Antecedents to managing publicness: a study of professional and cultural socialization

Cullen C. Merritt

School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

merritt1@iupui.edu

Morgan D. Farnworth

School of Public Affairs & Administration

University of Kansas

mfarnworth@ku.edu

INTRODUCTION

Research on public-private organizational distinctions, publicness theory, and the "public" characteristics of government, business, and nonprofit organizations are among the most frequently cited in the discipline of public administration. Theoretical insights offered by this stream of research have led multiple scholars to identify publicness as a leading paradigm of public administration research (Lan and Anders 2000; Riccucci 2010). Public administration researchers highlighted the theoretical significance of publicness at the Minnowbrook Conference in 2008, a gathering (held once every 20 years) devoted to "critical inquiry and honest examination of the field" (O'Leary 2011, p. i3) (see Chapter 14 in this volume for additional discussion on Minnowbrook and related concepts). Attendees, select scholars early in their academic careers, expressed commitment to "serve as change agents to uphold and shape the culture of Public Administration, a culture that is open-minded to and appreciates multiple theoretical and methodological perspectives, *with an emphasis on 'publicness'*" (O'Leary 2011, p. i5, emphasis added; see also DeHart-Davis et al. 2010). Now a decade removed from Minnowbrook III, theoretical and empirical research in this area continues to gather momentum, due in large part to the implications of publicness for organizational behavior (Wittmer and Coursey 1996; Wheeler and Brady 1998; Brewer and Brewer 2011) and performance (Andrews et al. 2011; Walker and Bozeman 2011; Zhu and Johansen 2014; Petrovsky et al. 2015). This research informs us that publicness is not simply a theoretical instrument for classifying the degree to which an organization is public; it also presents implications for public management (Bozeman 1987; Merritt et al. 2018a), namely, managing for public outcomes, or what Moulton (2009, p. 889; see also Bozeman and Moulton 2011) refers to as "managing publicness."

Recent scholarship on managing publicness better positions scholars to consider antecedents to managing publicness, such as the role of a manager's professional and cultural socialization. In this chapter, we consider professional and cultural socialization with respect to management tenure, gender, and race, and explore how these factors associated with a manager's socialization influence the way in which a given manager seeks to achieve public outcomes in the context of their organization (for a related discussion, see Chapter 11 in this volume). Better understanding of the effects of socialization in this publicness-specific context of management, whether emanating from tenure, gender, or race can " lead to insights into factors that make certain styles of leadership more effective or relevant in some contexts as compared with others" (Hamidullah et al. 2015, p. 249). While this study theorizes on the independent effects of these socialization factors, it may lay additional groundwork for scholars to explore the interactive effects of management tenure, gender, and race on managing publicness, similar to Breslin et al.'s (2017) research on intersectionality in public leadership.

In this chapter, we review existing theories on classifying public organizations, offer propositions on the role of professional and cultural socialization in managing for public outcomes, and provide implications of this research for public administration scholarship and practice.

PUBLICNESS THEORY

Public administration scholars often examine the internal and environmental factors associated with various organizational outcomes, such as behavior and performance (Merritt et al. 2018a). Research in this area has provided clarity on the effects of varying organizational types on organizational outcomes and employ one of four analytical frameworks: the generic approach,

the core approach, the dimensional publicness approach, or the "realized publicness" approach (for summaries on the theoretical development of publicness theory and various publicness frameworks, see Moulton 2009; Merritt 2014; Rainey 2014; Su 2017; Merritt et al. 2018a, 2018b).

The earliest form of sector analysis occurred under Murray's (1975) generic approach, where government and private organizations were viewed as not being comprised of meaningful differences with respect to organizational structure, decision-making processes, or managerial functions (Lau et al. 1980). Distinctions identified between organizations in the public and private sectors, such as the motivations of personnel, were also generally discounted, suggesting that these differences do not shape the ways in which organizations operate. While studies rejecting the basis of the generic approach contend that private entities are primarily motivated by profit maximization and government organizations by political interests (Rainey et al. 1976), Murray (1975, p. 365) posits that "the desire for personal power and security is the same; responsiveness to outside pressures is the same. In short, once general priorities are established, public and private bureaucracies operate the same." Interestingly, motivating the generic approach, in part, are issues at the center of contemporary discourse on public–private distinctions (Merritt et al. 2018a), such as the blurring of sectors (Bozeman 1987), provision of public goods and services by private entities (Frederickson 1999; Heinrich and Fournier 2004; Koppell 2010), and the similarities of certain management practices across government, private, and hybrid organizations (Helco 1977).

The core approach to classifying organizations rejects the generic approach, contending that by virtue of legal ownership, public and private sector organizations vary in terms of their internal structures and processes, environmental conditions, and organizational–environmental

transactions (Rainey et al. 1976). The basis for the public–private distinction lies in the division between political authority and market incentives, and their impacts on government and private organizations, respectively (Dahl and Lindblom 1953; Perry and Rainey 1988). Whereas the objectives and outcomes of public organizations are dictated primarily by the political context of their work, the objectives and outcomes of private organizations are largely shaped by their shareholders, clients, and the market economy (Nutt and Backoff 1993; Walker and Bozeman 2011). The different legal statuses of government and private organizations—including their different political and market contexts—also have implications for the management of a number of issues, such as measurement of performance, emphasis on efficiency versus equity, and clarity regarding the "bottom line", among others (Allison 1987).

Although an organization's legal ownership provides a useful framework for understanding its behaviors and performance outcomes, Bozeman and Bretschneider (1994) maintain that the core approach may yield limitations for organizational analysis. In part, this is because organizational outcomes are the product of institutional and structural mechanisms working in concert with ownership, rather than ownership alone (Heinrich and Fournier 2004; Merritt 2014). Moreover, the blurring of sectors introduces empirical challenges to analyzing organizations primarily through an ownership lens (Dahl and Lindblom 1953; Wamsley and Zald 1973; Bozeman 1987; Bozeman and Bretschneider 1994). While core publicness does not fully discount the public characteristics of which many private organizations are comprised, it downplays the theoretical insights that research on private organizations may offer when seeking to classify public organizations (Merritt et al. 2018a, 2018b).

The dimensional approach to classifying organizations integrates factors alongside ownership to identify organization type (Bozeman 1987). According to Bozeman's (1987)

dimensional approach, organizations are more or less public (as opposed to purely public or private) depending on the degree to which they are subject to political authority, which is determined by the combination of distinct factors: public ownership, level of government funding, and degree of exposure to government regulation. Public ownership refers to collective ownership by a political community, such as a municipality, and provides formal control of assets and any value generated (Petrovsky et al. 2015). With regard to funding, public organizations are largely funded by tax receipts and funding from political bodies, while private organizations rely considerably on fees paid by consumers of services (Andrews et al. 2011). Finally, regulation captures the degree to which elected officials or their agents leverage government authority to shape the policies and practices of organizations via laws and oversight (Hood et al. 2000). Much can be understood about organizations by knowing the combination of public- and market-based authorities to which they are subjected (Bozeman 2013). For example, organizations receiving the majority of their financial resources from government may be less responsive to product consumers compared to organizations whose primary funding is acquired from customers (Andrews et al. 2011). Even though publicness is principally associated with political authority to which government organizations are subjected, this form of authority is also salient in private for-profit (Moulton 2010; Moulton and Feeney 2010) and third sector (Moulton and Eckerd 2012) organizations.

Publicness presents implications for a number of public management inputs, processes, and outcomes, such as that which is associated with service to vulnerable populations (Su 2017), information technology (Bretschneider 1990), inequality (Zhu and Johansen 2014), strategic management (Bozeman and Straussman 1990; Nutt and Backoff 1993), administrative practices related to integrity (Molina 2015), ethical work climate (Wittmer and Coursey 1996; Wheeler

and Brady 1998), regulatory administrative approach (Carter 2016), managerial reforms (Antonsen and Jørgensen 1997), productivity (Bozeman and Bretschneider 1994), goal ambiguity (Chun and Rainey 2005), quality management (Goldstein and Naor 2005), performance (Heinrich and Fournier 2004; Feeney and Welch 2012), and internal resource acquisition functions (Scott and Falcone 1998).[1]

Building on both the core and dimensional publicness frameworks, "managing for public outcomes, or managing publicness, requires attention to the combined effects of regulative, associative, and cultural-cognitive public value institutions" (Moulton 2009, p. 889). According to Moulton's (2009) realized publicness framework, institutions are defined as systems "comprised of regulative, normative [or associative], and cultural cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life" (Scott 2008, p. 48), including those which better enable organizations to achieve public outcomes. Scott (2008) defines these types of institutions in his classic book, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests*. Regulative institutions involve "the capacity to establish rules, inspect others' conformity to them, and, as necessary, manipulate sanctions—rewards and punishment—in an attempt to influence future behavior" (Scott 2008, p. 52); normative institutions "introduce a prescriptive, evaluative, and obligatory dimension into social life" (Scott 2008, p. 54); cultural-cognitive institutions represent "shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and the frames through which meaning is made" (Scott 2008, p. 57). Indicators of regulative institutions include rules, laws, and sanctions; indicators of normative institutions include horizontal activities, such as certification, accreditation, and cooperative agreements; indicators of cultural-cognitive institutions include common beliefs and shared logics of action (Scott 2008; Moulton 2009). The ability to identify regulative, associative, and

cultural-cognitive public value institutions, Moulton (2009) contends, better positions scholars identify the "public" characteristics of government organizations and the effects of publicness on the organizational achievement of public outcomes (see also, Merritt et al. 2018b). That is, the identification or institutionalization of public values within organizational designs, structures, and processes may facilitate the effective management of publicness.

In considering the empirical utilities of the multiple publicness frameworks, Scott and Falcone (1998, p. 4) call for scholars to bear in mind that, "no one perspective has assumed a level of paradigmatic preeminence." One approach to classifying public organizations may provide increased utility over another depending on which organizational characteristics are under investigation (Scott and Falcone 1998) or whether publicness is specifically being utilized as a management tool to advance public outcomes. For the purposes of managing publicness to fulfill public outcomes, Moulton's (2009) realized publicness framework may be particularly valuable for managers seeking to steer organizational outcomes (see also, Merritt et al. 2018b). Managers employing the realized publicness framework must take into account their organization's legal ownership, funding from the government, and regulation by the government when designing their organizations to fulfill public outcomes. As Moulton (2009, p. 889) states:

> In light of the blurring between sectors, it is critical to not only understand public organizations, but also to identify the factors that contribute to the achievement of public outcomes across sectors … By integrating the theory of dimensional publicness with recent work on public values, this analysis presents a framework that defines realized publicness as public outcomes predicted in part by institutions embodying public values.

Moore (1995, p. 52) maintains that public value is generated through governmental activity, and that specific managerial actions integral to achieving public good are tied to government "deploying the money and authority entrusted in them to produce things of value to particular clients and beneficiaries" and "establishing and operating an institution that meets

citizens' (and their representatives') desires for properly ordered and productive public institutions." While Moore identified these responsibilities as governmental, managers in the private and nonprofit sectors similarly adhere to certain organizational processes to generate public value; they deploy resources and authority (with the backing of government) and establish and operate institutions that fulfill the needs of citizens.

So what makes managing publicness distinct from other approaches to management? This approach does not primarily base management prescriptions on the sectoral designation of an organization. Rather, this approach to management is designed for any organization—regardless of its sectoral affiliation—that aims to address public problems. For example, business management scholars may find value in publicness theory, as their discipline has begun to place greater emphasis on the study of corporate social responsibility, which emphasizes that the actions of organizations in the private sector "contribute to social welfare, beyond what is required for profit maximization" (McWilliams 2015; see also Merritt et al. 2018b).

ANTECEDENTS TO MANAGING PUBLICNESS: PROFESSIONAL AND CULTURAL SOCIALIZATION

Scholarship has yet to consider the antecedents to managing for public outcomes, specifically those related to a manager's professional and cultural socialization. Socialization, according to Presthus (1978), is described as a process by which cultural values and institutions mold personalities and behaviors. More specifically, professional socialization is associated with behaviors resulting from career- and instruction-related experiences and cultural socialization refers to intrinsic characteristics—both of which may explain or predict an individual's values and behaviors (Presthus 1978). Hamidullah et al. (2015) note that values shape managerial

preferences regarding the desired means for achieving particular outcomes, which in turn influence organizational performance. That is, "values can be communicated by organizational leadership and become part of, and embedded in, an organization's culture" (Stazyk et al. 2017, p. 606). As Hill and Lynn (2009, p. 192) put it, the values, beliefs, and ethics of individual participants, such as managers, work in concert with shared organizational norms to broadly characterize the organization and its divisions. Thinking specifically about the institutionalization of public values within organizational structures, designs, and configurations, managerial value systems present in light of socialization may effect "(a) perceptions of situations and problems, (b) decisions and solutions, (c) views of other individuals and groups, (d) perceptions of success, (e) understanding of what constitutes ethical behavior, and (f) decisions to accept or resist organizational pressures" (Stazyk et al. 2017, p. 607). Through exploration of the characteristics of managers, we can better postulate the possible ways in which managers of varying professional and cultural backgrounds may interpret and employ publicness, specifically regulative, associative, and cultural-cognitive institutions, to drive organizational outcomes.

We consider professional antecedents with respect to management tenure, and cultural antecedents with respect to gender and race. Considering these antecedents is critical because it sheds light on the implications of a professionally and culturally diverse workforce of managers charged with leading organizational efforts to address public problems across sectors. While the internal and environmental public value institutions facilitate organizational performance— specifically the realization of public outcomes—to consider these institutions absent from the background of the managers putting these institutions in place overlooks the implications of the social attributes of top-level managers.

Management Tenure

Research on organizational theory and behavior demonstrates the role of a manager's professional background on organizational outcomes. Professional socialization forces are shaped in large part by "indoctrination" by the organization in which an individual is presently employed and can shape managerial values, strategies, and decision making (Hamidullah et al. 2015). Hamidullah et al. (2015, p. 252) maintain that:

> organizations play a key part in making sure that the values of the individual are consistent with the goals of the organization. A key part of this is organizational socialization, which scholars have considered as happening when administrators adopt behaviors and preferences that are more consistent with the organization, and minimize their own personal influence on their behavior.

They go on to state that:

> organizations may provide such interventions and cause individuals to place value on different goals. Administrators may place those values ahead of their personal beliefs to increase opportunities for promotion or further career success. This internalization of organizational beliefs can happen because of peer pressure or because the individual begins to agree with the dominant organizational view. (Hamidullah et al. 2015, p. 252)

Stazyk et al. (2017) note that socialization factors present themselves through both formal and informal organizational processes.

Management tenure plays a role in exposing actors to an organization's social expectations and is a particularly salient driver of public outcomes (Juenke 2005). While Lewis's (2008) research demonstrates that career professionals with longer tenures are more successful in leading organizations to stronger performance, Gallo and Lewis (2012) provide insight into the institutions managers tap to meet these ends. They contend that, similar to political appointees, career managers are likely to have connections to political stakeholders (Gallo and Lewis 2012). With time, these political connections are likely to attract greater resources to the agency (Gallo

and Lewis 2012). While organizational and environmental mechanisms associated with greater exposure to political authority (that is, government ownership, funding, regulation) may suggest that regulative institutions are beyond managerial control, this can actually be managed (Moulton 2009; Merritt et al. 2018a), such as with respect to the level of governmental resources (for example, funding) managers generate for their organizations.

Proposition 1

Managers with longer tenures, all else being equal, are more likely to leverage regulative institutions (for example, attracting funding from political authorities) to achieve public outcomes.

The procedures and activities related to collaboration and networking are examples of associative institutions which may be employed by managers to achieve public outcomes. McGuire (2006, p. 33) describes collaborative public management as "the process of facilitating and operating in multiorganizational arrangements in order to remedy problems that cannot be solved—or easily solved—by a single organization." Similar to the process of collaboration is managerial networking, which recognizes that "program success requires collaboration and perhaps coordination with other parties [for example, state legislators, local business leaders, nonprofit managers] over whom managers exercise little formal control … [and specifically refers to] a pattern of two or more units, in which not all major components are encompassed within a single hierarchical array" (O'Toole 1997; O'Toole and Meier 2004, p. 470). For managers seeking to advance public outcomes, collaboration or networking behaviors may consist of activating stakeholders and participants, framing rules and regulations within a network, mobilizing actors around a common objective, and synthesizing a favorable environment (Agranoff and McGuire 2001; Davis and Stazyk 2016).

Longer management tenure is associated with greater network connectedness and stronger management within networks (Juenke 2005). Juenke (2005) offers theoretical rationale on this relationship in the context of secondary education, contending that "new superintendents may quickly become frustrated trying to deal with combative school board members or overwhelmed with an uncooperative state education bureaucracy. Conversely, more experienced superintendents have closer ties with many of the network nodes, understanding which ones need to be cajoled and which ones need to be avoided altogether" (Juenke 2005, p. 116). As a result, managers with shorter tenures will experience "information deficiencies, exclusion from information and influential networks, and a peripheral position of control" (Juenke 2005, p. 116; see also Reis Louis 2001, p. 378). To the extent that managers understand the specific networks or collaborators that are integral to organizational effectiveness—which clarifies as one's tenure extends—they will invest greater time within the "right" or influential networks to generate positive outcomes for their organization (Juenke 2005). That is, management tenure is associated with the ability to identify and engage in quality networks, and is not necessarily associated with frequency of network interactions (Juenke 2005). Furthermore, Milward and Provan (2000) demonstrate that network stability elevates network effectiveness. With tenure being associated with stability (Meier and O'Toole 2001), managers may feel the positive effects of participation in a network and begin to recognize the benefit of repeated interactions over time (La Porte and Metlay 1996; Klijn and Teisman 1997; Milward and Provan 2000; Juenke 2005). For example, the ability of the manager to effectively network or collaborate is linked to greater efficiency (Provan and Milward 1995; Agranoff and McGuire 2001), increased organizational stability through environmental buffering (O'Toole and Meier 1999; Huxham 2003), and augmented performance (Meier and O'Toole 2003; McGuire 2003; O'Toole et al. 2005). Management

skills, the manager's reputation, and other strategic considerations likely play key roles in network interaction and any success generated (Meier and O'Toole 2001; Milward and Provan 2000).

Proposition 2

Management tenure, all else being equal, is positively associated with a manager's utilization of quality associative institutions to achieve public outcomes.

An important caveat must also be considered in light of this proposition. Juenke (2005) maintains that "over time, previously useful and cooperative networks may become rigid and unproductive. In fact, this is the type of structure-building and uncooperative behavior that bureaucracies often exhibit". Managers may respond to network inefficiencies or ineffectiveness by integrating formal measures (Juenke 2005) or may even begin to identify alternative mechanisms to generate positive outcomes outside these networks (Alter and Hage 1993; Milward and Provan 2000; Juenke 2005).

Gender

While women are generally well represented in public sector employment, only 30 percent of women are in government management and decision making positions in the United States (OECD 2014). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2014) notes that institutional barriers sometimes prevent women from gaining leadership positions in organizations. Despite these institutional barriers, women have made incremental gains in employment as public managers (Perrott 2002). As a result, the extent to which gender matters in the context of management has received increased scholarly attention in the field of public administration and organizational studies (Stivers 2002; Meier et al. 2006a; Portillo and Dehart-

Davis 2009; Hamidullah et al. 2015). For example, Meier et al. (2006b, p. 899) maintain that

female public managers more often exhibit emotional labor, defined as "the projection of

feelings and emotions needed to gain cooperation of clients or coworkers, the ability to see

another's side of the issue and integrate that perspective into what the organization does."

Emotional labor, the practice of which aligns with dimensions of emotional intelligence (for

example, empathy, motivation, self-regulation, self-awareness, and social skill), is linked with

positive organizational outcomes (Goleman 1998; Francouer et al. 2007). By this observation,

public organizations with a higher proportion of females acting as middle and upper managers

may experience strong organizational performance with respect to productivity, reduced

employee turnover, and client satisfaction (Goleman 1998; Meier et al. 2006b).

Stivers (2002, p. 76) contends that females have "different personal qualities and life

experiences than men, and therefore approach organizational leadership distinctively" (see also

Meier et al. 2006a). Distinctions in this area may present implications for the achievement of

public outcomes because the nature of managing public organizations has shifted from planning,

organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (POSDCORB)-based

administrative duties introduced by Gulick (1937) to a more leadership-based, externally

engaged management approach which recognizes that complex public problems cannot be

addressed effectively by a single organization (Provan and Milward 1995; O'Toole 1997;

Agranoff and McGuire 2003). Meier et al. (2006a), in particular, suggest that the range of

competencies of which organizational leaders must be comprised to successfully manage in an

era of (collaborative) governance are consistent with managing for public outcomes. They

contend that "public managers and those who research their roles should think of managerial

tasks in terms of a tripartite distinction among managing upward, downward, and outward—

shorthand for involvement with sets of considerations and also stakeholders who can be expected to matter in the production of public value" (Meier et al. 2006a, p. 26). Specifically:

> managing upward, or dealing with overhead political leaders, is likely accomplished at least in part—probably significantly—through the interactions of managers with their political principals. Managing outward, a way of thinking about the networked character of public programs, can also be characterized by explicit interactions. Managing downward [by interacting with subordinates], the most conventional and core component of public management, can be more complex behaviorally." (Meier et al. 2006a, p. 27)

In analyzing the distinctions between male and female managers, Meier et al. find that female managers consistently outperform men in leveraging political authorities to address organizational objectives. Specifically, "women managers are able to convert the negative impacts of managing upward into positive results on several of the organizational performance indicators. In contrast, women managers generally get lower results from managing downward and managing outward than do their male counterparts" (Meier et al. 2006a, p. 33). Fox and Schuhmann (1999), analyzing female city managers, similarly find that females place greater value on open communication with elected officials when seeking to enhance organizational performance outcomes compared with male city managers. These findings may result from the observation that women (particularly those at higher organizational levels) may compensate for their lack of organizational power, traditionally speaking, through the utilization of bureaucratic means (Portillo and Dehart-Davis 2009).

Proposition 3

> Female managers, all else being equal, are more likely to leverage regulative institutions to achieve public outcomes.

In terms of managing outward, studies reveal that female managers are more effective in developing new formal networks with external organizations such as occupational associations

and social groups, while men more frequently rely on "good old boy" networks (Meier et al. 2006a); see also Guy and Duke 1992). Hamidullah et al. (2015, p. 251) note that "women tend to be more collaborative and democratic and their presence in organizations has an impact on policy outcomes and organizational performance." Even when studies find that women managers spend quantitatively less time than male managers engaging in networks, female leaders generate higher-quality results for organizational performance through these interactions (Jacobson et al. 2010). This may be attributable to the aptitude of female managers to tap into quality networks not previously leveraged.

Proposition 4

Both male and female managers engage associative institutions to achieve public outcomes; however, all else being equal, female managers are more likely to develop partnerships with organizations with whom the principal organization has not previously engaged.

Race

Public organizations are becoming increasingly diverse with respect to race, including at the managerial level. Racial diversity has implications for organizational performance (Wise and Tschirhart 2000; Pitts 2005). For example, Pitts's (2005, p. 628) study demonstrates that "if target population diversity is higher, then the need for diversity among managers is higher. Matching diversity between the two levels—public managers and target population—produces the most positive and consistent relationship between ethnicity and performance." Thompson (1976) contends that a critical mass of racially diverse managers is integral to representation. Interestingly, prior to research conducted by Stazyk et al. (2017), public administration research

has offered relatively little insight into whether (and to what extent) the perceptions of public values differ between minority and non-minority managers. "Accounting for race in the public values context matters insofar as it likely affects how public managers make decisions about service and program delivery" (Stazyk et al. 2015, p. 25) and may specifically offer insight into how organizational leaders of color institutionalize public values to achieve public good.

Conner's (2016, p. 296) study on the role of shared identity in the collaborative process notes that "the degree to which Indian education officials in public schools believe that native nations should, and have a right to be, involved in the internal affairs of public schools related to Indian education have a significantly higher level of engagement with tribal government." Related to this finding, Connor's study suggests that minority managers who aim to achieve public outcomes by integrating cultural-cognitive institutions, such as the participation of service recipients in the organizational decision-making process, may also find such institutions are alone insufficient to advance public outcomes. Stakeholder participation in the policymaking and implementation process is often contingent upon elected officials' commitment to public policies that benefit the stakeholders (or target population) in question (Nicolson-Crotty and Meier 2005; Ingram et al. 2007). The government is sometimes directly responsible for initiating public participation by affected stakeholders (Daley and Reames 2015). As Connor (2016, p. 292) explains, "public policies send powerful messages to groups that, over time, become institutionalized and engrained in the political psyche. The disproportionate treatment of particular groups in society can greatly affect their participation in the political system" (see also Schneider and Ingram 1993; Soss 1999). With minority managers reporting a stronger preference for the public administration values of efficiency and effectiveness (Stazyk et al. 2017), we may expect minority managers to view managing upward with political authorities as a necessary

precondition to utilizing mechanisms such as public or stakeholder participation in policy implementation.

Proposition 5

When pursuing public outcomes, minority managers, all else being equal, are more likely to secure support from or through regulative institutions prior to leveraging cultural-cognitive institutions.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The chapter offered a preliminary theory on the roles of professional and cultural antecedents in managing publicness. More specifically, this chapter considered how management tenure, gender, and race may shape our approach to managing for public outcomes. These factors related to our socialization may shape the management tools as well as organizational structures and configurations managers identify, value, and ultimately employ when designing their organizations to advance public outcomes amid increasingly multifaceted and complex governance systems. While we theorize how certain professional and cultural socialization factors may influence a manager's approach to structuring their organization to achieve public outcomes, we do not consider there to be an ideal form of socialization, nor do we contend that socialization factors considered in the present chapter represent an exhaustive set.

Public administration may benefit from additional research in this area (including the empirical analysis of our theoretical assertions) for a number of reasons. First, the role of professional and cultural antecedents to managing publicness enables scholars to marry two important areas of public administration research—publicness and diversity (for a discussion on diversity in US public administration, see Chapter 16 in this volume). At the time of writing,

publicness theory has provided insight into how to classify "public" organizations (Rainey et al. 1976; Bozeman 1987; Moulton 2009) and how to effectively manage institutions with public value implications (Moulton 2009; Bozeman and Moulton 2011; Merritt et al. 2018a). Diversity scholarship informs researchers that a person's culture, background, and experiences are fundamental to that individual's perception of public values (Bozeman and Johnson 2015; Stazyk et al. 2017) and may shape how public values are evoked in management strategy to pursue public outcomes in organizations (Hamidullah et al. 2015). Research on diversity also calls for scholars to further consider how the range of characteristics tied to a person's background serves as complementary or competing forces to effective management (Hamidullah et al. 2015; Breslin et al. 2017) Together, research on organizations and the varying backgrounds of the managers who lead them may provide scholars with a more holistic understanding of factors integral to the organizational realization of public outcomes.

This chapter may also present implications for human resources management, particularly the recruitment, training, and development of senior managers. During the recruitment process, organizations may benefit from understanding how a prospective manager's cultural background (Hamidullah et al. 2015; Stazyk et al. 2017) and professional experiences (Petrovsky et al. 2015) may individually shape their management strategy in light of the organization's mission. Recognizing that strategic management skills diminish over time (Getha-Taylor et al. 2015), efforts to continually develop organizational leaders may prove more effective if training is tailored for a single individual, taking into account how their professional and cultural background may uniquely shape their management. For example, organizations training top-level leaders with extensive management tenures may benefit from taking into consideration this key aspect of their background, while simultaneously recognizing that tenure

may not singularly (or even primarily) explain or predict one's approach to managing for public outcomes.

Just as theory on diversity management and representative bureaucracy maintain that having diverse sets of values will enhance organizational decision-making (Selden 1997; Keiser et al. 2002; Stazyk et al. 2017), future research should aim to build upon the work of Nabatchi (2012), Thomas (2013), and Bryson et al. (2013), among numerous other scholars, to better understand how citizens can fully engage their unique characteristics to shape the fulfillment of public outcomes in their private lives (Nabatchi 2012) (see also, Chapter 24 in this volume). As Merritt et al. note, even if individuals never advance to management positions or

> lack capacity in their eventual employment to shift their organization's focus or investment in the achievement of outcomes that align with public values, they will gain an appreciation of how activities, such as serving on a community-based task force or participating in political discourse, can also contribute to the public good. (Merritt et al. 2018b, pp. 20–21; see also Nabatchi 2012)

Indeed, even outside of a management context, a diversely socialized and engaged citizenry may play an essential role in advancing the public good.

NOTE

1   Bozeman and Moulton (2011); Merritt et al. 2018a, 2018b; and Rainey (2011) provide

      comprehensive reviews of empirical studies concerning the effects of publicness.

REFERENCES

Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire (2001), 'Big questions in public network management

      research', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **11** (3), 295–326.

Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire (2003), 'Inside the matrix: integrating the paradigms of intergovernmental and network management', *International Journal of Public Administration*, **26** (12), 1401–22.

Allison, Graham T. (1987), 'Public and private management: are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects?', in Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde (eds), *Classics of Public Administration*, Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks-Cole, pp. 510–29.

Alter, Catherine and Jerald Hage (1993), *Organizations Working Together*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Andrews, Rhys, George A. Boyne and Richard M. Walker (2011), 'Dimensions of publicness and organizational performance: a review of the evidence', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 3), i301–i319.

Antonsen, Marianne and Torben Beck Jørgensen (1997), 'The "publicness" of public organizations', *Public Administration*, **75** (2), 337–57.

Bozeman, Barry (1987), *All Organizations Are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bozeman, Barry (2013), 'What organization theorists and public policy researchers can learn from one another: Publicness theory as a case-in-point', *Organization Studies*, **34** (2), 169–88.

Bozeman, Barry and Stuart Bretschneider (1994), 'The "publicness puzzle" in organization theory: a test of alternative explanations of differences between public and private organizations', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **4** (2), 197–224.

Bozeman, Barry and Japera Johnson (2015), 'The political economy of public values: a case for the public sphere and progressive opportunity', *American Review of Public Administration*, **45** (1), 61–85.

Bozeman, Barry and Stephanie Moulton (2011), 'Integrative publicness: a framework for public management strategy and performance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 3), i363–i380.

Bozeman, Barry and Jeffrey D. Straussman (1990), *Public Management Strategies: Guidelines for Managerial Effectiveness*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Breslin, Rachel A., Sheela Pandey and Norma M. Riccucci (2017), 'Intersectionality in public leadership research: a review and future research agenda', *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, **37** (2), 160–82.

Bretschneider, Stuart (1990), 'Management information systems in public and private organizations: an empirical test', *Public Administration Review*, **50** (5), 536–45

Brewer, Gene A. and Gene A. Brewer Jr (2011), 'Parsing public/private differences in work motivation and performance: an experimental study', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 3), i347–i362.

Bryson, John M., Kathryn S. Quick, Carissa Schively Slotterback and Barbara C. Crosby (2013), 'Designing public participation processes', *Public Administration Review*, **73** (1), 23–34.

Carter, David P. (2016), 'Public, nonprofit, and for-profit sector regulatory approaches in third-party regulatory administration', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **26** (4), 726–44.

Chun, Young Han and Hal G. Rainey (2005), 'Goal ambiguity in US federal agencies', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **15** (4), 529–57.

Conner, Thaddieus W. (2016), 'Representation and collaboration: exploring the role of shared identity in the collaborative process', *Public Administration Review*, **76** (2), 288–301.

Dahl, Robert A. and Charles E. Lindblom (1953), *Politics, Economics, and Welfare*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Daley, Dorothy M. and Tony G. Reames (2015), 'Public participation and environmental justice: access to federal decision making', in David M. Konisky (ed.), *Failed Promises: Evaluating the Federal Government's Response to Environmental Justice*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 143–71.

Davis, Randall S. and Edmund C. Stazyk (2016), 'Examining the links between senior managers' engagement in networked environments and goal and role ambiguity', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **26** (3), pp. 433–47.

DeHart-Davis, Leisha, Mark K. Feeney, Beth Gazley, Yilin Hou, Stephanie Moulton, Rebecca Nesbit et al. (2010), 'Statement of commitment for new public administration scholars', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21**, i5.

Feeney, Mary K. and Eric W. Welch (2012), 'Realized publicness at public and private research universities', *Public Administration Review*, **72** (2), 272–84.

Fox, Richard L. and Robert A. Schuhmann (1999), 'Gender and local government: a comparison of women and men city managers', *Public Administration Review*, **59** (3), 231–42.

Francoeur, Claude, Réal Labelle and Bernard Sinclair-Desgagné (2008), 'Gender diversity in corporate governance and top management', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **81** (1), 83–95.

Frederickson, H. George (1999), 'The repositioning of American public administration', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, **32** (4), 701–12.

Gallo, Nick and David E. Lewis (2012), 'The consequences of presidential patronage for federal agency performance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **22** (2), 219–43.

Getha-Taylor, Heather, Jacob Fowles, Chris Silvia and Cullen C. Merritt (2015), 'Considering the effects of time on leadership development: a local government training evaluation', *Public Personnel Management*, **44** (3), 295–316.

Goldstein, Susan Meyer and Michael Naor (2005), 'Linking publicness to operations management practices: a study of quality management practices in hospitals', *Journal of Operations Management*, **23** (2), 209–28.

Goleman, Daniel (1998), *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, New York: Bantam.

Gulick, Luther (1937), 'Notes on the theory of organization', in Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick (eds), *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.

Guy, Mary E. and Lois Lovelace Duke (1992), 'Personal and social background as determinants of position', in Mary E. Guy (ed.), *Women and Men of the States: Public Administrators at the State Level*, Armonk, NY: Sharpe, pp. 43–60.

Hamidullah, Madinah F., Norma M. Riccucci and Sanjay K. Pandey (2015), 'Women in city hall: gender dimensions of managerial values', *American Review of Public Administration*, **45** (3), 247–62.

Heinrich, Carolyn J. and Elizabeth Fournier (2004), 'Dimensions of publicness and performance in substance abuse treatment organizations', *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, **23** (1), 49–70.

Helco, Hugh (1977), *A Government of Strangers*, Washington, DC: Brookings.

Hill, Carolyn J. and Laurence E. Lynn (2009), *Public Management: A Three-Dimensional Approach*, Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Hood, Christopher, Oliver James and Colin Scott (2000), 'Regulation of government: has it increased, is it increasing, should it be diminished?', *Public Administration*, **78** (2), 283–304.

Huxham, Chris (2003), 'Theorizing collaboration practice', *Public Management Review*, **5** (3), 401–23.

Ingram, Helen, Anne L. Schneider and Peter DeLeon (2007), 'Social construction and policy design', in Paul A. Sabatier (ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*, Bellevue, TN: Westview Press, pp. 93–126.

Jacobson, Willow S., Christine Kelleher Palus and Cynthia J. Bowling (2010), 'A woman's touch? Gendered management and performance in state administration', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **20** (2), 477–504.

Juenke, Eric G. (2005), 'Management tenure and network time: how experience affects bureaucratic dynamics', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **15** (1), 113–31.

Keiser, Lael R., Vicky M. Wilkins, Kenneth J. Meier and Catherine A. Holland (2002), 'Lipstick and logarithms: gender, institutional context, and representative bureaucracy', *American Political Science Review*, **96** (3), 553–64.

Klijn, Erik-Hans and Geert R. Teisman (1997), 'Strategies and games in networks', in Walter J.M. Kickert, Erik-Hans Klijn and Joop F.M. Koppenjan (eds), *Managing Complex Networks. Strategies for the Public Sector*, London, New York and New Delhi: Sage, pp. 98–118.

Koppell, Jonathan G.S. (2010), 'Administration without borders', *Public Administration Review*, **70** (suppl. 1), s46–s55.

La Porte, Todd R. and Daniel S. Metlay (1996), 'Hazards and institutional trustworthiness: facing a deficit of trust', *Public Administration Review*, **56** (4), 341–7.

Lan, Zhiyong and Kathleen K. Anders (2000), 'A paradigmatic view of contemporary public administration research an empirical test', *Administration and Society*, **32** (2), 138–65.

Lau, Alan W., Arthur W. Newman and Laurie A. Broedline (1980), 'The nature of managerial work in the public sector', *Public Administration Review*, **40** (5), 513–20.

Lewis, David E. (2008), *The Politics of Presidential Appointments: Political Control and Bureaucratic Performance*, Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press.

McGuire, Michael (2006), 'Collaborative public management: assessing what we know and how we know it', *Public Administration Review*, 66 (suppl. 1), 33–43.

McGuire, Michael (2003), 'Is it really so strange? A critical look at the "network management is different from hierarchical management" perspective', paper presented at the Seventh National Public Management Research Conference, Washington, DC, 9–11 October, pp. 9–11.

McWilliams, Abagail (2015), 'Corporate social responsibility', *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, vol. 12, *Strategic Management*, art. 39, accessed 8 May 2018 at https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom120001.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O'Toole (2001), 'Managerial strategies and behavior in networks: a model with evidence from US public education', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **11** (3), 271–94.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O'Toole (2003), 'Public management and educational performance: the impact of managerial networking', *Public Administration Review*, **63** (6), 689–99.

Meier, Kenneth J., Sharon H. Mastracci and Kristin Wilson (2006b), 'Gender and emotional labor in public organizations: an empirical examination of the link to performance', *Public Administration Review*, **66** (6), 899–909.

Meier, Kenneth J., Laurence J. O'Toole and Holly T. Goerdel (2006a), 'Management activity and program performance: gender as management capital', *Public Administration Review*, **66** (1), 24–36.

Merritt, Cullen C. (2014), "Specifying and testing a multi-dimensional model of publicness: an analysis of mental health and substance abuse treatment facilities", PhD dissertation, University of Kansas.

Merritt, Cullen C., Kathleen Cordell and Morgan D. Farnworth (2018a), 'Less is more? Publicness, management strategy, and organizational performance in mental health treatment facilities', *Public Administration Quarterly*, **42** (1), 3–31.

Merritt, Cullen C., Morgan D. Farnworth and Matt R. Kienapple (2018b), 'Developing organizational leaders to manage publicness: a conceptual framework', *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 26 March, accessed 8 May 2018 at https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15236803.2018.1429816?scroll=top&needAccess=true.

Milward, H. Brinton and Keith G. Provan (2000), 'Governing the hollow state', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **10** (2), 359–80.

Molina, Anthony D. (2015), 'The virtues of administration: values and the practice of public service', *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, **37** (1), 49–69.

Moore, Mark Harrison (1995), *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moulton, Stephanie (2009), 'Putting together the publicness puzzle: a framework for realized publicness', *Public Administration Review*, **69** (5), 889–900.

Moulton, Stephanie (2010), 'Integrating the public in public administration: envisioning the scholarly field in 2020', *Public Administration Review*, **70** (suppl. 1), s317–s318.

Moulton, Stephanie, and Adam Eckerd (2012), 'Preserving the publicness of the nonprofit sector resources, roles, and public values', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **41** (4), 656–85.

Moulton, Stephanie and Mary K. Feeney (2010), 'Public service in the private sector: private loan originator participation in a public mortgage program', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (3), 547–72.

Murray, Michael A. (1975), 'Comparing public and private management: an exploratory essay', *Public Administration Review*, **35** (4), 364–71.

Nabatchi, Tina (2012), 'Putting the "public" back in public values research: designing participation to identify and respond to values', *Public Administration Review*, **72** (5), 699–708.

Nicholson-Crotty, Sean and Kenneth J. Meier (2005), 'From perception to public policy: translating social constructions into policy designs', in Anne Schneider and Helen Ingram (eds), *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy,* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 223–42.

Nutt, Paul C. and Robert W. Backoff (1993), 'Organizational publicness and its implications for strategic management', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **3** (2), 209–31.

O'Leary, Rosemary (2011), 'Minnowbrook: tradition, idea, spirit, event, challenge', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 1), i1–i6.

O'Toole, Laurence J. Jr (1997), 'Treating networks seriously: practical and research-based agendas in public administration', *Public Administration Review*, **57** (1), 45–52.

O'Toole, Laurence J. Jr and Kenneth J. Meier (1999), 'Modeling the impact of public management: implications of structural context', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **9** (4), 505–26.

O'Toole, Laurence J. Jr and Kenneth J. Meier (2004), 'Public management in intergovernmental networks: matching structural networks and managerial networking', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **14** (4), 469–94.

O'Toole, Laurence J. Jr, Kenneth J. Meier and Sean Nicholson-Crotty (2005), 'Managing upward, downward and outward: networks, hierarchical relationships and performance', *Public Management Review*, **7** (1), 45–68.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2014), *Women, Governance, and Policy Making in OECD Countries: Fostering Diversity for Inclusive Growth*, Paris: OECD.

Perrott, Stella (2002), 'Theme: gender, the professions and public management: gender, professions and management in the public sector', *Public Money and Management*, **22** (1), 21–4.

Perry, James L. and Hal G. Rainey (1988), 'The public-private distinction in organization theory: a critique and research strategy', *Academy of Management Review*, **13** (2), 182–201.

Petrovsky, Nicolai, Oliver James and George A. Boyne (2015), 'New leaders' managerial background and the performance of public organizations: the theory of publicness fit', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **25** (1), 217–36.

Pitts, David W. (2005), 'Diversity, representation, and performance: evidence about race and ethnicity in public organizations', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **15** (4), 615–31.

Portillo, Shannon and Leisha DeHart-Davis (2009), 'Gender and organizational rule abidance', *Public Administration Review*, **69** (2), 339–47.

Presthus, Robert (1978), *The Organizational Society*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Provan, Keith G. and H. Brinton Milward (1995), 'A preliminary theory of interorganizational network effectiveness: a comparative study of four community mental health systems', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **40** (1), 1–33.

Rainey, Hal G. (2011), 'Sampling designs for analyzing publicness: alternatives and their strengths and weaknesses', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 3), i321–i345.

Rainey, Hal G. (2014), *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rainey, Hal G., Robert W. Backoff and Charles H. Levine (1976), 'Comparing public and private organizations', *Public Administration Review*, **36** (2), 233–44.

Reies Louis, Meryl (2001), 'Surprise and sense making: what newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings', in Jay Shafritz and J. Steven Ott (eds), *Classics of Organization Theory*, London: Harcourt, pp. 337–90.

Riccucci, Norma M. (2010), *Public Administration: Traditions of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram (1993), 'Social construction of target populations: implications for politics and policy', *American Political Science Review*, **87** (2), 334–47.

Scott, Patrick G. and Santa Falcone (1998), 'Comparing public and private organizations: an exploratory analysis of three frameworks', *American Review of Public Administration*, **28** (2), 126–45.

Scott, W. Richard (2008), *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Selden, Sally Coleman (1997), *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness in a Government Agency*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Soss, Joe (1999), 'Lessons of welfare: policy design, political learning, and political action', *American Political Science Review*, **93** (2), 363–80.

Stazyk, Edmund, Randall S. Davis and Shannon Portillo (2015), 'More dissimilar than alike? Comparing minority and non-minority managers' value preferences', working paper, Center for Organization Research & Design, Arizona State University, accessed 8 May 2018 at http://cord.asu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Stazyk-et-al_More-Dissimilar_Manuscript_2015-12-14.pdf.

Stazyk, Edmund, Randall S. Davis and Shannon Portillo (2017), 'More dissimilar than alike? Public value preferences across minority and white managers', *Public Administration*, **95** (3), 605–22.

Stivers, Camilla M. (2002), *Bureau Men, Settlement Women: Constructing Public Administration in the Progressive Era (Studies in Government and Public Policy)*, Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Su, Xuhong (2017), 'Dimensional publicness and serving the vulnerable analyses of specialized substance abuse treatment programs', *American Review of Public Administration*, **47** (8), 898–913.

Thomas, John Clayton (2013), 'Citizen, customer, partner: rethinking the place of the public in public management', *Public Administration Review*, **73** (6), 786–96.

Thompson, Victor Alexander (1976), *Bureaucracy and the Modern World*, Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Walker, Richard M. and Barry Bozeman (2011), 'Publicness and organizational performance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **21** (suppl. 3), i279–i281.

Wamsley, Gary L. and Mayer N. Zald (1973), 'The political economy of public organizations: a critique and approach to the study of public administration', *Public Administration Review*, **33** (1), 62–73.

Wheeler, Gloria F. and F. Neil Brady (1998), 'Do public-sector and private-sector personnel have different ethical dispositions? A study of two sites', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **8** (1), 93–115.

Wise, Lois Recascino and Mary Tschirhart (2000), 'Examining empirical evidence on diversity effects: how useful is diversity research for public-sector managers?', *Public Administration Review*, **60** (5), 386–94.

Wittmer, Dennis and David Coursey (1996), 'Ethical work climates: comparing top managers in public and private organizations', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **6** (4), 559–72.

Zhu, Ling and Morgen Johansen (2014), 'Public responsibility and inequality in health insurance coverage: an examination of American state health care systems', *Public Administration*, **92** (2), 422–39.