

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

FOREWORD

Performance and Democracy in the Public Sector: Exploring Some Missing Links in the Study of Administration and Society (Part A—Administrative Performance, Trust in Governance, and Social Equality)

Eran Vigoda*

Department of Political Science, The University of Haifa,
Mount Carmel, Haifa, Israel

**INTRODUCTION TO THE SPECIAL ISSUE:
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS**

The original idea for this special issue of the IJPA can be found in the 2001 meeting of the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA) at Vaasa/Finland. In this meeting a study group on productivity and quality in the public sector have focused on issues of managerial quality, citizens satisfaction and trust in government. Directed by Professor Geert Boukaert from The Catholic University of Leuven/Belgium a cross-European forum discussed for the first time various links between governmental outputs and

*Correspondence: Eran Vigoda, Department of Political Science, The University of Haifa, Mount Carmel, 31905 Haifa, Israel; Fax: 972-4-8257785; E-mail: eranv@poli.haifa.ac.il.

43 citizens trust in democratic institutions across Europe, searching for better
44 conceptual and theoretical ideas as well as valid and reliable empirical
45 instruments that may explore an essential scene in public administration
46 activity. The Vaasa meeting thus signaled, for me and for many others,
47 a growing interest in the relationship among administrative productivity,
48 trust, involvement, participation and other democratic values of modern states.
49 It was then followed by the 2002 EGPA meeting at Potsdam/Germany and a
50 similar planned meeting at Lisbon/Portugal in the year 2003. In all these
51 meetings a progress was made as to our understanding of democratic
52 construction via public administration activity. This special issue is thus a
53 partial summary of various spirits woven in our democracies in recent years
54 and is aimed at encouraging academic and practical discussion of the relation-
55 ship between public administration outcomes and the social impacts it has on
56 our political values, attitudes, positions, and behaviors in modern communities
57 and in democratic nations.

58 In recent decades reforms in public administration, and especially the
59 New Public Management (NPM) doctrine, have raised many questions as to
60 the role of citizens and governments in our modern societies. This leading
61 contemporary paradigm in public administration has emphasized the need to
62 improve administrative performance and to treat citizens as clients. However, it
63 has drawn fire from those who prophesized a resulting decline in citizenry
64 activism and involvement and from those who predicted serious harm to
65 democratic values. The call for increased responsiveness by public agencies
66 was countered by pressure for more collaboration between bureaucracies and
67 social players. This second paradigm believes that the goal of better perfor-
68 mance can be accomplished only by safeguarding and advancing democratic
69 values.^[1-3]

70 In light of the above, this special issue attempts to enrich the discussion
71 about two prominent topics relating to public administration and modern
72 societies, namely *performance* and *democracy* and to explore the conceptual
73 territory between them. Naturally, this is a challenging task, as it tries to
74 assimilate ideas and conceptual thinking from several disciplines such as
75 management, public administration, politics, and sociology. In many ways
76 such a discussion calls for a better balance of managerial/administrative
77 theories with social/humanistic ideology and the creation of a much more
78 realistic understanding of public administration. Thus, despite the various
79 points of view of and dissimilarities between each of the above disciplines, the
80 goal of all of them is the same: to find a golden path between the needs and
81 restraints of the market society and the desires and demands of the citizens of
82 liberal states. While performance and democracy are frequently perceived as
83 two separate concepts, they also have complementary meanings that are
84 central and essential for the prosperous growth of our states and societies.

85 **PERFORMANCE VERSUS DEMOCRACY IN PUBLIC**
86 **ADMINISTRATION: BUREAUCRACY-DRIVEN MODELS**
87 **AND CITIZEN-DRIVEN MODELS**
88

89 Recent criticism of the responsiveness-oriented thinking of new public
90 management has called for a theoretical and practical shift towards increased
91 collaboration in and around public administration.^[1,3] According to this
92 criticism, an emerging view sets forward the alternative where market-based
93 model of public administration need to be assimilated with collaborative
94 relationships between citizens and bureaucracies. Box et al.^[1] suggest that
95 “this relationship is based on shared knowledge and decision making rather
96 than control pleasing and placating” and that “it assumes that citizens have the
97 ability to self-govern, even in these complex and confusing times” (p. 616).
98 Moreover, NPM breeds passivism among citizens as clients by overstating the
99 idea of responsiveness.^[4] Placing the citizen-client at the center sends a covert
100 social message to the people saying, “Make your wish . . . it is our goal to
101 serve you;” yet it adds, “But please don’t bother us . . . leave the professional
102 work to us.” In other words, NPM and the ethos of responsiveness put citizens
103 as clients at the center by asking them about their needs and demands.
104 However, public administrators still ask citizens to keep their distance from the
105 administrative work and the decision-making centers. The covert message is,
106 “Bureaucracy needs to work for you, so keep away.” Citizens’ involvement is
107 accepted only as passive client feedback to actions by the administration.
108 Innovative methods of redefining goals and strategies are left in the hands of
109 politicians or civic servants. Through this message modern public adminis-
110 tration wins the battle for responsiveness, but does not even try to fight the
111 battle for collaboration.

112 Therefore, it seems essential that we turn towards more cross-sectoral
113 collaboration and social orientation in the public sector. In many respects such a
114 move bears a strong resemblance to any kind of administrative reform, one
115 directed at the minds and hearts of policy makers, policy implementers, and
116 other social players such as private entrepreneurs, third-sector organizations,
117 and citizens in general. Doing (good) administrative work *for the public* also
118 means doing it *with the public*, as well as with all those who are concerned with
119 the formation of modern, prosperous societies. Hence, despite some serious
120 obstacles and difficulties, the idea of a “collaborative public administration”
121 may be defined as reform in progress. It should promote the trust of citizens in
122 government, enhance equality, and bring higher levels of citizens’ participa-
123 tion and community involvement into our lives. It is a reform that has the
124 potential of revising our conventional view of government by making govern-
125 ment and public administration more willing to share ideas, knowledge, and
126 power with others, not merely instruct citizens and patronize them.

127 There are two major theoretical models for reforming public administra-
 128 tion: (1) bureaucracy-driven models and (2) citizen-driven or grass-roots-
 129 driven models. Both of these models imply change in the public sector, each
 130 from a different starting point. As will be demonstrated in this special issue,
 131 both models are practical and available. Bureaucracy-driven models view
 132 government and public administration as those who are responsible for the
 133 initiation of change and for making it work properly. Grass-roots-driven
 134 models, on the other hand, make more demands of the people, expecting
 135 that they, instead of governments and bureaucracies, will make the first move
 136 towards reform. These models demonstrate how various reforms became
 137 successful when emanating from the urgent needs of individuals and groups
 138 or from the spontaneous collective support for an original, popular leader.
 139 Naturally, there is no *ideal* model for integrating both of these approaches in
 140 policy planning cycles, but there may be an *ideal type* of model for
 141 collaborative reform, one that should be explored and developed in the
 142 years to come. Naturally, this model is also subject to cultural variations, as
 143 some of the papers in this volume demonstrate quite convincingly.

144
 145
 146 **TWO ESSENTIAL TRACKS IN THE DISCUSSION OF**
 147 **ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE: TRUST AND**
 148 **EQUALITY VERSUS PARTICIPATION AND**
 149 **INVOLVEMENT**

150
 151 Without a doubt, we live in an era of great challenges for modern
 152 societies. The twenty-first century will necessitate enormous changes in our
 153 conventional perceptions of governmental activities and responsibilities. It will
 154 similarly require a reformation of the meaning of citizenship and a redefinition
 155 of the role of citizens, businesses and private sector firms, the third sector, the
 156 media, and academia. All these players, and others, will need to find better
 157 ways to collaborate, and it is the role of academic activity and studies to pave
 158 the way for such productive interaction. The papers included in both parts of
 159 this special issue of the *International Journal of Public Administration*
 160 contribute to the understanding of the linkage between performance and
 161 democracy in modern public administration. Naturally, each paper focuses
 162 on a particular vision and culture. Nonetheless, they all point, implicitly or
 163 explicitly, to the conflict between “collaborative” administration and “respon-
 164 sive” public administration as a core element in helping bureaucracies evolve.
 165 Hence, the papers are divided into two sections. Part A focuses on the
 166 relationship between performance and trust in government, as well as the
 167 relationship between performance and the idea of citizens’ rights and social
 168 equality. Part B puts more emphasis on the relationship between administrative

169 performance and the actual participation of citizens in political activities and in
170 communal life. While the division into separate sections may be useful for
171 those who wish to concentrate on only one aspect of the relationships, I believe
172 that both parts should be read as one, due to their strong mutual interactions.
173 Indeed, performance has implications on the attitudinal and perceptual levels,
174 but these are tightly connected with citizenship behavior and involvement in
175 the political and social arenas. Thus, Parts A and B are really variations on the
176 same theme about democratic values and thus should be seen as one
177 complementary collection.

178

179

180

PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE, TRUST IN GOVERNANCE, AND SOCIAL EQUALITY

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

Part A is based on four papers by S. Van de Walle and G. Boukaert, R. Harisalo and J. Stenvall, S. M. Haque, and R. Mano-Nagerin. The papers are similar in that they provide a broad theoretical overview of the relationship between and the impact of performance-oriented governance on democratic values such as trust in governance and social equality. The first two papers deal with trust in governance and with its relationship to the idea of productivity and performance. The other two papers focus on the concepts of citizens' rights and gender inequality in modern nations.

The first study in this part is the stimulating paper by Boukaert and Van de Walle on the problem of causality between performance and trust in governance. Up until now, the intriguing question of "what comes first?" (performance or trust) has received little if any attention in the literature. The authors begin the paper by presenting the commonly held hypothesis that better performing public services will lead to increased satisfaction among their users, and this, in turn, will lead to more trust in government. However, they observe that this hypothesis contains a number of flaws and is only valid within a certain context. According to their view, the converse of the original hypothesis is also reasonable, namely that negative attitudes toward government in general lead people to evaluate the quality of its public services in a negative way. The goal of their paper is thus to offer a framework within which the relation between public sector performance and the citizens' attitudes toward and trust in government can be investigated. Based on an impressive literature review of the ideas of trust, confidence, faith, and performance in government, the paper proposes five alternative models entitled (1) disconnection; (2) dominant impact; (3) multiple influences; (4) reversed causality; and (5) moderated reversed causality. While these models are not subjected to empirical investigation in the paper, the conclusions are enlightening. To explore the relationship between the evaluation of the quality of public service

211 performance and evaluations of government in general, the authors recom-
212 mend focusing on the object(s) of evaluation, the evaluation criteria, and on
213 the causal processes in the evaluations. Finally, they argue that restoring trust
214 in government cannot be based solely on a managerial action-plan, but
215 requires social engineering as well, where the core question should be how
216 government can alter these perceptions and evaluation criteria in a way that is
217 acceptable in a democratic society.

218 Following Van de Walle and Boukaerts' theoretical discussion of inter-
219 relationships between performance and trust, the next paper by Harisalo and
220 Stenvall examines the intra-organizational sphere as another level of analysis.
221 Their paper, "Trust Management in the Finnish Ministries: Evaluation of
222 Management Systems," is another look at the issue of trust and confidence in a
223 western society. Based on a random sample of 1450 respondents from some
224 5500 civil servants in Finland, Harisalo and Stenvall try to find an answer to
225 the question, to what extent do civil servants have confidence in the manage-
226 ment systems of the 13 ministries in Finland and what does their level of
227 confidence mean for the understanding of performance in these institutions?
228 They argue that such an internal trust or mistrust may indicate organizational
229 fragmentation and become a barrier to overall productivity in the public sector.
230 Moreover, the authors suggest that the ability of management to successfully
231 implement its strategic plans and policy is efficiently slowed down or impaired
232 by civil servants who have reason to doubt the validity of the programs or
233 goals. Hence, by linking employees' trust with the general "public goods" as
234 delivered to citizens, the paper builds a theoretical model that sees trust as a
235 consequence of various antecedents in the organizational and public arenas.
236 The authors thus make a strong case for connecting the intra and extra
237 organizational environments as a means of bridging the ideas of performance
238 and democratic values.

239 Next in this part is an interesting paper by Shamsul Haque who examines
240 the contradictory trends of NPM and citizenship rights in several non-western
241 societies. The paper, entitled "Reinventing Governance for Performance in
242 South Asia: Impacts on Citizenship Rights," notes that, based on the global
243 idea of "reinventing governance," South Asian countries have adopted
244 significant policy reforms and structural changes during the past two decades.
245 Business-oriented reforms in other countries such as Bangladesh, Nepal, India,
246 Pakistan, and Sri Lanka are reviewed, suggesting that these changes have led
247 to a situation where the state-centered model of development administration
248 has been replaced by market-driven models borrowed largely from advanced
249 capitalist nations and from the "new public management" paradigm. The
250 paper shows how a business/market shift in governance has enhanced overall
251 administrative performance by stressing the contribution of efficiency and
252 quality. However, it further notes that there is a tendency to overlook the

253 implications of such a transition for the basic rights and entitlements of
254 citizens in the region. As Haque correctly claims, the public sector is being
255 downsized, privatized, and deregulated in favor of market forces and individual
256 choices, and as a result the entitlement of citizens to social justice and basic
257 needs has come under fire. The paper argues that despite significant changes in
258 governance and in its performance, the status of citizens' political rights has
259 hardly improved at all in most South Asian cases. Moreover, as the citizens
260 are redefined as utilitarian consumers or clients, their capacity to exercise
261 collective power has allegedly weakened. Thus, Haque argues, there is an
262 increasing need to reinforce citizenship in public governance, enhance
263 citizens' empowerment, and adopt a "citizens first" approach. In light of
264 this view, the article examines the contradictory patterns of advancement in
265 South Asian states and their implications for the political and social rights of
266 citizens in South Asia. It concludes by stressing the need for vigilant attention
267 to citizenship rights in the current context of governance.

268 The fourth and last paper in this part is Mano-Nagrin's essay on
269 "Performance and Equality in Public Sector Wages." This is an intriguing
270 empirical study that deals with the question of performance and democratic
271 values from another point of view, namely that of equality between genders
272 and among various other social minorities. The paper describes how demo-
273 cratic values, as reflected in work equality values, paired with the organiza-
274 tional performance characteristics as defined by the levels of organizational
275 inputs and outputs, affect gender differences in wages. Mano-Nagrin's study
276 used a resource policy theory in the public sector to argue that there is a need
277 to ask how organizational criteria of performance, coupled with values of
278 gender equality and "participative bureaucracy," generate or eliminate demo-
279 cratic processes of work reflected in gender-based differences in wages. As
280 suggested in the paper, the mere adoption and implementation of equal
281 employment opportunity principles do not guarantee liberty and equality
282 and thus cannot eliminate discrimination against various social groups such
283 as women or other minorities in public administration. Based on a sample of
284 83 local authorities, the paper found that despite the democratic conception of
285 the public sector's equal employment opportunities, variations in the organiza-
286 tional performance account for gender differences in wages. Thus, a question
287 arises about the contribution of market/business oriented reforms in public
288 authorities to the increase of equality between genders in terms of wages,
289 opportunities for career development, and the better integration of women as
290 employees and managers in the public sector. The paper ends by noting that
291 democracy and equality, even though not "market" values, still provide the
292 ideological pillar on which human societies rely to prosper in the future.

293 All in all, the papers presented in this part illustrate how the idea of better
294 administrative performance can be linked to the ideas of trust in governance,

295 citizenship, political and social rights, as well as social equality among
296 different groups. The papers come from four different countries/regions;
297 Belgium and Finland as representative of the traditional European system
298 on one hand, and South Asian countries and Israel, representing other western
299 oriented nations. They are all strong evidence of the way to bridge
300 performance targets and democratic concerns that result from the implementa-
301 tion of managerial reforms such as NPM. Moreover, the papers vary in that
302 they use multiple research methods and approaches to capture the meaning of
303 performance and democratic values. While some rely mostly on soft data such
304 as citizens' perceptions of government (Van de Walle and Boukaert and,
305 Harisalo and Stenvall), others put more emphasis on hard data (Haque and
306 Mano-Nagrin). Nonetheless, most of the studies come to the conclusion that
307 the relationship between performance and democratic values in terms of trust
308 and equality raise serious questions that are somehow paradoxical.
309 In most cases the challenge of improving performance in public administration
310 with or without modern reforms such as the NPM have signaled a crisis in
311 citizens' trust in government and in other social indicators such as citizens'
312 rights and gender equality.

313

314

315

REFERENCES

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

1. Box, R.C.; Marshall, G.S.; Read, B.J.; Read C.M. New public management and substantive democracy. *Public Admin. Rev.* **2001**, *61*, 608–619.
2. Vigoda, E. From responsiveness to collaboration: governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. *Public Admin. Rev.* **2002A**, *62*, 515–528.
3. Vigoda, E. Administrative agents of democracy? A Structural Equation Modeling(SEM) of the relationship between public sector performance and citizenship involvement. *J. Publ. Adm. Res. Theor.* **2002B**, *12*, 241–272.
4. Vigoda, E. Are you being served? The responsiveness of public administration to citizens' demands: An empirical examination in Israel. *Public Admin.* **2000**, *78* (1), 165–191.