The Public Service Ethos Versus Public Management Models[1]

Stanisław Mazur[*]

Abstract

The paper examines the issue of public service ethos and poses a question how that specific culture fits into the framework of public management. The author states that in the early 21st century, the Weberian model of bureaucracy is under increasing pressure of market-logic driven models of public management. On the other hand, an alternative to both classic bureaucracy and modern public management seems to have emerged in the form of public governance theory. In the context of contradictory influences, Poland's administration finds itself at a crossroads nowadays, as it struggles with the bureaucratic legacy and underdeveloped public service ethos, while entering the foreign land shaped by not entirely compatible logics of the market and public governance.

Key words: public service, public management, public governance, bureaucracy

Introduction

This article sets out to describe the various conventions of understanding the public service ethos that have developed in democratic law-governed countries throughout

---

the last century. Another purpose is to explain the implications of those different understandings for the management of public affairs.

An inspiration for tackling this issue was the observation that in the 20th and early 21st centuries, the democratic law-governed states saw the emergence of three faces of the public service ethos – administrative, market and community-based ones. Each one appears in different socio-economic circumstances, is influenced by different factors and is associated with different public management models emphasising specific values and producing different consequences.

The administrative face of the public service ethos is coupled with the classical Weberian model of bureaucracy. Its market face is linked to the managerial model of public administration based on transaction construed in terms of economy. Conversely, the community face of the public service ethos corresponds with the republican formula for the organisation of the state and its administrative apparatus. Each of them is associated with a different image of the nature of actions pursued to attain public good.

The faces of the public service ethos and their associated administrative models do not substitute one another, but gradually accumulate. The nature of interactions occurring amongst them is more integrative than exclusive. This leads to their amalgamation resulting in normative vagueness and functional ambiguity of the public service ethos. The ethos is becoming increasingly complex and, at the same time, its internal integrity is weakened, furthermore, it acquires an increasingly heterogeneous nature.

The interpretation of the public service ethos thus conceived, respect for its axiology and its resulting practical application renders public officials subject to antagonistic imperatives and opposing pressures. While adapting to these divergent claims, officials undertake rationalisations in order to reduce the cognitive dissonance, circumscribe ambiguities and inconsistencies with which they have to cope.

Reflections on the public service ethos were deliberately narrowed down to the administrative sphere, essentially omitting references to the political sphere, which was dictated by the desire to achieve more accuracy and clarity of exposition.

1. The Administrative Face of the Public Service Ethos

1.1. The Essence of Weberian Administration

The essence of Weberian administration consists in a meticulous division of responsibilities and their detailed description, a formalised system of orders and sanctions, as well as the hierarchical division of roles based on specialist competencies tested in the course of formal verification procedures. The bureaucracy is characterised – as maintained M. Weber, the precursor of intellectual reflection on public officials – by efficiency, accuracy, speed, supervisory professionalism, continuity, discretion and the desire to maximise benefits in proportion to the funds invested. Its organisational structure eliminates relationships of a personal nature and irrational considerations (Weber 2002).

Activities pursued by qualified officials are governed by general, abstract and strictly specified rules. The essence of a bureaucratic organisation consists in a rationalised and impersonal nature of its structural components and shared objectives (Weber 2002). In their activities, officials are supposed to be competent, objective, impartial and loyal, guided by concern for the public interest.

Although Weber considered bureaucracy to be technically dominant, he feared its potentially destructive impact on individuals and their communities. Weber noted that '… bureaucratic organization was at work creating the shell of that future iron cage, which a powerless mankind may someday be forced into, like the fellahin of ancient Egypt. This will occur when technical standards become ends in themselves, that is, when bureaucratic rule and bureaucratic self-perpetuation are the ultimate and sole principles' (Weber 2002: 544).

Weber, while reflecting on the nature of bureaucracy, raises a key question for the rule of democratic representation, at the same time providing a pessimistic answer: 'Always, however, there arises an important question: who controls the existing bureaucratic apparatus? And always control over it for the layman is possible only in a limited way; in the long run, a skilled expert-secret counsel will have an advantage over the layman-minister when it comes to exerting his will' (Weber 2001: 167).

In the Weberian model, the preferable primary mechanism for coordinating collective action is legislation. Legal standards are perceived as a universal tool of

governance. The law governs the creation and implementation of public policies and the mode of distribution of public resources. The model also makes intensive use of mechanisms of distribution and redistribution of national income and regulatory instruments.

The state and its administrative apparatus, enjoying a law-making monopoly, remains in an empowered position with respect to other social actors. The state, founded on extensive administration and extensive regulatory system is the dominant architect of public actions and their main executor. It pursues a policy based on the belief in the superiority of centralised mechanisms of managing public affairs over decentralised and local ones. In this approach, the importance of social and economic actors as partners of administration in the process of creation and implementation of public policies is relatively minor.

Public policies pursued under the Weberian model of public management reflect the constitutive features of the latter. They can, therefore, be defined as procedural and centralised policies based on hierarchical management mechanisms. At their core lies the belief in the capacity of central planners and decision-makers to accurately define problems, select appropriate measures for their resolution and the ability to effectively manage the implementation process. These policies, their design and implementation constitute the domain of the state and its agencies with relatively little involvement of social organisations and economic entities.

The basic mechanisms with which to implement public policies, including the management model, comprise law, regulation, distribution and redistribution of national income. A special role is attributed to the legal norm perceived as both the solution to socio-economic problems and the trigger of positive change. In this management model, a key role is played by distributive and redistributive public policies conducted through intensive legislative activity.

Mechanisms of organisational and systemic learning in public policies within the Weberian model of governance are reactive in nature. Their essence and, at the same time, their objective is to improve organisational procedures and the basic criterion for the appraisal of officials is the literal fulfilment of the latter.

1.2. The Public Service Ethos in Weberian Administration and Ways of its Cultivation

The public service ethos has its origins in the Weberian bureaucratic model of administration. It is identified with effectiveness, efficiency, specialisation, loyalty and neutrality. It is rooted, apart from the constitutive features of Weberian bureaucracy, in the Wilsonian dichotomy between politics and administration (Wilson 1887), Taylor's scientific management theory (Taylor 1911), and rationalism present in the works of Goodnow (1900) and Willoughby (1919).

The bureaucratic public service ethos corresponds to the procedural model of democracy and the logic of action typical of a technocratic administration. It relies on the following assumptions:

a) public objectives are established in an arbitrary manner in the political process understood in accordance with the rules of procedural democracy,

b) effective and efficient methods of achieving public objectives are derived from scientific knowledge,

c) the means of achieving social goals are instrumental and rational in nature,

d) actions of public officials are evaluated primarily though the criterion of legality and compliance with administrative procedures,

e) public officials faithfully, impartially and honestly serve their political superiors (representing the collective sovereign, i.e. the nation) in achieving the objectives formulated in the democratic political process (Mazur 2011).

The bureaucratic ethos constitutes an expression of utilitarianism. Its utilitarian nature underscores instrumental values and focuses on an efficient and effective implementation of political will. Decisions concerning public good are made in the democratic process of formulating objectives. On completion of this process, the role of officials is to execute legitimised directives adopted by their political superiors (Thompson 1983).

The bureaucratic ethos is cultivated via a hierarchical approach to the means of control and supervision. H. Finer, a prominent representative of this trend, based his reasoning on the following three assumptions:

a) the primacy of sovereignty of the people means that the state apparatus acts to address the needs expressed by citizens,

b) the pivotal role in such a system of democratic governance is attributed to the parliament acting as an emanation of the sovereign's will,

c) the primary role of the sovereign and its representative is not announce the will to the executive branch (officials and their political superiors), but to ensure its implementation in a manner intended by the sovereign (Finer 1941: 337).

The researcher and his supporters recognise political control, legislative supervision, the judiciary and internal administrative control as the primary ways of controlling officials. They deny the argument that bureaucracy is capable of self-restraint and self-improvement: '... public servants should not decide for themselves about their actions, they have to be accountable to the elected representatives of the sovereign, and it is the latter that should determine the actions of public servants to the greatest extent possible' (Finer 1941: 336). Likewise, they disagree with the opinions that specialisation and technical knowledge of public administration and its capacity ability to mobilise specific stakeholder groups makes it impossible to control. They insist that the political and legal control instruments wielded by politicians and their public legitimacy endow them with a capacity to effectively control clerical activities.

Finer points to two fundamental ways of understanding the official responsibility. He identifies the first one with the condition in which 'someone' is responsible 'for something' and 'to someone'. The other method rests in the inner sense of moral obligation felt by an individual towards the sovereign. In the former case, the mechanisms to correct irregularities are external, and in the latter one, they arise from the moral maturity of an individual. Finer does not reject the importance of the sense of moral responsibility of officials or their ability to cultivate public interest. He only points out that its application to the exclusion of others may result in insufficient effectiveness of control. For this reason, he advocates combining these two forms of responsibility, however, with a primacy of external control, in which he perceives the capacity for effective supervision of public officials and cultivation of the public service ethos.

Table 1 shows the distinguishing features of the Weberian model of administration and the associated aspects of the bureaucratic ethos.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Weberian administration and its ethos

Dimensions	Highlights (constitutive features)
Role of government	'Rowing'
Management principle	Hierarchy
Management mechanisms	Legislation, regulation
Way of defining public interest	Political activity supported by experts

Nature of the public service ethos	Technocratic servitude to political superiors
Constitutive values of public service ethos	Hierarchy, neutrality, effectiveness, efficiency, loyalty, objectivity, accountability
Rationality	Formal
Key resources	Public
Success criteria	Procedural perfection
Organisational structure	Bureaucratic
Relations with the environment	Exclusive
Learning character	Individual
Learning objectives	Strict, literal adherence to procedures
Dominant public policy	Distribution, redistribution

Source: Author's own formulation.

2. The Market-oriented Face of the Public Service Ethos

2.1. The Essence of a Market-oriented Administration

Conceptual and ideological foundations of the new public management may be found in the public choice theory, neoclassical economics and the neo-liberal doctrine. Market-oriented administration is conceptually rooted in those economic theories that emphasise the issue of efficiency and effectiveness of public institutions. The ideological basis for the reforms aimed at the development of a market-oriented public administration formed was provided on the one hand by the belief that it was no longer possible to maintain the too costly and highly inefficient welfare state model. On the other hand, it was the neo-liberal belief in the need to introduce into the public sector mechanisms characteristic of the free market.

Such a model of public administration has been promoted with particular fervour for the past thirty years by researchers and politicians supporting neoliberal ideas. Its prominent representatives included, among others, politicians such as Margaret Thatcher, John Mayor or Ronald Reagan. Its conceptual framework is based on the works of D. Osborne and T. Gaebler (Osborne, Gaebler 1992) and C. Hood (Hood 1991), while its intellectual sources can be traced back to the precursors of public

choice theory such as A. Downs (Downs 1957), G. Tullock (Tullock 1965), M. Olson (Olson 1965) and W. Niskanen (Niskanen 1971).

The wave of market reforms of public management mechanisms started in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, initially in the English-speaking countries and in Scandinavia. The type of reform it advocated is broadly known as the New Public Management (Hood 1995). The key features of the market-oriented organisation and operation of public administration is the recognition of market mechanisms as essential for the coordination of public activities and the provisions of public services, customer orientation (with the customers identified with the recipients of public services), and the privatisation of a significant portion of the public sector.

Equally distinctive features include deregulation, decentralisation and debureaucratisation, economisation of activities and performance orientation. In addition, an integral element of the concept of new public management (NPM) is the belief that the key criterion for the evaluation of officials should be the efficiency and effectiveness of their actions, which was supposed to be linked with their remuneration. This approach is dominated by an emphasis on the need to introduce flexible organisational structures, to broaden the scope of contracting for public services as well as on the desirability of their parameterisation, monitoring and evaluation. Proponents of NPM also postulate the establishment of public sector executive agencies, strengthening the responsiveness of officials and an extensive use of information technology for the provision of public service (Bresser-Pereira 2004).

In the new public management model, the role of the state is to provide institutional conditions for an efficient and effective use of market mechanisms in managing public affairs. The state also has the duty to support the cooperation of public authorities with non-public organisations for the achievement of public objectives. In this management model, government departments and agencies focus on involving citizens in order to obtain information concerning the latter's preferences and opinions as well as on determining the quality parameters of relevant public services.

The new public management model consistently applies two groups of mechanisms. The first group is associated with the introduction into the public sector of mechanisms typical of the private sector. They include, among others, management by objectives (or results), task-based budgeting, standardisation of quasi-markets for public services, flexible remuneration mechanisms, management through contracts, audits and evaluation. The second group is associated with the introduction of market features in the process of performing public mandates. They include primarily

privatisation, deregulation, decentralisation, contracting for public services, public-private partnerships and vouchers.

Public policies in the new public management model can be described as performance-oriented ones, where performance is mostly conceived in economic terms. These policies are decentralised and hybrid in nature. They are based on transactional mechanisms rather than on hierarchical and command-based ones. The predominant type of public policy is regulatory policy.

The strategic directions for public policies are charted in a centralised way. However, the selection of operational objectives as well as mechanisms and instruments for their achievement is delegated to departments and agencies endowed with a considerable autonomy. Public policies are pursued in a fairly decentralised organisational environment. Their implementation progresses with an active involvement of recipients (customers) and stakeholders, in particular, in the area of setting the standards for public services. This mode of implementing public policies promotes flexible organisational forms such as contracting for services, introduction of internal competition mechanisms in the public sector as well as privatisation and deregulation.

The basic criteria for the success of an administrative officer and public organisations rest in the efficiency and effectiveness of allocation of goods and the quality of public services. The practice of systems and organisational learning focuses on problem-solving based on economic criteria. This is coupled with an awareness that organisational learning requires teamwork.

2.2. The Public Service Ethos in Market-oriented Administration and Ways of its Cultivation

Market-oriented public administration has developed its own unique ethos. It is based on the idea of the central role of the citizen – conceived as a client – with respect to public sector organisations. The primary duty of the public sector is, therefore, to provide high-quality and economical public services. The relationship that links officials with citizens is a transaction, in which officials are responsible for the provision of a service, and citizens are buyers – customers paying for the service.

Mutual relationships between administration officials and citizens occur in the space of exchanging goods and services. The core of ethical conduct of public officials involves efficient and effective operation, cost-effective public spending and

maximisation of the quality of services offered by the public sector. Economically conceived effectiveness, efficiency and utility are the key values in the ethos of a market-oriented administration. The emphasis placed on economic values is not tantamount to a rejection of procedural values typical of the bureaucratic public service ethos. Certainly, however, it reveals the primacy of economic values over procedural ones.

Cultivation of the ethos of a market-oriented administration is seen in a pluralistic approach. Such an approach emphasises the importance of multiple power centres, competition and rivalry, in order to limit the negative consequences of officialdom and the development of its sense of public mission. The conceptual roots of this approach can be found in the theories of pluralism (Dahl 1961; Polsby 1963) and neopluralism (McFarland 2004).

Its supporters perceive public organisations as heterogeneous communities operating in a competitive environment – in order to survive, they are forced to seek support, cooperate, create strategic alliances and respect the values and interests of different stakeholders. According to proponents of this approach, such a situation *per se* requires behaviours consistent with the logic of the system, which operates in the public administration and protects against its hegemony. '… the pluralism of pressures tames the power of the bureaucracy and minimises its threat, for it ensures that bureaucracy cannot gain ascendancy over democratically elected institutions and that no one interest group can gain ascendancy through it.' (Etzioni-Halevy 1983).

Despite the fact that interest groups generally represent various sectarian interests and values, they still articulate opinions and expectations of certain segments of society that constitute their clients. By articulating the demands deemed important by the represented circles, an interest group both draws public attention to them and affects the decisions and actions taken by officials. In an effort to support important interest groups, officials are forced to respect, at least partially, different and often divergent interests and expectations.

Table 2 shows the distinguishing features of a market-oriented administration and the associated aspects of the public service ethos.

Table 2. Characteristics of a market-oriented administration and its ethos

Dimensions	Highlights (constitutive features)
Role of government	'Steering'
Management principle	Exchange
Management mechanisms	Economic
Way of defining public interest	Aggregation of needs and interests of citizens-consumers made by officials supported by experts
Nature of the public service ethos	Management by objectives, standardisation of public services, quality measurement, privatisation, deregulation, contracting, public-private partnerships, vouchers
Constitutive values of public service ethos	efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, easement
Rationality	Economic
Key resources	Economic
Success criteria	Effectiveness and efficiency of allocation, selection and quality of public services
Organisational structure	Decentralised
Relations with the environment	Partially inclusive
Learning character	Collective
Learning objectives	Problem-solving based on economic criteria
Dominant public policy	Regulatory

Source: Author's own formulation.

3. The Community-oriented Face of the Public Service Ethos

3.1. The Essence of Public Governance

Public governance developed as a result of a growing public dissatisfaction with the performance of an administration subordinated to free-market mechanisms. The main charge brought against it was excessive prominence accorded to the instrumental and technological aspects of management of public affairs accompanied by marginal importance of systemic aspects of governance in a complex social reality.

The basic premises for the development of the Public governance paradigm include the development of multi-level public affairs governance mechanisms, limited

opportunities for command-based as well as hierarchical social and economic problem-solving by public authorities in a complex social reality and the unpredictability of problems and risks whose resolution and elimination requires cooperation of the state with various social actors. The concept of public governance is based on rules such as networking, multi-level governance, deliberation, participation, partnership, dialogue, consensus, reconciliation, autonomy and responsibility.[2]

The concept is based on the following assumptions:

a) public values and objectives are established in the process of communication understood in terms of rules typical of a republican democracy,

b) social actors share the conviction as to the importance of public affairs,

c) the achievement of public objectives results from a synergistic integration of resources held by social actors with different capacities and a different status,

d) public actions are judged by such criteria as responsiveness, concern for the public interest, fairness, quality of interaction with stakeholders,

e) the state and social actors evaluate the way certain objectives are achieved in order to improve the associated mechanisms (Mazur 2011).

The public governance paradigm emphasises the central importance of the mode of interaction between actors with a different status participating in the public decision-making process. Such interactions are not determined by any public authority, but by their capacity to steer the network relations that reflect the dynamics of interdependence amongst the actors of the system of managing public affairs (Chhotray, Stoker 2009).

The public governance model is based on the belief that the values and public objectives are established in the process of communication understood in terms of rules typical of a republican democracy, while the participating social actors share the conviction about the importance of public affairs. It is believed that the achievement of public objectives results from a synergistic integration of resources held by social actors with different capacities and a different status. Public actions are judged by such criteria as responsiveness, concern for the public interest, fairness and quality of interaction with stakeholders. The state and social actors evaluate the way certain objectives are achieved in order to improve the associated mechanisms (Mazur 2011a).

The public governance model emphasises the central importance of the way in which the interactions between actors with a different status participating in public decision-making process, occur (Rhodes 1994). These interactions are not

---

[2] These characteristic features can also be found in other paradigms. However, in this case, they appear jointly with other features and manifest themselves quite strongly.

determined by the state power, but by its capacity to steer the dynamics of the network relationships that reflect the interdependence amongst the actors of the system of managing public affairs (Chhotray; Stoker 2009). Power is dispersed and fluid, based on the interdependence of actors from other resources necessary to achieve their objectives. The relationships are dynamic, constantly modified in response to new expectations and challenges. In this approach, the problems of the state and its administration cross the borders of departments and public organisations 'spilling over' on the territories belonging to other social actors (Stocker 1998) with an emphasis on the coordination functions of the state acting in an environment of empowered stakeholders (Kooiman 2003; Rhodes 2001). The idea of social interdependence of actors considered from different perspectives has led to the launch of the network approach. It occasioned a perception of public management systems in terms of networking, self-organising and inter-organisational systems (Rhodes 1997). Network coordination and negotiation activities came to be seen as key issues of concern, while recognizing the state as an important entity at the helm of political processes.

The model of public governance makes use of network and non-hierarchical management mechanisms. It is based on the assumption that the role of public authorities is to integrate the resources held by autonomous actors (public, private and social ones) in order to solve problems collectively. Without it there is no way to solve these problems.

The public governance model uses a broad range of instruments. They are not granted by public authorities; instead, their sources lie in the interactions between the state and social actors. It is through these interactions that such instruments are produced, reproduced and improved. The instruments can be divided into four categories – informative, reconciliatory, implementation and reflexive ones (Mazur 2011 a).

In the public public governance model, public policies are based on network management mechanisms involving consultation, dialogue, compromise as primary instruments of coordination of collective action. The role of public authorities is to integrate the resources belonging to autonomous actors (public, private and social ones) with a view to collective problem solving. The essence of this role is facilitation.

In the public governance, the key role is played by regulatory and institutional policies[3] based on reconciliation mechanisms. This approach to practicing public policies applies a comprehensive model of responsibility in an attempt to achieve the set goals. Its components comprise economic and social criteria. Public entities that conduct public policies apply a comprehensive collection of instruments that facilitate obtaining information from stakeholders and recipients of public policies. With equal frequency they apply solutions involving the latter in the programming and implementation of public policies.

In the public governance model, an important role in the implementation of public policies is played by reflection on the outcomes of those policies. It has the form of systems and organisational learning geared to improving public policies. In the public governance model, practicing public policies constitutes a kind of experimental approach based on the so-called evidence-based public policies.

3.2. The Community-oriented Public Service Ethos and Ways of its Cultivation

The community-oriented public service ethos appears to be an instance of deontological reasoning – the conduct of officials and citizens is rooted in a higher order of democratic principles (Thompson 1983). The crucial values are neither instrumental, as is assumed in the bureaucratic ethos, nor transactional, as is the case in the market-oriented ethos, but are seen as socially produced and morally binding.

The community public service ethos is based on communication relationships through which social actors (politicians, officials and citizens) define public problems, deliberate on ways to solve them and once they have done so, they jointly participate in their implementation, contributing their resources and incurring the consequences (Mazur 2011a). These relationships are imbued with concern for the public interest and a tendency to seek solutions that are likely to gain social approval.

In the case of ethos thus conceived, officials are neither executors of commands formulated by political appointees identified in the democratic process nor public sector managers driven exclusively by the logic of the economy. Their duties reach

---

[3] Institutional policies serve to change the rules and mechanisms of the institutional order that constitutes the social, economic and political spheres. Typically, they operate in an evolutionary and incremental manner.

much further. Their essence lies in the cooperation in defining and redefining public interest, in planning actions and bearing responsibility for their implementation.

The possibilities of cultivating the community-oriented public service ethos are thought to reside in the normative approach. It is based on the belief that the classical, formal instruments of control are relatively ineffective. It underlines the importance of the moral dimension of supervision, i.e. socialisation and internalisation by officials of values shared by the society and preferred by the collective sovereign, that is, the citizens at large.

Friedrich – Finer's great intellectual antagonist – believed that the most effective way of controlling administration consisted in the internalisation of ethically desirable behaviours. Friedrich indicated the two main sources of shaping responsible attitudes and actions of officials, i.e. expertise and responsiveness (Friedrich 1940). The integration of the technocratic aspect (specialist know-how) with the democratic element (responsiveness) constituted an expression of a desire to reconcile neutral competencies with the public service ethos.

As an advocate of autonomy of officials, Friedrich saw it necessary for officials to adopt responsive attitudes – he proposed that their decisions should be determined by social imagination and concern for the common good, and their activities be characterised by reflexivity. Friedrich underscores that responsibility in the performance of administrative duties may not be based exclusively on coercion, as it will lead to officials 'slipping' out of control and working below par. Hence he advocated using a combination of different control instruments – normative, political, administrative and managerial ones. Friedrich challenged the view that the political superiors of administration are always capable of effectively controlling it. In search of a solution to this problem, he called for a 'brotherhood of science and politics' understood as a situation in which competing research groups present alternative solutions to specific social problems, thus contributing to a plurality of views, limiting the monopoly of knowledge and information kept by administrative officials.

A number of researchers concur with Friedrich's views, especially those who question the effectiveness of an overprescriptive approach to attitudes, decisions and actions of officials via political and legal rules in a variable, dynamic and increasingly difficult to predict social reality (Pinkele and Williams 1985), indicating the need for a continuous adaptation of officials to rapidly changing demands of the environment in which they operate (Chapman 2000) and emphasising the limitations of legislators and other designers of rules that organise the social order as well as the mode of operation of the state structures in terms of absolute, deterministic and detailed

standardisation of social life in all its infinite dimensions (Sowa, Selden 2003; Bryner 1987; Lipsky 1980; Scott 1997). Researchers who subscribe to this approach also point out that in the context of excess rules, officials will be prone to choose those that suit them, while at the same offering a rational basis and ensuring legitimacy to their decisions (Fox, Miller 1995).

Table 3 shows the distinguishing features of public governance and the associated aspects of the community-oriented public service ethos.

Table 3. Characteristics of public governance and its ethos

Dimensions	Highlights (constitutive features)
Role of government	„Mediation, reconciliation, facilitation"
Management principle	Networking
Management mechanisms	Debate, reconciliation, compromise
Way of defining public interest	Dialogue amongst politicians, officials and citizens in search of satisfactory solutions
Nature of the public service ethos	Public governance
Constitutive values of public service ethos	Dialogue, compromise, reconciliation, integration of resources of social partners to manage public affairs; participation, responsiveness, inclusiveness
Rationality	Reflective
Key resources	Sharing (public, private and social)
Success criteria	Consensus-based implementation of arrangements
Organisational structure	Smooth, task-based, process-oriented
Relations with the environment	Inclusive
Learning character	Organisational
Learning objectives	Innovative problem solving based on economic and social criteria
Dominant public policy	Regulatory, institutional

Source: Author's own formulation.

Concluding Remarks

The three faces of the public service ethos, which developed in democratic law-governed countries in the last century and early in the 21st century, have significant

theoretical and practical implications for the management of public affairs, as shown in this paper.

On the theoretical level, the progressive process of amalgamation should be addressed. It consists in the accumulation of specific characteristics epitomised by each of these faces of the public service ethos. In fact, these faces do not substitute one another, but accumulate. As a result, an intrinsically diverse construct appears, characterised by the coexistence of bureaucratic, market and community-oriented components. These components in part are mutually complementary and in part remain antagonistic. Thus, a heterogeneous public service ethos is fashioned. It is devoid of axiological distinctiveness and causes problems related to its interpretation.

The interpretation of and compliance with the rules and mechanisms of such a highly heterogeneous public service ethos raises many problems due to its complexity and internal inconsistencies. The administrations of countries characterised by continuity of their bureaucratic apparatus are quite well-equipped to deal with them. Those countries gradually introduced new models of organisation and operation of their administrative apparatuses. The process institutional change was evolutionary and incremental in nature, more often than not based on social learning. This has led to a fairly successful synthesis of administrative, market and community-oriented arrangements, including the sphere of the public service ethos.

Governments of countries which have undergone political transformations, including Poland's administration, did not enjoy similar opportunities. They introduced at a single sweep, constructivist, inconsistent and erratic solutions appropriate for different models of public administration without a deeper reflection on their consequences. The resulting structure was inconsistent, made up of rules and mechanisms randomly derived from different orders, devoid of cultural roots and institutional fit. The design is poorly internalised, by citizens, politicians and officials alike.

Poland's administration finds itself at a crossroads. Once it used to move along the rational-procedural path. Now it has entered the market and public governance paths. Navigating along each of these results in conflicting pressures faced by officials. The aggregation within such a short time-span of a number of significant transformations in the organisation and operation of public administration exceeds its capacity for creative adaptation.

Officials are the most familiar with the bureaucratic model of administration, they like to invoke it and apply its logic in practice. They avoid what they consider to be uncharted territories and are reluctant to venture into them. In this case, the unknown comprises the market and community faces of the public service ethos.

Nonetheless, when pressed by public expectations, officials pay lip service to it, which appears to be something of a ritual. For the most part, they seek to demonstrate their ability to meet the formulated expectations rather than actually fulfil them. As a result, the public service ethos in Poland is still rather bureaucratic in nature while its market and community faces seem to be only gradually emerging.

A series of setbacks in developing a consistent public service ethos in Poland stems from the lack of understanding of the logic of institutional change. The assumption that public authorities are in a position to effect a command-based, hierarchical and flexible transformation of the administrative apparatus of the state and the belief in the universality of solutions derived from different institutional and cultural agendas turned out to be illusory. The root causes of this situation should be sought in the inability of public authorities to understand social change, their penchant for constructivist and dogmatic shaping of such change, in an unthinking imitation of external models as well as in their failure to interpret the rules of social life that reflect an immensely complex social reality.

References

Bresser-Pereira, L.C. (2004), *Democracy and Public Management Reform*, Building the Republican State, Oxford University Press Inc 2004.

Bryner, G.C. (1987), *Bureaucratic Discretion. Law and Policy in Federal Regulatory Agencies*, Pergamon

Chhotray, V., Stoker, G. (2009), Governance Theory and Practice. A Cross-Disciplinary Approach, Palgrave Macmillan

Chhotray, V., Stoker G. (2009), *Governance Theory and Practice. A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Dahl, R.A. (1961), *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, Yale UP, New Haven

Downs, A. (1957), *An Economic Theory of Democracy, Harper and Rowe*, New York

Downs, A. (1967), *Inside Bureaucracy, Little, Brown and Company*, Boston

Etzioni-Halevy, E. (1983), *Bureaucracy and Democracy. A Political Dilemma*, Boston: Routledge&Kegan Paul

Finer, H. (1941), 'Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government', *Public Administration Review* 1(4)

Fox, C.J., Miller, H.T. (1995), *Postmodern Public Administration.* Toward Discourse, Sage, Thousand Oaks

Frederickson, G. (1983), *Ethics and Public Administration*, Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Friedrich, C.J. (1940), 'Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility', in: T. Miyakawa (2000), *The Science of Public Policy: Policy Process*, Part III. Routledge

Goodnow, F.J. (1900), *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, New York: Russell and Russell

Hood, C. (1991), 'A Public Management for All Seasons' *Public Administration* 69: 3–19

Hood, C. (1995), 'The "New Public Management" in the 1990s: Variations on a Theme', *Accounting Organizations and Society* 20(2/3)

Kooiman, J. (ed.) (1993), *Modern governance,* London: Sage

Lipsky, M. (1980), *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, New York: Russell Sage

Mazur, S. (2011), *Władza dyskrecjonalną wysokich urzędników. Perspektywa nowego instytucjonalizmu*, Kraków: Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie

Mazur, S. (ed.) (2011), *Państwo integrujące zasoby*, Kraków: Małopolska Szkoła Administracji Publicznej Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie

McFarland, A.S. (2004), *Neopluralism, The Evolution of Political Process Theory, Studies in Government and Public Policy*, University Press of Kansas

Niskanen, W. (1971), *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*, Chicago: Aldine Press

Olson, M. (1965), *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, Harvard University Press

Osborne, D., Gaebler, T., (1994), *Rządzić inaczej. Jak duch przedsiębiorczości przenika i przekształca administrację publiczną,* Poznań: Media Rodzina

Pinkele, C., Williams, C. (eds.) (1985), *The Politics of Police Discretion in Discretion, Justice, and Democracy: a Public Policy Perspective*, Ames: The Iowa State University Press

Polsby, N.W. (1963), *Community Power and Political Theory*, New Haven: Yale UP

Rhodes, R. (1994), 'The Hollowing', Out of the State, *Political Quarterly* 65

Rhodes R.A.W. (1997), *Understanding Governance*, OUP Buckingham

Sartori, G., (2008), *Teorie demokracji*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN

Scott, P.G. (1997), 'Assessing Determinants of Bureaucratic Discretion: An Experiment in Streetlevel Decision Making', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(1)

Sowa, J.E., Selden, S.C. (2003), 'Administrative Discretion and Active Representation: An Expansion of the Theory of Representative Bureaucracy', *Public Administration Review* 63(6), Washington: American Society for Public Administration

Taylor, F.W. (1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York, NY, USA and London, UK: Harper & Brothers

Thompson D.F. (1983), 'Bureaucracy and Democracy', in: D. Graeme (ed.), *Democratic Theory and Practice*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Tullock, G. (1965), *The Politics of Bureaucracy*, Washington: Public Affairs Press

Willoughby, W.F. (1919), *The Government of Modern States*, New York: The Century Co.

Weber, M. (2002), *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo. Zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN

Wilson, W. (1887), 'The Study of Administration', *The Academy of Political Science:* 2, No. 2 (Jun.)