Developing Patterns of Governance in Public Organizations

CHARLES CURRAN

"Growth is not automatic. It does not follow from success."'
"But all dinosaurs had tiny brains."

Dinosaurs, the largest and most terrifying land animals that ever prowled the planet, could have used some governance. They simply could not cope with change. The process was gradual and they did not rush to destruction in the manner of lemmings—yet although Marlin Perkins was not there to photograph the event for "Wild Kingdom," most authorities acknowledge that after 150 million years, there are no more dinosaurs. It seems that when nature's forces altered their landscape, climate and food supply, the giant beasts could not adjust. They liked things the old (very old) way, and competition from mammals, the new creatures in the neighborhood, did not help matters. The new plants were less tasty than the old ones; exit the plant-eaters—and exit the meat-eaters, too, for their favorite food was the plant-eaters.

It matters what kinds of governance models are employed in the public organizations now and in the future. The performance of assigned functions is dependent upon the establishment of policy, the allocation of resources, the utilization of personnel, and the regulation of services—the stuff of governance. Although the survival of some organizations may not be the crucial issue, perhaps those which fail to carry out their assigned functions ought to go the way of the dinosaur and make way for organizations which can perform.

While consolidation has affected some police agencies, and decreased enrollment has forced the closing of some colleges, public organizations
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such as those concerned with law enforcement and education are not in immediate danger of extinction; however, the quality of their, and our, survival is at issue. Change is the most demonstrable feature of current existence and society insists that public organizations like law enforcement agencies and institutions of higher learning be responsive. Society still demands transportation, clothing, shelter, food, and all the traditional, production-oriented outputs, but society also demands to be healthy, safe, entertained and informed, and those public organizations charged with providing such services must learn to anticipate and respond to those demands. Organizations which do not do so may become this era's dinosaurs, victims of their own inefficiencies; or worse, they may become scavengers — another of nature's cruel sentences imposed upon creatures who do not evolve.

Some public organizations appear to be making a move. The judiciary has recognized that organizational changes are in order. Police are observing that society considers the apprehension of alleged perpetrators only one of a number of essential police functions. Educators, especially those involved in higher education, are questioning the suitability of bureaucratic and collegial models to deal with conflict. Even some organizational theorists are beginning to realize that in order to share their insights and discoveries, they will have to get out of the laboratory and communicate with practitioners in symbols that both groups understand.

Libraries do not enjoy, or suffer the consequences of, the status of performing a crisis function. Those who argue that the need for information has reached a crisis stage may be correct, but the possibilities are slim of their showing that libraries — as they are presently organized and governed — address those needs. The fact is that more citizens know and care about "Laverne and Shirley" than about the public library. For years, Ralph Blasingame has been attacking (not in the jargon of organizational developers and model-builders but in the language of theoreticians and practitioners) some lingering dysfunctional influences of the prototype library and its inability to cope with change. Those interested in the governance of public libraries should consult his latest effort.5

The purpose of this article is to present evidence of general trends in the governance of public organizations. A brief look at (1) recent developments in organizational theory, (2) the lag between theory and practice, and (3) the fate of some management tools is followed by a closer inspection of governance trends in three major areas: government, law enforcement and higher education. The article concludes with some suggestions. While no fossils are intentionally overlooked here, it is not a purpose of
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this article to identify likely candidates for a "Museum of Extinct Public Organizations." If a fossil count were taken, however, there would be fewer organizations than theories of organization among the extinct and the near-extinct.

SOME DEVELOPMENTS

Whatever developments may occur in theories of governance, there will be a lag between those developments revealed in the laboratory or in the literature and those in practice. This is because the writers and experimenters are different people from the workers. In other words, practice will always postdate theory because by the time a theory evolves, the organizational problems requiring theoretical attention predate the interest in developing theories to deal with them. By the time the needed theory is developed, the organization has dealt with the old problem and faces a new problem. The cycle starts again. Note the contention is not that practice is necessarily ahead of theory, just different. Litchfield observed many years ago that administrators act without any real theory of administration to guide them.4

Referring specifically to organizational development activities and consultant intervention which is sometimes "over-researched and underconceptualized," Weisbord relates the less-than-satisfactory results that consultants achieved when they tried to help Roman Catholic and Protestant theological schools to combine some of their efforts. Whatever the theoretical bases for the team-building activities which the consultants instituted, the project was in serious trouble from the outset. Teaching team-building to organizational constituents with no track record of cooperation and few or no interdependent structural ties requires considerable skill and knowledge of client operations.

Organizational developers might protest that citing this example of poor application of organizational development technique does their profession a disservice. The point is that successful application of technological wizardry requires that the client, as well as the technology, be studied before remedies are applied. A related consideration is that an affection for systems application should be tempered by knowledge gained through study of the environment in which systems theory or systems remedies would be applied. There is evidence that the superimposition of a systems solution on a subset of constituents with unresolved problems which the new system does not specifically address results in a nonsystem. One might protest: Bad systems theory! Poor example! Yes, it is bad systems theory,
but it is not a poor example. In the name of systems, such mistakes are made.6

Insofar as developments in organizational theory are concerned, a now-famous pair of researchers have made a significant contribution to closing the gap between theory and practice: "The Lawrence and Lorsch theory is so potent because it views such variables as structure, conflict, goals and outcomes within different environments, and shows that different conditions call forth different organizational forms."7 Relationships between organizational fit and performance relate crucially to governance patterns, especially to the establishment of policy and the utilization of personnel.

Any claim that a citadel such as the traditional rational bureaucracy is under siege and undergoing changes deserves some attention. The alleged attack comes from those who no longer accept the religion of centralized control which excludes them from decision activity. Qualitative values inspire attack on cost/production and quantitative values. Service economy, with its many unmeasurable — or as yet unmeasured — outputs, nudges production-oriented economy for a position at center stage, if it does not upstage it completely. These are processes which may significantly affect the governance of public organizations, especially the nonproduction-oriented ones.

Police forces, hospitals and even universities are in the business of improving the quality of human life; they "enrich experience," "enhance creativity,"8 or promote the general well-being — outputs that have always challenged and sometimes defied specific measurement. Some organizations survive through political activism, "through essentially political appeals based on the support of their values and activities by outside publics."9 As a consequence, the allocation of resources becomes politicized, largely because services paid for and consumed collectively are difficult to measure. Simpson calls this a "radical departure from rational bureaucratic values." He further states that "politics is nonrational," because political decisions are products of compromise, not "accounting criteria of efficiency."10

Another consequence of the attack on traditional rational bureaucracy is the absorption into the bureaucracy of values espoused by activists and interest groups. Big business, for example, has responded to the demands of women's groups, minority spokesmen and environmentalists by launching activities infrequently related to "productive efficiency or old fashioned rationality."11 This is not to say that rational (production-oriented) decision activity is on the way out with the dinosaurs. It may mean, however, that amateur social scientists and social activists have made more progress
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toward humanizing organizations than professional behavioral scientists
who merely describe the phenomena and do little to lessen the lag between
theory and practice.

One should not hasten to conclude that the assimilation of activist
causes by bureaucratic organizations is as attributable to humanizing in-
fluences as it is to enlightened self-preservation (one of bureaucracy's en-
during and distinguishing characteristics). By espousing or appearing to
espouse the causes of activist detractors, the organization effectively weak-
ens its opponents and may strengthen its own position.

Even if these changes are only cosmetic adjustments, and even if they
do not necessarily herald the advent of humanizing influences, they do
signal the opportunity to increase organizational responsiveness. It would
be premature to cite this as a trend in governance, however. One observes
that prominent humanists are actively trying to promote their wares in
the organization. Advocates of interpersonal communication, training
groups, and participatory problem-solving have not lost their fervor, nor
have they jettisoned their beliefs about alleged employee characteristics,
such as that which holds that participation in decision activity leads to
satisfaction and thus leads to productivity.

Kaplan and Tausky marshal some arguments, based upon research
findings, that cast considerable doubt on the relationships between satis-
faction and participation and between satisfaction and productivity.12
Moreover, the authors are critical of some superstars. Argyris, Bennis and
Maslow are suspected of allowing ideological orientations to influence
their observations. Does the dogma of the immaculate perception hang on?13 "Largely based in academic surroundings which afford them oppor-
tunities for creativity and self-actualization, have organizational humanists
inadvertently infused their own values into their theories and overgeneral-
ized their perspectives to all workers?"14

If the organizational humanists are off-target and if their view of man
in the organization is a slanted one, then based upon the theorists' own
value-laden concepts of man, their theories are unlikely to have a lasting
impact upon governance. Their views on motivation may render their
models incapable of guiding improvements in organizational structure and
governance, especially if worker dissatisfaction with bureaucratic organi-
zation is overstated. Workers may be less impatient in the shop than some
theorists imagine.

Bureaucracy observers note the phenomenon of absorption of causes,
and they also detect what has been referred to as an evaporation process
in the federal government bureaucracy. Because change tends to occur
slowly in the bureaucracy, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether tools such as management by objectives (MBO) or Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) are successful, or even whether they are alive, dead, or live in the sense that their concepts endure under a different descriptive tag.

Distinguishing between management tools which provide data to help make decisions about what ought to be done and those which provide data for deciding how to run the operation (MBO being an example of the latter), Rose comments on the fate of MBO as it was adopted and implemented at the federal level in 1973. Apparently, the age-old problem of establishing and articulating objectives was not made easier by adopting MBO, because this method concentrates on implementing and evaluating objectives, not just on listing them. Any hope that MBO would result in the reform of the federal bureaucracy soon disappeared, largely because the objectives set and published were noncontroversial and apolitical. Loss of interest at the top levels of the Office of Management and Budget filtered down through agency heads and management associates. The safe objectives advanced by bureaucrats drew little interest from political bigwigs, who had plenty of controversial issues that they hoped to influence. It became nonproductive for executive office staff to concern themselves with an agency objective such as the published intention to prepare a report by a given date, without an accompanying agency commitment to the contents of the report. The record shows that at least 80 percent of the agency objectives filed in 1973 and 1974 were safe, apolitical and unlikely to spark controversy.

The paper exercises of 1973 and 1974 may not be heralded as a major managerial innovation, but in some agencies remnants of MBO-type activities persist. "Perhaps it is better to turn from a legalistic determination of its status to a more atmospheric one, concluding that MBO has evaporated, becoming a part of the climate of management, albeit a part whose specific influence is limited and incapable of precise measurement." Similarly, PPBS seems to have evaporated, not disappeared. Its spirit lives in that the program analysis which it was designed to influence continues. The formal structure has disappeared, but analytical concepts in current usage are offspring of the formal structure of PPBS.

Identifying trends in the governance of public organizations requires one to focus on a type of public organization, for not to do so would result in the production of little more than a partial picture drawn from a mosaic of patterns. Even focusing on a type of organizational structure — the bureaucracy — provides only a limited, if useful, view. No promise
Eveloping Governance Patterns

of completeness accompanies the report which follows, because concentration of focus on governmental, law enforcement and educational agencies compensates only partially for the vastness of the issue. Some preliminary observations about such trends, however, are suggested by the parts thus far presented. In seeking to perpetuate itself, i.e. to remain in control of governance, an organization may battle inimical forces, and when the organization encounters real threats, it may affect adjustments in governance that will assimilate the demands of pressure groups, absorbing even their personnel. These workings have a way of sustaining the reigning authority and placating the challengers, who, having seen their causes succeed through absorption, vanish or go in search of other causes. The report that follows here cites challenges to the bureaucratic instrument of governance, but only in higher education is the bureaucratic model under serious attack.

TRENDS IN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Political rhetoric invests the word reform with some inherent good, but political reality challenges successful reform candidates to keep their promises. For example, a promise to reform or streamline the federal bureaucracy must encounter a severe challenge in the realization that a chief executive needs the federal bureaucracy to help him run the country. No president of the United States who really enters into an adversary relationship with the federal bureaucracy is likely to find the going smooth. Warwick notes that bureaucrats who do not see change—especially change which would result in debureaucratization—as preserving their interests will vigorously resist it.17 (John Pfiffner pointed out this fact in 1935.)18 Warwick’s insights add dimension to the well-known facts of bureaucratic life at the federal level in that he has probed the inner workings and made discoveries about fundamental aspects of the bureaucracy. It is with these aspects which reformers must deal if they are to be successful.

Words like accountability and reform, and expressions like “decentralize the decision-making process” are high-octane utterances which, if repeated often enough in the right political climate, can help to elect reform candidates. Recent government scandals at the federal level provided the appropriate climate, and a number of reformers were swept into office as a number of incumbents were swept out. The current trend may be to elect reform candidates, but evidence of massive reform as a trend in governance at the federal level awaits discovery.
Possibilities for bureaucratic responsiveness may be greater when efforts to decentralize political and administrative machineries are successful. The bureaucracy may not permit these changes; it may view decentralization as dismemberment and resist this threat to its survival. The values of self-preservation that apply in the organization about the organization may, however, not apply to all decision-makers. For example, some of the rationality and efficiency (values closely associated with older bureaucratic models) may be replaced by other values, such as those advanced by environmentalists or energy conservationists in an effort to make the government responsive to societal needs. Frederickson is one who claims that if these tradeoffs are to occur, they have the best chance under decentralized conditions.19

Support for decentralization at the state level is offered by Sigelman, who has observed that “the quality of administration is not closely related to centralization of the decision-making process.”20 This is a tentative conclusion, but it is based on the use of specified standards for evaluating the quality of administration in the various states, and it announces no trend in the direction of decentralization at the state level of government.

Two trends are observable at the local level of government: (1) the continuance of revenue-sharing, which is the result of approval at the federal level; and (2) the continued popularity of the city-manager form of government. In combination, the two may result in less local decision input than anticipated. Almy reports the results of a study showing that there is little significant public involvement in the decision to spend federal revenue sharing funds and that city managers exert considerable influence on, yet provide few opportunities for, public review and participation in the budgeting process.21 As a power-to-the-people measure, revenue sharing seems less effective than some had anticipated. Almy hastens to observe that his data do not permit the conclusion that if citizens had more say, the decisions to spend would be different. There is cause to suspect, however, that in light of the increasing popularity of the city-manager form of government, there may be a corresponding increase in manager-influenced budget decisions and a decrease in examples of citizen participation which could encourage responsiveness on the part of the manager.

By default or by design, budget power may be headed into the hands of fewer people than reformers had hoped. Slogans may get politicians elected but they do not pay the bills. “Power to the People” is of less interest to city officials—especially those fighting the urban crisis battle—than “Money in the Treasury.”
Developing Governance Patterns

Especially since Watergate, the public's confidence has been eroded and daily press revelations of examples of corruption in government encourage the erosion process. Cincinnati's city manager William Donaldson believes this corruptibility is a function of a poor accountability mechanism — that crimes being committed are "crimes of opportunity rather than hard core white collar corruption." In an effort to build public trust in government, Cincinnati is developing a system of accountability aimed at removing opportunities for accepting kickbacks, skimming receipts, padding payrolls, and using city materials and time to work on personal projects and other "crimes of opportunity."

Whether Cincinnati is ushering in a trend remains to be seen. Decentralization of governmental decision-making is hardly a trend at the federal level, but at the local level home rule is gaining momentum. Glendenning and Reeves note the strengthening and broadening of state and local officials' powers to set policies relating to their own employees, powers reinforced by key U.S. Supreme Court decisions on wage and hour regulations.

Federal legislative and executive actions also affect local governance. Revenue sharing and countercyclical aid aimed at combatting unemployment have been controversial programs. Insofar as trend-influencing properties of these measures are concerned, they seem to continue to strengthen the decision-making positions of local fiscal authorities to the exclusion, it is charged, of input from the citizen.

Extension of revenue sharing and grant opportunities has fueled the efforts toward home rule. Available funds allow local governments more latitude in establishing and executing policy, but innovations in the decision-making mechanisms of metropolitan areas are scarce. There does seem to be a trend toward employing professional managers to oversee administrative functions in the municipalities.

TRENDS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The governance of law enforcement agencies is also affected by issues which confront federal, state and local governments. Organizational structure, the use of management tools, control and responsibility, centralization versus decentralization, and responsiveness to societal needs are only a few of these issues.

The consolidation of police services cannot be described as a trend, but interest in such activity is widespread on the part of both proponents and opponents. It is common to think of consolidation as an economy
measure aimed at streamlining services and ending unnecessary duplication of expenses in related areas. Economic criteria may not provide the chief basis for judging the success of consolidation and metropolitanization of police services. Socioeconomic characteristics are more responsible, according to Fachon and Lovrich, for citizen satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the organizational pattern.24

Clearly, matters of function and responsibility must be settled before organizational patterns develop. Kenney foresees consolidation and expanded efforts at instituting regional bases for police service, but he observes that policing is no longer the exclusive responsibility of police forces. His claim that the "basic responsibility for the policing of society remains with a disciplined people,"25 is a proposition inviting explanation. How does a society exercise that basic responsibility and still allow its representatives (delegates, really) the policing authority required to do the policing? The acceptance of Kenney's proposition necessitates the exploration of ways to put the concept into practice in the streets, precincts, courts and jails.

In an attempt to establish goals and objectives and to organize to accomplish them, some police agencies are turning attention to employee-management relations, the need to attract and retain good personnel, and the establishment of personnel administration and other specialized units in police departments.26 The employment of civilians by police departments is another growing practice that has yet to reach trend proportions. Where this practice is judged to be substantially beneficial (especially where savings are realized), the variety of jobs for civilian employees is likely to increase.

It may be the nature of bureaucracy to impose on its membership certain duties which some members regard as irritating and/or unrelated to their essential functions. Librarians who rise in state hierarchies, for example, frequently find themselves engulfed in reports and proposals. Some have been heard to complain that they have become paper-shufflers and bureaucrats instead of librarians. Police are not spared this situation, and the acquisition of civilian forces to aid in administrative duties is welcomed. Gray clouds do appear, however, in the form of complaints by civilian forces about low pay. If such complaints are met with salary and benefit adjustments, the increased expense could substantially reduce the cost initiative for hiring civilian components.27

Attention to the more basic issue of organizational planning has yet to reach trend proportions, but the efforts of the Kansas City (Missouri) Police Department to engage in long-range planning, grant selection,
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computer-assisted planning procedures, and research and development activities deserve notice. The use and fate of certain management tools will be especially interesting to watch. A tool like PPBS, for example, requires operational statements of goals. Goals so stated — in ways that can be measured — call for police to translate operationally the goal of maintenance of public safety. What is a tolerable number of rapes for the month of March? Some societal forces, uneducated in the niceties of budget jargon, might be uncomfortable with any figure as a “tolerable” number for any crime.28 Perhaps there are ways around the language which will avoid conflict.

What happens, however, when pressures of economy and politics or economy and social welfare conflict? Many organizational principles, which are theoretical constructs, are based almost exclusively on economics; when principles of industrial economy are imposed on police, some problems arise. Not all police efforts are quantifiable; some are. An economic equation may help administrators to decide how many patrolmen to deploy to a traffic intersection, but when certain inalienable rights require protection or when criminals must be prosecuted if police are to keep faith, what purely economic principles apply?

The problem is probably more basic than one of finding ways to describe and execute a police function. Richardson claims that police are asked to do the impossible: to prevent and control crime in a society, committed to freedom and economic individualism, which permits a huge amount of social and economic inequality.29 Given these conditions, a search for trends in governance indicates that police at all organizational levels face enormous problems. Society’s expectations fluctuate and make the office of commissioner an extremely vulnerable one, subject to both mayoral and constituent displeasure. “No matter what the formal powers of control and discipline may be, civil service protection and internal cohesion against outside threat reduce the administrator’s ability to run his own department.”30 Internal cohesion among rank and file results in conservative and negative reaction to outside pressure for change; one may consider, for example, the fate of civilian review boards and special review agencies and commissions. Furthermore, many patrolmen feel rejected by the very society they have pledged to protect. These feelings reinforce suspicions and promote a solidarity on the force that results in the maintenance of the status quo rather than the pursuit of innovation.

It is small wonder that police would consider change a threatening issue. They serve a society that is concerned with personal safety, supportive of “law and order” issues, gradually reinstating the death penalty,
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intolerant of criminal behavior, and tolerant of harsh law enforcement. This same society, however, also appears to want to treat antisocial behavior with new and/or different approaches, and considers law enforcement only one of a number of appropriate police functions. Compounding this formidable obstacle is the fact that, in too many cases, "each unit in the criminal justice system pursues its own goals rather than those of the system as a whole."

Kenney describes efforts to develop a criminal justice system composed of integrated subsystems: police, courts, prosecuting agencies and correctional agencies. Like Richardson, he observes that these agencies often function as a nonsystem. To deal with this situation, "massive efforts at reform are being undertaken by the federal government through the allocation of large sums of money for research, education and operational improvement administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration" and by state and local agencies. How successful are current efforts to integrate, to institute changes, to influence change? Kenney claims that "the current police administrative environment generally mitigates against change."

These are conditions which must affect any trend in the governance of law enforcement agencies. They produce serious conflict between fluctuating societal expectations and police administration and middle management, which are generally resistant to change. In spite of this conflict, and partially because of it, there is discernible movement in the direction of clarifying the police role, establishing higher academic requirements for police service, instituting a greater variety of in-service training programs, and gathering and interpreting better data about crime and criminals.

System aspects which characterize relationships among the public organizations charged with maintaining the social order are detected in the complaints of police who claim that arrested criminals are not prosecuted, in the complaints of judges who protest the backlog of cases, and in the complaints of appellate review advocates who see theirs as a mission to install accountability measures in the judiciary. The ubiquitous resistance to change endures among the men in black as it does among the men in blue.

Robin has some excellent insights to share on this topic. In the administration of criminal justice, practitioners exercise a number of discretionary powers, and they may view any change as weakening or threatening to the exercise of such powers. Criminal justice reform movements, with a heavy management-by-objectives emphasis that focuses on out-
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come, are viewed as particularly threatening to sentencing powers. Specifically, appellate review is opposed by most judges who are uncomfortable with the idea of writing sentence justifications which are subject to review, criticism and even reversal. This is disruptive to routine and is threatening to the autonomy of judges who prefer to avoid sanctions and who jealously guard prerogatives.

A feature of a reform movement begun in bureaucratic mechanisms is that change is usually championed by and imposed by those higher in the pyramid. Those upon whom reform is imposed see themselves as having to suffer the consequences of change, while the decision-makers whose routines are undisturbed look on from their loftier positions and enjoy the benefits that their highly publicized reform has won. Therefore, in addition to wanting to avoid justifications for sentencing, judges resist appellate review because they see it as an imposed change that has disruptive consequences for them, but not for the champions of reform in the hierarchy who impose it. As long as reformers ignore the fact that judges, like all human beings, require some incentive to compensate them for their risk-taking, reform movements such as appellate review are likely to encounter continued resistance. “What rewards are offered that would be sufficiently persuasive and satisfying professionally and psychologically to motivate such self-sacrifice in the name of ‘improving the system’?”—that may be the pivotal question.

One modification in the organization of the judiciary may be on the way, however, probably because it is seen as a nonthreatening, helpful measure for dealing with congestion in the courts. Where the attempt to separate questions of liability from questions of damage and the appointment of more judges have failed to speed court procedures, the office of state court administrator seems to be succeeding in two important ways. Some of the administrative tasks which once burdened judges have been shifted to these officers, and the court administrator has been able “to provide a liaison with the legislative and the public and private groups who have an interest in the administration of justice.” Legislative liaison is considered “a necessary precondition to modernizing the courts and increasing their efficiency,” for it is through such contact that the judiciary is able to get sufficient financial support.

What trends exist in the governance of public organizations charged with preserving the public welfare? Reform is a popular term that draws unfavorable reactions in the establishment, especially in lower echelons. Except where some police forces are taking steps to alter and expand their services in response to specifically interpreted societal demands, most
decisions about policy, allocation of resources, and regulation of services perpetuate the status quo. The hiring of civilians to fulfill certain police and judicial functions seems to be the most apparent trendlike occurrence in these organizations.

TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

*Omerta* (the Sicilian word meaning “code of silence”) and “publish or perish” are mutually exclusive commands that have great bearing upon what is known about certain organizations.

Public university administrators find their policies, budgets and curricula subject to legislative review; faculty are evaluated by students, colleagues, deans, and tenure and promotion committees; and students and their activities are on constant display. Citizens have addressed to newspaper editors angry letters demanding that professors work more than eight hours a week for their fat salaries. Campus unrest in the 1960s, the coming of collective bargaining to academe, enrollment issues and the high visibility of public colleges and universities are among those factors which combine to make public higher education a likely environment in which to study governance. While the increases will be slower than those in the 1960s, institutions of higher education will experience a continued increase in enrollment, which will peak in 1982. This period will see an emphasis on preservice career education, as well as on continuing education for those who seek to update skills. These forecasts have serious implications for the governance issue. How accurately a university appraises demand and how swiftly it accommodates change may determine its very survival.

The view of the governance issue presented by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is worth noting. In its “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,” the association describes an “inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students and others...[that requires]...adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.” The statement does not, however, explain how and why a “distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.” For over fourteen years the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges has been preparing this statement which ACE “recognizes...as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of
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governing boards, faculties and administrations. The statement is interesting reading, but it will do little to remove doubts that AAUP has ever rushed to perceive an issue in time to do anything about it.

Whatever its shortcomings, the statement acknowledges the need to understand the decision environment. Gove and Floyd have recently searched the literature of higher education for efforts to describe the external political environment in which college and university administrations function. They noted an abundance of analyses of internal organizational structure and of the mission of higher education, but a "relatively low level of development of the literature on higher education politics." The authors were able to show evidence that the disappearance of older political boundary lines is known to some researchers. The politics of the outside world are becoming part of the politics of the university. Forces of change are detected, and if universities do not respond with programs designed to address those changes, other groups may determine what their response should be. Gove and Floyd concluded that although no one has yet defined the role of the university in the political arena, university-based political scientists are beginning to realize that their own environment is as appropriate for study and analysis as are other areas of society.

That environment is further described by Van Dyne, who reports that by late 1974, twenty-seven states had "statewide coordinating boards for higher education as well as governing boards for individual institutions"; these bodies "occupy the legal and political turf between the various universities (which have their own 'governing boards') and the state governments." These boards subject the campuses to external controls and reduce their independence significantly. Among the powers exercised by some of them are licensing and program approval, the establishment of enrollment ceilings, and the setting of tenure standards.

Wherever these boards exist, power drifts from the campus toward the state. A trend toward centralization thus appears, but, as has been noted, little headway has been made in understanding that environment toward which power tends to drift.

The inner environment of students, faculty and administration has more often been the focus of study and is better understood. Bureaucratic and collegial models of governance are under close scrutiny, if not attack. In the university a "political model is closer to an accurate description of the actual state of affairs and is potentially more helpful for constructive conflict resolution than is the ivory tower model of rational, selfless enlightenment which is purported to exist among a community of scholars."
Older, tamer issues, such as men in the women’s dorm and library hours, sometimes tested the capacity of university governance to maintain order. Today’s issues rock the very foundations of academe and they are fueled by ideological commitment not invested in earlier ones. Older models of governance will not accommodate the charged issues of the late 1970s.

Some evidence of this change can be drawn from findings which show decision-making processes to include faculty as well as administrators. In an effort to determine the decision-making roles of deans in liberal arts colleges of large public universities, Schuh questioned deans about twenty-one issues of academic administration. He found that nineteen of the twenty-one issues were instituted or implemented by faculty or department chairmen, not deans—but deans maintain the vital approval prerogatives, so theirs remains a potent decision-making role. If these are legitimate examples of governance by the governed, and if they constitute a real shift in power rather than an isolated example, the university version of the bureaucratic model with its structural concessions to collegiality may be on the way out in favor of a political model.

A comparison of bureaucratic, collegial and political models characterizes the bureaucratic model as applicable to the administrative structure of the college or university; the collegial model as consistent with the usually peaceful sharing of interest and involvement among students, faculty and administrators; and the political model as accepting of conflict as “a normal aspect of organizational existence and, consequently, focusing on conflict-resolution procedures.” All three models have something to contribute to an acceptable theory of college or university governance which helps to explain current phenomena and to provide expectations of future events. Bureaucratic and collegial models have poor forecasting capabilities and have failed to deal successfully with some recent events (e.g., campus unrest, collective bargaining, and the struggle for scarce dollars). The political model, with its major focus on change, treats conflict as normal in the flow of events; bureaucratic and collegial models do not.

The political model requires that students and faculty exert a great deal of energy in the experience of self-government, shared decision-making and power politics. (Many still avoid this experience, considering it inappropriate in academe—but their numbers dwindle.) Political models must be engineered, however. Their features are probably not present to any great extent in those faculty senate organizations which are mere concessions to the desires of some faculty to earn a voice or of some adminis-
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trators to divest themselves of decision activity they would rather not exercise.

Collective bargaining is the issue that most clearly indicates a need for the conflict-resolving properties of the political model. As unions on the campus grow in strength, they frequently become involved in issues of curriculum implementation. A serious problem is thus created, for the unions' frequent exclusion of department chairpersons and almost always of administrators systematically eliminates the influence of those who can contribute constructively to such policy decisions. To offset this problem (or, perhaps, trend), Kemerer and Baldrige call for the establishment of deliberative forums which bring together members of the academic community — teachers, administrators, support staff and others — and thus involve them in governance. Unions should promote these forums, because the collective bargaining arena remains an inappropriate setting for academic policy deliberation. Such bodies may not differ substantially from the faculty senate-type organizations which exist with unions on some campuses. Even joint membership in such organizations does not eliminate the we-they attitudes that frequently develop. Union sponsorship of institutionwide deliberative forums may be the key to peaceful and productive coexistence.

In economics classes the term collective bargaining was once used by professors to describe an activity of labor unions. Now the professors are also selecting collective bargaining agents; this is an identifiable trend. Occasionally, another term, retrenchment, which rarely used to apply to college teachers, becomes a topic of concern on campus. Cutbacks and closings are also part of the current scene, and while they are not yet trends or prevailing tendencies, they are closely associated with unionization — which is a trend — and may accompany the trend toward decreasing enrollment forecast for the 1980s.

Universities may soon discover that their chief concern will be how to attract and keep students, i.e. how to survive. A realization likely to affect the allocation of resources and the utilization of personnel is that teaching activities have a greater immediate impact on keeping students at the university than research and publication. Shall "instruct or destruct" replace "publish or perish"?

It is difficult to agree with an opinion that the trend in higher education will be away from governance per se and toward academic redesign. The two seem so closely related. Academic redesign can come only as the result of decision activity in matters of policy, resource allocation, person-
nel utilization and service regulation, and the entire academic community is likely to be involved in this. Diamond lists eight prerequisite conditions for promoting effective and healthy responses to problems associated with change. All of them relate to governance as defined here.

Trend-watchers observe the establishment of coordinating boards — extra layers in the state government bureaucracy — that siphon power from the university to its outer environment. That same outer environment is supplying clients at a diminishing rate and by 1980 there will be a downward turn in enrollment, accompanied by demands for more career-oriented education. Trend-watchers observe that the internal affairs of the university seem frequently drawn along lines best described by a political model. Major universities also seem to be developing an interest in policy analysis. Perhaps academic leadership will discover how to promote responsive behavior in the organization, but manipulative appeals for accountability unaccompanied by measures to implement responsibility are mere gestures according to Etzioni. He suggests coalition-building as a method for mobilizing the forces of change.

Among the most significant advances made in the area of understanding organizational behavior are the findings of Lawrence and Lorsch, whose pioneering investigations on relationships between organizational fit and performance have won them recognition in the academic community of theorists and scholars. The locus of recognition makes their findings of only potential value. Their landmark achievements must somehow be communicated to practitioners (i.e. persons capable of making change) in ways that convince them that their organizations can benefit from the researchers' insights. Warwick has described the anatomy, and has begun even to capture the soul, of the bureaucratic hierarchy. Blau and Schoenherr have demonstrated the relationship between organizations and environment. The stuff of understanding is available. Only when these and other theoreticians and researchers are able to convince practitioners that their hypotheses and theories are as supportable and valid in the trenches as they are in the laboratories will conceptual frameworks enabling organizations to deal with change have a chance at adoption.

As long as theoreticians aim first and only for the approving nods of others in their fraternity, as long as outside management teams are hired to consult and run, and as long as researchers hawk models that are either so incomplete or so abstract that they defy implementation, the trends in the governance of public organizations will always be behind the developments that need to be governed.
Developing Governance Patterns
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