as clients and to provide competitive as well as high-quality services. Indeed, these were appropriate goals for a public service, which prior to the 1980s paid scant attention to the economy of bureaucracies.

Today, despite the popularity in America and Europe of the theme of running government like a business, it also carries an unexpected difficulty. NPM has taken the lead in the study and practice of public systems, highlighting the main direction of flow of responsibilities: the commitment and obligation of public institutions to citizens as passive clients. Conversely, however, the idealized relationship between citizens and governments has been described more in terms of a *unidirectional treaty* rather than the *bidirectional relationship* consistent with representative democracy. Administrators are encouraged to assume greater responsibility toward citizens, whereas citizens' participation and involvement in the administrative process are perceived by politicians and by public servants as problematic. As King, Feltey, and Susel (1998) argued,

Although many public administrators view close relationships with citizens as both necessary and desirable most of them do not actively seek public involvement. If they do seek it, they do not use public input in making administrative decisions . . . [and] believe that greater citizen participation increases inefficiency, . . . delays, and red tape. (p. 319)

Hence, NPM tends to overlook the importance of self-derived, spontaneous, and voluntary actions that are both vital and economical for prosperous societies (Etzioni, 1994, 1995) as well as successful organizations (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Ironically, this behavior has enjoyed considerable attention in the business management literature, which served as a role model for NPM but has never been properly used in its original form. For example, since the early 1980s, many studies of organizational behavior elaborated the importance of prosocial and extra-role activities later known as OCB. Organ (1988) defined this behavior as the "good soldier syndrome," and other scholars sought to relate it to a broader concept of citizenship at

the national and community levels. A progressive definition of citizenship behavior refers to voluntary actions inside and outside the workplace that can be beneficial for private or public organizations (e.g., Graham, 1991; Organ, 1988; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Still, many issues have been overlooked in NPM literature, including engaging the public in administrative processes, encouraging citizens to take an active part in managing local governance, OCB and spontaneous involvement of public employees inside the workplace, and the general promotion of citizenship and altruistic behavior at all social levels.

Consequently, NPM traditionally does not elaborate on the advantages of citizenship behavior within or around the public system. Most of the writing in the field focuses on simplistic business-like orientations; these are necessary and important, but they fail to effectively cultivate the many dimensions of human enterprise. The conventional perspective of NPM calls for a massive implementation of business standards in the public sector by strategies of privatization, outsourcing, performance indicators (PIs), and orientation to quality service. It does call for improved communication channels with citizens, but only as passive clients (Pollitt, 1988). It also views rulers and administrators as the major agents of managerial change. In this view, public administration adopts a "patronage" position toward citizens who are left with only minor responsibilities, such as becoming good customers or sensible clients. It does not, however, encourage more voluntary active effort and participation by citizens in the administrative process.

An advance across ground broken by Fredrickson (1997) in *The Spirit of Public Administration* suggests that a revitalized spirit of *new* public administration is necessary. In line with this idea, we further argue that a balanced reciprocal relationships between citizens and rulers may lead to the creation of a *spirit of new managerialism*. This spirit is relevant to the 21st century and may flourish only in a soil rich in mutual contributions by different parties. There is a need to develop the theory of the advantages of multidimensional citizenship behavior and to elaborate on its contribution to modern societies via NPM. Our argument is that citizenship behavior is vital for any public system and administrative bureaucracy in quest of effectiveness, efficiency, fairness, social justice, and overall healthy growth and development. Citizenship behavior, whatever form it takes, carries significant values for the environment.

A more comprehensive inclusion of citizenship behavior in the study of new managerialism is also in line with the contemporary business management approach because of the relatively low costs of voluntary action (Brudney, 1990; Brudney & Duncombe, 1992). From an economics viewpoint, the NPM approach does not take advantage of its most powerful, valuable, and inexpensive resources: good will, civic virtue, spontaneous initiatives, and innovation by individuals. Even in its own business-oriented terminology, contemporary NPM theory is limited and incomplete. It needs a much more sound understanding of how to relate citizenship behavior with the management of public systems. In the following sections, we try to portray this multidimensionality of citizenship behavior and prepare the ground for a model of integration between citizenship and NPM. Such a discussion is vital to

better understand how to incorporate manifold voluntary enterprises in modern public management.

DIMENSIONALITY OF CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Foundations and Settings

Previous research has pointed to three core elements of general citizenship behavior: obedience of the people to social rules, loyalty to social institutions, and participation in social life (T. H. Marshall, 1950). Whereas obedience and loyalty naturally belong to a worldwide definition of citizenship, the essence of citizenship behavior is participation. Participation concerns active involvement of citizens in three main settings: governance (a national arena), local lives (a communal arena), and the workplace (an organizational arena).

The national and communal arenas. Montesquieu in *The Spirit of the Laws* argued that a state based on popular participation, as distinct from other forms of government (e.g., those based on obedience or loyalty), depends for its stability on the civic virtue of its good citizens. Rousseau emphasized the importance of citizens' freedom, political participation, and a "general will," which calls for contribution to the governing and administrative process without gaining any personal advantages, only the common interest. Active citizens assist in safeguarding and supporting sound governance (e.g., by holding or electing others to executive positions) and in adjudicating violations (e.g., by serving on juries). They also participate (directly or through representatives) in changing laws in response to new needs and in evolving an understanding of the common interest. Consequently, citizenship behavior includes devoting time and effort to the responsibilities of governance and administration, being well-informed, sharing information and ideas with others, engaging in discussions about controversial issues, voting in whatever manner is provided under the law, and encouraging others to do likewise (Graham, 1991; Putnam, 1993; Van Dyne et al., 1994).

Community involvement and participation in local administrative processes constitute another unique aspect of participatory citizenship. Communal citizenship represents more informal participation than national activity (Sobel, 1993). Some people may decline to participate in citizenship behavior at the national level through disinclination or indifference. They may prefer a closer, perhaps more personal domain, such as the community. Whereas much research has been conducted to uncover the mechanisms of individual voluntary action at the national level (e.g., Almond & Verba, 1963; Milbrath, 1965; Verba & Nie, 1972), recent studies have emphasized the importance of citizenship participation and voluntary action at the communal level (Barber, 1984; Etzioni, 1994, 1995; Hurd, 1989; King & Stivers, 1998; Putnam, 1993). For example, Barber (1984) argued that "political partici-

pation in common action is more easily achieved at the neighborhood level, where there are a variety of opportunities for engagement” (p. 303), and Hurd (1989) noted that

the need to foster responsible citizenship is obvious. Freedom can only flourish within a community where shared values, common loyalties and mutual obligations provide a framework of order and self-discipline, otherwise, liberty can quickly degenerate into narrow self-interest and license. (n.p.)

King and Stivers (1998) argued that “active citizenship is different from voting, paying taxes, or using government services . . . in active citizenship citizens rule and are ruled in turn” (pp. 195-196). Putnam (1993) concluded that communities with higher levels of voluntarism and civic engagement become better places to live, characterized by more trust in government, better government performance, and positive relations between citizens and the state.

The organizational arena. Beyond the national and communal spheres, active citizenship participation also has an organizational aspect. Studies in organizational behavior have long argued that more participation in the workplace, high job involvement, and opportunities to use an effective voice may lead to high job satisfaction, low turnover and absenteeism, and better performances of organizations (Keller, 1997; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reied, & Sirola, 1998). Other studies found that public organizations that promote values of employees’ empowerment and participation in decision making are more likely to enhance communication throughout units, to increase commitment to stakeholders, and to improve productivity as well as quality of services (Berman, 1995; Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998). Hence, an analysis of citizenship behavior in modern societies entails a broader conceptual discussion, applicable not only to nations, states, and communities but also to organizations, bureaucracies, and public agencies. In a rapidly changing environment, organizations and the workplace have an important task. Organizations’ productivity leads to significant improvement in quality of life. Citizens’ demands and needs grow faster and reach farther than ever before. The expansion of welfare services provided by the state to its citizens, directly or by proxy, must cohere with such demands and satisfy more people more frequently and more extensively. In practice, organizational change in these agencies only partly follows the rapid transformation of the environment, and it needs better support of quasi-public and nonpublic organizations (the third sector). Therefore, the idea that self-derived citizenship activity should be related to management and organizational sciences, as well as to public administration operation, has attracted growing attention in recent decades (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Organ, 1988).

Two basic patterns of relationship between citizenship behavior and the organizational arena should be mentioned in this regard: (a) Enhanced involvement of citizens in the administrative process (e.g., becoming members or supporters of public

or third-sector agencies) generates commitment to a healthy public service, proper understanding of what is right and what is wrong in managing public organizations, and education toward constructive participatory democracy. (b) Improved intra-organizational citizenship behavior by public employees improves performance by public and third-sector agencies. The advantages of self-inspired contributions of employees reach far beyond the merits of formal authority and bureaucratic mechanisms. Recently, Rimmerman (1997) suggested that increased citizens' participation in workplace decision-making processes is important if people are to recognize their roles and responsibilities as citizens within the larger community (p. 19). This idea is consistent with an earlier work of Pateman (1970), who argued that through participation in decision making (at the state, community, and organization levels), the individual learns to be a public as well as a private citizen.

We thus suggest that participation in multiple settings such as the national or communal arena, as well as participation inside organizations, should be borne in mind when NPM strategies are developed. The involvement in, and contribution of, citizens to the state, community, workplace, and society in general are valuable. Citizens' involvement has the advantage of being the lowest-cost input in the administrative process. Participation also enhances individuals' commitment to their environment and approval of public administration's legitimacy. Also, the increase in political participation carries improvement of political stability and accountability of the public sector (King & Stivers, 1998). Stability and accountability create proper responsiveness and effectiveness of services to the people.

Levels of Analysis

Citizens' participation is manifested in two major ways: personal initiatives and organized action. McKeivitt (1998) suggested that participation and active citizenship are frequently portrayed as individual qualities, but at the same time, they have strong overtones of collective responsibility (p. 42). Box (1998) also emphasized the centrality and current trends in individualism and collectivism, especially in communities (pp. 71-74). Like McKeivitt, Box identified a struggle for "a point of balance" between individualism and collectivism that largely influences the nature of citizenship in America. The tension between the individualistic and the collectivist ideas of citizenship is real, and disagreement exists about its boundaries. Following this, we identify two levels of active citizenship behavior that are discussed in the psychological, sociological, managerial, and administrative literature: (a) *individual*: altruism and voluntarism of persons in the national, communal, and organizational settings; and (b) *collective*: organized or semiorganized citizenship behavior as represented by interest groups, volunteers' associations, volunteers' programs, not-for-profit organizations, and the third sector. Together, these levels comprise the citizenship behavior hierarchy of modern societies.

The individual level. Individual citizenship behavior refers to the very basic construct of personal actions and reactions taken by individual citizens. These

are spontaneous actions of unorganized persons who render altruistic actions aimed at enhancing the prosperity and development of their environment. Citizens may show compassion for other citizens; contribute time, money, and other resources to help the incapable; and provide assistance for others whenever the situation requires it without seeking any personal advantage or compensation (e.g., Conover, Crewe, & Searing, 1993; Monroe, 1994; Piliavin & Charng, 1990). Moreover, inside public organizations, citizen-employees may exert additional effort to help fellow employees in fulfilling their duties and in serving the public without seeking any personal rewards. General management literature has defined these enterprises as OCB, which reflects an informal contribution that participants can choose to make or withhold without regard to sanctions or formal incentives. As noted in previous studies (e.g., Organ, 1988; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997), many of these contributions, aggregated over time and persons, considerably enhance organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Further studies concluded that working under multiple pressures, public organizations should better understand the relationship between citizenship behavior inside and outside the workplace, management, and organizational outcomes (Cohen & Vigoda, 1999, 2000; Graham, 1991). Encouragement of citizenship behavior in and around public agencies may contribute to these organizations' productivity, competence, and success, hence to society in general.

The collective level. This level of citizenship behavior comprises semiorganized and fully organized actions initiated by groups of individuals. Usually, citizenship behavior at this level emerges when a group shares mutual interests and all members are willing to be actively involved in collective voluntary endeavors. The group's ambition is high, and there is recognition that it will be almost impossible to achieve and secure most of the joint goals as individuals. Among these groups, one finds neighborhood associations, ad hoc groups that seek limited ecological goals, volunteer programs inside organizations, and even altruistic support groups offering help to those in need from others who experienced similar needs (e.g., quitting smoking, avoiding drugs or alcohol, supporting families in distress, etc.). Previous research has demonstrated that the emergence, growth, and decline of voluntary groups can be explained by human capital variables, emergence of leadership, socioeconomic status, and competition with other groups (Janoski & Wilson, 1995; McPherson & Rotolo, 1996). It was also found that membership in voluntary groups increased forms of political expression and participation (Michael, 1981), and membership in volunteer programs in the public sector had economic merit for public organizations as well as symbolic effects of citizen participation (Brudney, 1990; Brudney & Duncombe, 1992).

Apart from the semiorganized citizenship actions, the collective level of analysis also includes highly organized and fully institutional collective endeavors. The most obvious representative of this subcategory is the organized not-for-profit

sector, which has grown rapidly in recent decades. Collective institutional citizenship derives from ambitious interests of large groups that have undergone a relatively complicated process of institutionalization and formalization. Management and public administration sciences have devoted considerable attention to this field (Brinton, 1994; Coble, 1999; O'Connell, 1989; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). In many ways, these organizations (also known as nonprofit or voluntary organizations) represent increased public involvement aimed at providing services in which the state is unable or unwilling to play a significant role. This third sector is distinct from the traditional public and private sectors (Gidron & Kramer, 1992). In recent years, voluntary organizations and the third sector constituted about 10% of the economic size of all governmental activities in the United States (O'Connell, 1989), and their relative size continues to grow. Such figures may indicate that citizens of modern societies have more needs and/or demands and that they are disappointed with governments' operation and inability to provide satisfactory welfare services. Hence, it seems that today, more than ever before, citizens are willing to engage in collective voluntary actions (both semiorganized and fully organized) to support their needs (King et al., 1998).

A MULTIDIMENSIONAL MODEL OF CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The complex construct of modern citizenship behavior and its limited employment in NPM theory calls for a revised conceptual framework that can unite this odd couple. This framework should advocate the coexistence of, and the mutual solidarity between, the public as represented by citizens on one hand and the administration as reflected in NPM on the other. Figure 1 presents a suggested model of multidimensional citizenship behavior and its effect on public service systems as stemming from the NPM approach. On the basis of the settings of citizenry action (communal and national versus organizational), and on the levels of analysis (individual versus collective action), we distinguish four types of citizenship behavior: micro-citizenship (MC1), midi-citizenship (MC2), macro-citizenship (MC3), and meta-citizenship (MC4). Each type is then related to the relevant construct of managerial operation and outcomes. Together, they are intended to provide a synthesis of the fields.

Micro-Citizenship

MC1 is the very basic image of citizenship actions as taken by individuals in the limited sphere of the workplace. Employees may present high levels of participation in workplace activities and greater willingness to support others even when not asked or ordered. These employees may be defined as good organizational citizens (Organ, 1988). They differ from other individuals who show lower levels of

| Setting Level | Organizational | Communal & National |
|-------------------|--|---|
| <i>Individual</i> | MC1 Micro-citizenship → Employees' Performance | MC3 Macro-citizenship → Personal Welfare |
| <i>Collective</i> | MC2 Midi-citizenship → Organizational Performance | MC4 Meta-citizenship → Social Welfare |

Figure 1: Multidimensions of Citizenship Behavior and Its Effect on Public Service Systems

citizenship behavior or withhold such positive behaviors entirely. Some of these employees may even engage in organizational misbehaviors, such as stealing organizational property or sabotaging the work itself (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). MC1 of individuals inside the workplace has been shown to have a direct and significant impact on employees' performance (Vigoda, 2000b). Findings suggest that organizations benefit from using measures of OCB as an integral part of their routine performance evaluation strategy because of the valuable information these measures provide on employees' informal contributions (Morrison, 1996). Hence, a challenge for management theory in general, and particularly for (new) public management, is the development of highly valid and highly reliable research tools that can distinguish different types of public employees, or organizational citizens, in public agencies. Such indicators are expected to increase the explanatory power and predictability of organizational-behavior models. In the public sector, it is extremely important that good organizational citizens be those who interact with the public to create a responsive environment and, as highlighted in NPM theory, serve citizens as clients. Enriching the public sector with employees who are better organizational citizens may also have an educative spillover effect on the public, improve the image of public administration, and make the contact with the citizens more fruitful and efficient both economically and socially.

Midi-Citizenship

MC2 also refers to actions taken inside organizations, but they arise from the collective voice of groups of individuals rather than from independent individual actions. Whereas MC1 has the greatest effect on other individuals, the MC2 pattern is fashioned by groups for the sake of other groups or units, or for the sake of the organization as a whole. MC2 focuses on better attainment of wider objectives and goals in the workplace, not only personal targets and interests. The involvement and general voice of groups in the manufacturing process are valuable. Studies have shown that more involvement of organized individuals in decision-making processes contributes to better operation in private as well as in public organizations (Erez, Earley, & Hulin, 1985). Methods such as quality circles, team-building

strategies, and management by objectives emphasize the general encouragement of work groups becoming more active as well as entrepreneurial in the various stages of production (Drucker, 1966; Hirschman, 1970). MC2 is accordingly built on MC1 but is far more ambitious in its effort to increase and improve general performance of public organizations. Furthermore, groups are more powerful than detached individuals and set more challenging goals, which are later translated into massive improvement of goods and services. The collective action also enhances the feeling of communitarianism and the sense of cooperation that can spill over into the extraorganizational environment (Peterson, 1990; Sobel, 1993). In this way, organizations in general, and especially public agencies, serve as habitats for the growth of citizenship awareness and the development of sensitivity toward others, be it other work units or various social groups.

Macro-Citizenship

We defined MC3 as altruistic endeavors of individuals in the national and communal settings, those that express self-initiated contribution for the sake of others in the wider society. Moving beyond the narrow organizational arena, individuals use similar tendencies of altruism and willingness to help fellow citizens in the national and communal spheres. As elucidated earlier, active citizenship of individuals outside the workplace is characterized by independent enterprises focused on assisting others who may need help. Such spontaneous actions of unorganized people aim at enhancing the prosperity and development of the environment in general, thereby increasing the welfare of their fellow citizens. This is why MC3 is related, in our model, to personal welfare in the national and communal arenas. Citizens may help other citizens by showing tenderness, kindness, and generosity. They can contribute a variety of diverse resources, such as time or money, to help the incapable. They may also provide assistance for the elders, for children in need, for minorities, or for other less capable groups. In so doing, they seek no personal advantage or compensation in return (Monroe, 1994; Piliavin & Charng, 1990). Studies have also suggested that some practices and skills gained in intraorganizational experiences may be useful for these initiatives. Citizens in the intimate workplace may learn how to use their personal resources more effectively and then transfer them into the wider society (Peterson, 1990). MC3 is also characterized by people engaging in only one-on-one or one-on-group activities, avoiding (intentionally or not) any relationship with organized groups of volunteer associations.

Meta-Citizenship

MC4 is the term we decided to use for collective citizenry action in the wider society. With the exception of ideas like universal citizenship (Oliver & Heater, 1994), this is perhaps the highest level of participatory and constructive citizenship behavior identifiable. MC4 is representative of collective actions at the communal and national levels that stem from deep altruistic dispositions, conscientiousness,

and extensive acceptability of the constructive citizenship duties and responsibilities.

As noted by Fredrickson (1997), collective actions by interest groups, by political parties, or by citizenship lobbies are the most acceptable and widely studied aspects of citizenship behavior in contemporary political science literature. However, during the 19th century, citizens (especially in America) functioned in a more direct way, through town meetings, raising a militia for defense, and engaging in midwestern barn raising (p. 12). Citizens' associations had been the most powerful image of American society in earlier centuries and became less popular during the late 1800s to the mid-1900s, with the emergence of the reform movement in public administration. The founding fathers of modern public administration, such as W. Wilson and D. Waldo, urged that the discipline become a formal field of knowledge and an independent science among all other social sciences. The reform movement introduced into government specialization, professionalism, merit-based appointment and promotion, and the application of management sciences. Citizens continued to play a role, but less direct. They continued to organize, albeit less and less, to solve problems or provide services and increasingly formed interest groups to influence government. As Fredrickson indicates, in the 1950s, *pluralism* emerged as the best term to describe the connection between citizens and governments. Thus, the indirect relationship between the public and the administrators became ever more widespread. The tradition of citizenship as involving an energized and self-directed public had essentially been lost.

Citizenship behavior was reconstructed only in the 1970s, and citizens resumed their functions in associations and nonprofit organizations, later known as the emerging third sector. Hence, patterns of MC4 were transformed over the years, but they continued to represent the overt, pure, and massive connection between organized citizens and governments. Specifically, MC4 has had a major impact on public sector services through a creation of awareness of social welfare. Today, more and more organized citizens are taking action when the state is unable or unwilling to do what it ought to do for the public. MC4 is advanced as supplementary to governmental policy and in some cases as an accelerator of processes already in progress.

A Synthesis: A Multidimensional Model of Citizenship Behavior and Public Management

We suggest that better incorporation of the idea of citizenship into NPM thinking can be acquired through a multidimensional model, such as the one presented here. Our model provides a classification that may better map voluntary enterprises in modern society and better explain them theoretically. Another theoretical contribution of our model may be the examination of the relationship between different dimensions of citizenship behavior in and around public organizations. Here one may follow some literature in political theory and management science that argues that citizenship behaviors at the state, community, and organizational levels are

related (Graham, 1991; Peterson, 1990; Sobel, 1993). An alternative theory may suggest that such a relationship is not possible, and further studies should subject the three perspectives to comprehensive empirical evaluation. The results of this effort may expose the nature of a good and constructive "citizenship syndrome" and the wide basis of voluntary action in society.

So far, we have demonstrated that citizenship behavior has many faces. However, it has only one source, namely, the people and their willingness to engage in the citizenry's constructive action. Building a spirit of new managerialism means bringing the citizens closer to their original role as equal members in the administrative process. An added value is necessary for turning simple bureaucracies and stagnated public service into a more flexible, responsive, and vital entity with broad shoulders on which modern societies can safely rest. The final sections of this article elaborate on the nature of this spirit and the challenges it sets for the future.

THE SPIRIT OF NEW MANAGERIALISM: ADDED VALUE BY NEW CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

The four types of citizenship behavior suggested here may be viewed as one alternative typology of human activism and voluntary actions that are revitalizing administration in modern society. As Joyce (1994) and Box (1998) argued, people in America and other developed democracies are ready for a new citizenship that will liberate and empower them. The new citizenship is calling for a revived relationship with governance, or citizen-centered governance. Citizens should be encouraged to become part of governance, taking on more responsibilities for running their lives rather than treating the administrative process as something separate, themselves as customers to be served or antagonists to be opposed (Ostrom, 1993). According to Schachter (1997), "a new citizenship" must be related to the process of reinventing government, which is a way of creating change through managerial techniques (Box, 1998). Referring to the Clinton administration's National Performance Review, Schachter describes a situation in which

current reform proposals do not include a wake-up call to the public to assume its obligations since customers have no obligations to the enterprise from which they buy products and services. . . . Citizens can sit back comfortably in their rocking chairs and watch government improve to meet their expectations. (p. 90)

Schachter criticizes this view because it encourages passive citizenship, equivalent to Box's free riders, instead of yielding productive involvement and participation. He then suggests a model of citizen owners and active citizenship that may be the ground for new citizenship. In all, these perspectives and models lead to robust citizen reliance on public management's commitment to increasing agency effectiveness and responsiveness. Active citizenship behavior at the

individual or collective level that emerges in national, communal, and organizational arenas represents people engaged in deliberation to influence public sector decision making. It shapes the political agenda and ponders the ends that governments should pursue as well as evaluates how well particular public sector programs work (Box, 1998, p. 73).

Nowadays, NPM literature tries to recognize and define new criteria that may help determine the extent to which public agencies succeed in keeping pace with the growing needs of the citizens (Pollitt, 1988; Smith, 1993). Nevertheless, it has not fully considered the potential advantage of multidimensional models or new-citizenship involvement (Box, 1999). The prime advantage of such citizenship involvement is its long-term effect and continuity. More involvement, participation, and voluntarism by citizens (as individuals or collectively as groups and organized institutions) in different settings (state, community, or organization) are valuable resources that new managerialism should not ignore.

Smith (1993) provides reasoning and support for this notion, arguing that citizens' participation, involvement, and awareness of the performance of public services should be a core element of NPM. It can increase the political pressure placed on elected and appointed public servants, thereby enhancing both managerial and allocative efficiency in the public sector. This process of public accountability to stakeholders and/or citizens is comparable to the role adopted by financial reporting in the private and/or corporate sector. As in the private sector, externally related outcomes (e.g., citizens' satisfaction, perceptions of public administration's responsiveness, perceptions of public personnel's morality and fairness, etc.) have a more profound impact on internal control mechanisms. Managers and public servants become more sensitive to their duties and more deeply committed to serving their public customers. Higher citizenship involvement, altruistic and voluntary activity, participation, and engagement in national or local managerial processes may breed internal organizational involvement, commitment, and innovation by public servants. Furthermore, public employees may become more willing to exert extrarole behavior, prosocial behavior, and OCB (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997) to support the common goals of citizens, governments, and the public service. In return, it is expected that citizens will further develop loyalty, commitment, and participation. They will exert additional effort and contribute to the general good of their environment.

A CHALLENGE FOR GOVERNANCE

A multidimensional analysis of citizenship behavior and its relationship with NPM creates a momentous challenge for governance. As suggested by Lynn (1998, p. 231), NPM of the late 1990s has three constructive legacies for the field of public administration and for democratic theory and practice: (a) a stronger emphasis on performance-motivated administration and inclusion in the administrative canon of performance-oriented institutional arrangements, structural forms, and managerial

doctrines fitted to the particular context. This may be considered a real advance in the state of the public management art; (b) international dialogue on, and a stronger comparative dimension in, the study of state design and administrative reform; and (c) integrated use of economic, sociological, social-psychological, and other advanced conceptual models and heuristics in the study of public institutions and management. These models have the potential to strengthen scholarship in the field and the possibilities for theory-grounded practice. Whereas the first two legacies are widely discussed in contemporary NPM literature, the third is scarcely studied and needs further theoretical development, empirical research, and practical implementation. We argue that the present multidimensional and interdisciplinary conceptual model conforms to the third legacy of Lynn. A recent study by McKeivitt (1998) supports our perspective. Criticizing public administration reforms in several European countries, McKeivitt (1998) argued that "the reforms do not allow for any interest, except self-interest; the measure of success is financial rather than community-based . . . and the reform programs do not take adequate account of citizens" (p. 169). In our opinion, the incorporation of multidimensional analysis of citizenship behavior in the study of new public administration is vital. The voice of citizens (as opposed to the option of exit) and their spontaneous actions must be viewed as a strategic tool for new managerialism in its attempt to improve the public service.

What guidelines should governments follow to respond properly to these challenges? Several suggestions can be defined: (a) enhancing partnership with and empowerment of citizens by various means that are not manipulated by the state. In general, these actions must stimulate environmental conditions that are necessary to generate spontaneous behavior by citizens as individuals or groups or as part of organized institutions (e.g., by means of education, participatory experience in community aid, and through financial support to organized groups); (b) programs of involvement must be governed by citizens and administered by practitioners who understand them; (c) public service practitioners must operate as advisers and helpers to citizens rather than as controllers of public organizations (Box, 1998; Rimmerman, 1997); (d) public administration must be responsible for evaluating these initiatives and learning their outcomes. All programs of citizens' involvement should be under continuous evaluation by unbiased professionals. These can be found in academia or in the private sector; and (e) at the intraorganizational level, public administration is responsible for creating a spirit of help and service beyond formal procedures (but not in contradiction to them). Improved OCB among public employees can become an effective tool in the relationship between citizens and public servants (Morrison, 1996).

Several programs and techniques can be applied to achieve these goals. First, volunteer programs in the fields of health, welfare services, education, and security should receive national and federal support. Adequate training programs of volunteers as well as volunteer leadership and management should be developed and implemented by professionals. Second, educational efforts that emphasize the importance of voluntarism may start in the very first years of school and create

awareness in the very young of the high values of citizenship involvement. A good example is the local democratic club that was established in Culver City, California, and contributes to higher citizenship involvement in community life (<http://www.culvercityonline.com/>). Without such an extensive educational effort, long-term initiatives will remain limited and incomplete. Governments should also be responsible for coordination of cooperation among different voluntary groups and institutions. Coordination may increase the efficiency of volunteer groups and organizations to get more value for effort. However, government's role should not be coercive but must remain consultative. Using their delegated authority, governments can establish public volunteers' committees to coordinate the voluntary activity at the local and national levels. This can be accomplished with the benefit of the experience gained in several countries, such as Denmark and Israel, that develop citizenship involvement through citizens conferences and citizens committees that deal with actual public interests and try to influence decisions on issues that are not fully addressed by governments (see, e.g., <http://www.zippori.org.il/English/index.html>). Governments will maintain their advisory position, providing the citizens with sufficient conditions and experience to work out their spontaneous ideas.

Citizens and citizens' leaders, for their part, have several roles in the process of generating the new spirit of managerialism: (a) The most elementary role is taking an active part in running their own lives and encouraging others to do likewise. As proposed above, this can be accomplished at the individual or collective level. Participating in neighborhood associations or voluntary groups; active involvement in parents' committees at schools; donating money, time, or effort for the development of community services; and encouraging others to take part in such activities are all valuable and important missions. (b) All citizens should exhibit constructive criticism of the public system to provide feedback for politicians and public servants, thereby increasing their responsiveness and sense of responsibility. (c) Citizens and citizens' leaders should serve as socialization agents of voluntary actions. The educational mission of citizens is to avoid passivity and to contribute to motivation for involvement by future generations. This is how better understanding of shared responsibilities in social life can be promoted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Fredrickson (1997) suggested that the spirit of public administration must develop a theory of the public that goes beyond interest group pluralism, beyond public choice theory or representative democracy, and beyond a customer service orientation, to a refined and expanded idea of citizenship. In accordance with this, our article has advanced a new perspective of modern citizenship that may be a starting point for the spirit of new public administration.

According to D. Marshall (1990), the center of the administrative art and science is the citizen being served. But should it be a unidirectional flow of services or a

bidirectional one that involves self-responsibility and active involvement of citizens? Marshall argues that there is a definite need for enhanced citizenship in the administrative process. The good citizen is interested in, active in, and responsible for his or her place in society. Box (1998) attempted to "bring public administration back to democracy by drawing on new roles for practitioners and citizens in the governance of their own communities" (p. xi). He challenged the idea, drawn from the private marketplace, that local residents are only consumers of public services, people who should be treated like customers as the NPM literature continuously argues. Instead, Box suggested that individuals are returning to their earlier role as (good) citizens, people who are the owners of the community and take responsibility for its governance (p. 3).

In line with these ideas, we developed a multidimensional perspective of citizenship behavior that does not necessarily contradict but indeed blends well with the trends of new managerialism and NPM. Our perspective elaborated on (a) settings of citizenship (national, communal, and organizational), (b) levels of analysis (individual and collective), and (c) integration of these dimensions with NPM ideas to create a spirit of new managerialism. This spirit may be defined as a mutual power of MC1, MC2, MC3, and MC4. It asks that governments take strategic steps to promote citizenship values at all levels and that citizens actively participate in spontaneous initiatives and in the process of social building. Public administration structure and culture must become more flexible and responsive to citizens' needs (Vigoda, 2000a). To achieve this goal, it should become active and entrepreneurial in the initiation of partnerships between public servants and citizens. The focus of NPM should adjust more vigorously to include transformation of goodwill to effective operations. In contrast with old managerialism, the new spirit of public management must call for multivariate citizenry action. Public administration, through its professional cadre, should initiate this process and learn its lessons. Investment in spontaneous behavior is low-cost and economical compared with other reform efforts, so it should receive higher priority on the NPM agenda that calls for improved performance of public agencies.

Furthermore, an encouragement of the mini-citizenship pattern may lead to improvement in all other patterns (MC1, MC2, and MC4). Organizational-behavior theory and general management literature can provide additional guidelines as to the nature of this phenomenon and its recommended application in the public sector (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Citizenship behavior should be an integral part of NPM as well as of any other new reform in the public sector. Similarly, much can be learned from research on communitarianism, organizational citizenship behavior, volunteer groups and programs, the third sector, and various other aspects of individuals' altruistic behavior. As suggested by Kramer (1999) and King and Stivers (1998), building relationships between citizens, administrators, and politicians is a long-term and continuous project. For truly democratic government, administrators and citizens must engage each other directly on a regular basis in full-throated public dialogue, neither side holding back anything important. Democratic public administration involves active citizenship and active administration that uses

discretionary authority to foster collaborative work with citizens. In sum, this article proposed that there is something unique about NPM compared with other managerial practices that makes citizenship behavior especially important to incorporate. Thus, the challenge for governance and new managerialism is a more comprehensive application of this valuable knowledge in public administration strategies. Accordingly, this article has suggested an insight into a wider effective use of the concept of *citizenship* in the study of new managerialism.

REFERENCES

- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations: An analytic study*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berman, E. M. (1995). Empowering employees in state agencies: A survey of recent progress. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 18, 833-850.
- Box, R. C. (1998). *Citizen governance: Leading American communities into the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Box, R. C. (1999). Running governments like a business: Implications for public administration theory and practice. *American Review of Public Administration*, 29, 19-43.
- Bozeman, B. (1993). *Public management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.
- Brinton, M. H. (1994). Nonprofit contracting and the hollow state. *Public Administration Review*, 54, 73-77.
- Brudney, J. L. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector: Planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brudney, J. L., & Duncombe, W. D. (1992). An economic evaluation of paid, volunteer, and mixed staffing options for public services. *Public Administration Review*, 52, 474-481.
- Coble, R. (1999). The nonprofit sector and state governments: Public policy issues facing nonprofit in North Carolina and other states. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9, 293-313.
- Cohen, A., & Vigoda, E. (1999). Politics and the workplace: An empirical examination of the relationship between political behavior and work outcomes. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 22(3), 389-406.
- Cohen, A., & Vigoda, E. (2000). Do good citizens make good organizational citizens? An empirical examination of the effects of citizenship behaviour and orientations on organizational citizenship behavior. *Administration & Society*, 32(5), 596-624.
- Conover, P. J., Crewe, I., & Searing, D. D. (1993, September). *Citizen identities in the liberal state*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggat, K. L., Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K. R. (1988). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 8-22.
- Drucker, P. (1966). *The practice of management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Erez, M., Earley, C. P., & Hulin, L. C. (1985). The impact of participation on goal acceptance and performance: A two-step model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 50-66.
- Etzioni, A. (1994). *The spirit of community*. New York: Touchstone.
- Etzioni, A. (1995). *New communitarian thinking: Persons, virtues, institutions, and communities*. Charlottesville: Virginia University Press.
- Fredrickson, H. G. (1997). *The spirit of public administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Garson, G. D., & Overman, E. S. (1983). *Public management research in the United States*. New York: Praeger.
- Gidron, B., & Kramer, R. M. (1992). *Governments and the third sector: Emerging relationships in welfare states*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249-270.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hurd, D. (1989, September 13). Freedom will flourish where citizens accept responsibility. *The Independent*.
- Janoski, T., & Wilson, J. (1995). Pathways to voluntarism: Family socialization and status transmission model. *Social Forces*, 74, 271-292.
- Joyce, M. S. (1994). Citizenship in the 21st century: Individual self-government. In D. E. Eberly (Ed.), *Building a community of citizens* (pp. 3-10). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 539-545.
- King, C. S., Feltey, K. M., & Susel, B. O. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58, 317-326.
- King, C. M., & Stivers, C. (1998). *Government is us: Public administration in an anti-government era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kramer, R. (1999). Weaving the public into public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 59, 89-92.
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reied, F., & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining nursing turnover intent: Job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 305-320.
- Lynn, L. E. (1998). The new public management: How to transform a theme into a legacy. *Public Administration Review*, 58, 231-237.
- Marshall, D. (1990). The restorative qualities of citizenship. *Public Administration Review*, 50, 21-25.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McKevitt, D. (1998). *Managing core public services*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- McPherson, J. M., & Rotolo, T. (1996). Testing a dynamic model of social composition: Diversity and change in voluntary groups. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 179-202.
- Michael, H. (1981). Youth, voluntary associations and political socialization. *Social Forces*, 60, 211-223.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1965). *Political participation*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Monroe, K. R. (1994). A fat lady in a corset: Altruism and social theory. *American Journal of Political Science*, 38, 861-893.
- Morrison, E. W. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior as a critical link between HRM practices and service quality. *Human Resource Management*, 35, 493-512.
- O'Connell, B. (1989). What voluntary activity can and cannot do for America. *Public Administration Review*, 49, 486-491.
- Oliver, D., & Heater, D. (1994). *The foundation of citizenship*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *O.C.B. : The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-164.
- Ostrom, E. (1993, Summer). A communitarian approach to local governance. *National Civic Review*, pp. 226-233.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Perry, J. L., & Kraemer, K. (1983). *Public management: Public and private perspectives*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Peterson, S. A. (1990). *Political behavior*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H. W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27-65.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133-151.
- Pollitt, C. (1988). Bringing consumers into performance measurement. *Policy and Politics*, 16, 77-87.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rainey, H. (1990). Public management: Recent development and current prospects. In N. B. Lynn & A. Wildavsky (Eds.), *Public administration: The state of the discipline* (pp. 157-184). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Rimmerman, C. A. (1997). *The new citizenship: Unconventional politics, activism, and service*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Schachter, H. L. (1997). *Reinventing government or reinventing ourselves*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Smith, P. (1993). Outcome-related performance indicators and organizational control in the public sector. *British Journal of Management*, 4, 135-151.
- Smith, S. R., & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Non-profits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sobel, R. (1993). From occupational involvement to political participation: An exploratory analysis. *Political Behavior*, 15, 339-353.
- Thomas, J. C. (1999). Bringing the public into public administration: The struggle continues. *Public Administration Review*, 59, 83-88.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Study*, 7, 151-165.
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. H. (1972). *Participation in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Vigoda, E. (2000a). Are you being served? The responsiveness of public administration to citizens' demands: An empirical examination in Israel. *Public Administration*, 78(1), 165-191.
- Vigoda, E. (2000b). Internal politics in public administration systems: An empirical examination of its relationship with job congruence, organizational citizenship behavior and in-role performances. *Public Personnel Management*, 29, 185-210.
- Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D. J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 339-348.

Eran Vigoda received his Ph.D. from the University of Haifa in 1998 and is now a lecturer in the Department of Political Science at the University of Haifa, Israel. His research interests include organizational politics, organizational citizenship behavior, citizenship behavior outside organizations, behavior and performance in the public sector, and responsiveness of public administration agencies. His recent work has been published in the Journal of Vocational Behavior, Human Relations, Administration & Society, Public Productivity and Management Review, and Public Administration Quarterly. He is also the editor of the forthcoming volume Public Administration: An Interdisciplinary Critical Analysis by Marcel Dekker.

Robert T. Golembiewski is a distinguished research professor at the University of Georgia, where he is part of the Public Administration program. He is an internationally active consultant

in planned change and is the only academic who has won all of the major research prizes in management: the Irwin in business, the Waldo Award in public administration, the American Association for Public Administration Award in public policy, two McGregor awards for excellence in the application of the behavioral sciences, and the Organizational Development Institute Prize for global programs in planned change. Golembiewski has more than 1,000 contributions to various literatures and has authored/edited more than 75 books.