Part I

Fundamental Concepts and Theoretical Debates

Chapter 1  Do Contemporary Theories of Public Administration Have More Influence Than Classical Ones?
   YES  Roberto P. Leone
   NO  Frank L.K. Ohemeng

Chapter 2  Do Politicians Control Government?
   YES  Greg L. Flynn
   NO  Jonathan Craft

Chapter 3  Should the Bureaucracy Be Politically Neutral?
   YES  Herman Finer
   YES  Donald C. Rowat
   NO  Seymour Martin Lipset

Chapter 4  Should the Public Sector Be Run Like a Business?
   YES  Sandford Borins
   NO  Donald J. Savoie
Editors’ Introduction

The study of public administration is very much concerned with analyzing institutions and organizations, and in particular with how administrative structures can be understood and shaped to meet the exigencies of national, provincial, or municipal governance. Various theoretical perspectives have, therefore, been developed over the years, and these theories continue to shape our thinking about organizational and institutional structures. Understanding these theories has become a necessity not only for academics, but for governments as well. This is because governments continue to experiment with different forms of organizational and institutional restructuring in the name of administrative reforms.

These reform efforts have occasionally led to what may be described as an “administrative labyrinth,” due mainly to the lack of understanding of the various organizational theories and how to best use such theories in reform initiatives. In some cases, such reforms have been underpinned by ideological inclinations without careful and systematic thinking about what impact they could have on the new organizational structure being advocated or implemented.

It is this lack of understanding, along with the influence such theories continue to have on reforms in the Canadian context, that this chapter attempts to examine. This opening debate is intended to set the tone for subsequent chapters of the book by explaining which organizational theory (or theories) have had, and continue to have, the greatest influence on Canadian public administration. While adhering to the same yes/no format as the chapters that follow, this debate is couched more in
terms of a comparison between traditional or classical theories of organization and modern or contemporary theories. The underlying question, then, is whether contemporary theories have had more influence in shaping Canadian public administration than traditional ones.

Roberto Leone’s response to that question is that contemporary theories such as total quality management and the new public management have been most influential in the structuring and functioning of Canadian public administration. He illustrates how these theories have led to significant structural changes over the past 30 years (the emergence of horizontal management being one of many examples), which led to the breakup of the bureaucratic silos that had characterized Canada’s earlier administrative system. After discussing how far we have deviated from classical theories and approaches, Leone briefly discusses some of the contributions to the study of public administration that have emerged from post-1970s traditions in organization theory, which offers some important and exciting new perspectives for scholars of public administration.

Frank Ohemeng’s piece that follows, however, disagrees with the assertion that contemporary theories continue to define the public sector. It forcefully asserts that, in spite of what many may consider to be the source of changes in organizational and institutional structures, traditional or classical theories of organization continue to shape public organizations in Canada. He identifies these classical theories as including Frederick W. Taylor’s scientific management, Max Weber’s bureaucratic theory, and the administrative management theory of Henry Fayol and Luther Gulick. These theories prescribed the structure of, as well as how to create efficiencies in, public organizations. And while contemporary theories may be seen by some as pushing these ideas aside, they are to some extent reinforcing the ideas of classical organization theories; the current obsession with performance management and measurement and efficiency, Ohemeng argues, were all laid out by the classical theorists.

In spite of their divergent views, the two pieces complement each other nicely, in that they help to elucidate the difficulty in clearly assessing which theories have been most influential. At the very least, they get the ball rolling for the lively discussions that follow in this book.
Introduction

The foundation of academic disciplines in the social and natural sciences is theory. Public administration is also grounded by a significant theoretical component. One of the special aspects of studying public administration is that we can have a debate about which theories have had more of an influence in our area of study. The suggestion that this is even possible means that the study of public administration is dynamic. That is, there are a number of different viewpoints that people hold when they approach public administration, and the way public administration is practised does change over time. We do not always agree, and that is part of the dynamism of the discipline.

This chapter discovers whether modern theories and approaches to public administration have had more of an influence on the discipline than traditional or classical theories and approaches. Public administration is an age old practice. It has existed for as long as governments have offered citizens public services, and so it is a relevant debate to understand whether classical theories have influenced the discipline more than contemporary ones. This essay will come down decidedly on the side of suggesting that contemporary theories and approaches of public administration have had more of an influence than classical ones. In particular, a look at the influences of new public management and total quality management will provide the basis for making this argument. Much of modern public administration is either occurring as a result of such modern theoretical perspectives, or in reaction to them, as will be seen in many of the chapters of this book. Because of both the ideas and the reactions to them, this essay will argue that modern theories are more influential than traditional ones.
The Context for a Change in Approach to Public Administration

To give a bit of context for changing the approach to public administration, it is first instructive to look at what was happening around the world during the 1970s and 1980s. Governments were seen as being inefficient and bloated. The costs of offering public services were going through the roof, and so too were spiralling government deficits. There was a seismic shift in global politics as a result of the administrations of Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Ronald Reagan in the United States. “Thatcherism” and “Reaganomics” were the new talking points of Western governments around the world. The underlining premise of both is that government needed to be small, to reduce red tape and regulation, to empower the private sector to be the economic engine, and to be much more laissez-faire in its approach to governing. This tone was set by Ronald Reagan during his first inauguration speech after winning the 1980 election, where he boldly stated that government was not the solution to people’s problems, it was the problem itself. The perception that emerged from this time was that the private sector was much more economically efficient than the public sector and thus private sector management practices were considered superior to public sector management practices.

In many academic disciplines, an inevitable discussion of neo-liberalism (the name by which the policies begun by Thatcher and Reagan became known) will occur. At the centre of the neo-liberal agenda was the goal to reduce government intervention in society. As a result, it can be argued that neo-liberalism had the most significant impact on public administration and how governments should deliver services, as well as on the debate over what services the government should be engaged in and what services the private sector should take over. The use of the word “debate” must be emphasized because there was never a conclusive answer to these questions. Indeed, part of the reason why we say that there was a debate leads to the dynamism noted above. However, the point that should be stressed is that public discourse in public administration and the political system at large is still about this core debate related to what role the government should play in society and in delivering services to the people. The fact that we are still consumed by the question of what governments should do leads to the conclusion that contemporary theories and approaches remain the single largest influence in public administration today.

Understanding New Public Management

Ever since the 1980s, students of public administration have read volumes of literature on the evolution of what has become known as new public management (NPM). In general, NPM was designed to make government more business-
like by reducing the role of the state through privatizing and contracting out, by
reforming the machinery of government through restructuring and creating al-
ternative types of organizations, as well as by improving management through
empowerment and collaboration (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000). One
of the major intents of these reforms was to create efficiency in government.

Governments abroad have adopted NPM for several reasons. These reasons
include the fact that economic realities required reduced public spending, a loss
of citizen confidence in public services, and a push for global competitiveness of
national economies (Aucoin 1995). The result of this reasoning has led govern-
ments down the path of privatization, contracting out of public services, expan-
sion of user fees, and expenditure restraint initiatives (Aucoin 1995). Henry
Mintzberg (2000) calls this the virtual government model of public administra-
tion. Virtual government assumes that the best government is one that cannot
be seen. The goal under this model of public administration is the necessary
reduction of the size of the state. Proponents of this view suggest that govern-
ment should be only a superstructure that coordinates private organizations to
provide services to the public. These ideas are part of the neo-liberal view that
less government is better and more government is intrusive.

Peter Aucoin (1995) traces the evolution of new public management to Britain
and the Thatcher administration of the late 1970s and early 1980s where a vigor-
ous three-step campaign emerged. The first step reduced the power of the civil
service so that the bureaucracy could be more responsive to political direction.
The second enabled private sector management practices to proliferate in the public
service in order to promote efficiency in government. Finally, the government
provided an opportunity for individuals to have more control over the design and
delivery of public services, which inevitably introduced citizen choice in the pro-
vision of government services. This campaign emerged because of a general dis-
respect for the public service, which was manifested by political leaders who made
citizens believe that civil servants were self-serving (Peters 2000). This, in turn,
resulted in a reduced policy role for senior civil servants and a declining faith in
government to solve problems (Peters 2000). The combination of these factors
led government to design alternative ways to deliver services to the public.

There are several goals for restructuring from a public administration per-
spective. These include the increased demand for public services, increased par-
ticipation of staff, the accommodation of new technologies, the provision of
essential public goods at lower costs, and public servant innovation (Kernaghan,
Marson, and Borins 2000). These goals have produced unique mixes of horizontal
management, decentralization, and alternative methods of delivering public
services under NPM.

Horizontal management differs from vertical management because of its
unique structural arrangement that extends beyond the classical Weberian model
of bureaucratic hierarchy (Sproule-Jones 2000). Management in a horizontal structure relies on managing interdependencies to attain both the goals of the unit and of the program as a whole. This means that consulting, planning, monitoring, re-consulting, and revising are important management skills that should be deployed. The goal of horizontal management is to be more responsive to citizen needs while lowering the costs to government in areas where it would otherwise lead to a disjointed and fragmented delivery of service. This is what Mark Sproule-Jones (2000) labelled “joint production of services.” The joint production of services can lead to greater efficiency when the value of the coordination exceeds transaction and opportunistic costs. In other words, when all parties in a horizontal structure are working under the agreed terms and neither is taking advantage of the other, it can prove to be a method in which costs can be reduced and where services delivery is enhanced.

This is in contrast to the classical Weberian model based on hierarchy. In this classical orientation of government, government departments are essentially individual organizational pyramids. If one thinks of a pyramid, the immediate image that comes to mind is that the bottom of the pyramid is wider than the apex. Because governments have a series of departments, they also have a series of vertical pyramids. The principal problem with this view is that governments have difficulty creating policy or delivering a service when the policy or service involves more than one government department. What tends to happen in the classical model is that one department implements a program when it does not have the maximum level of expertise. This sometimes leads to duplication when one government department tries to solve a policy problem that another government department is also working on. Horizontal management was designed to solve this problem by instituting collaboration among departments.

Alternative service delivery is the other product of administrative reforms that gained notoriety during the spread of NPM. James Iain Gow (2001) suggests that alternative service delivery was meant to bypass central controls as well as the excessive reliance and adherence to central rules. In essence, different methods of delivering public services are ways of moving further from the command and control style of traditional public administration.

There are several alternatives to service delivery that get away from the traditional departmentalization that was encouraged by Parliament and Cabinet, which are where money and leadership are anchored (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000). Parliament, usually through Cabinet, can create separate agencies that are funded by the public purse through legislation. The separate agency reports directly to the minister of a government department with the head of the agency having a similar status to that of a deputy minister in a department. Another method of service delivery is public partnerships. This is a popular new form of public sector service delivery that involves a collaborative pooling of
resources by other public sector governments or organizations. In other areas, particularly for research and regulatory functions, departmental corporations are formed that usually have greater decision-making autonomy than the standard departments.

Crown corporations are yet another service delivery method. They operate under commercial lines delivering goods and services, are most like private businesses, and have autonomy over their finance and human resources. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for example, is a Crown corporation that competes with other businesses in the marketplace. Regulated monopolies, on the other hand, exist to provide low-cost goods or services that can be realized with one producer and where the government regulates price to avoid gouging. Utilities are generally areas for which regulated monopolies are created. Another innovative alternative mechanism for service delivery is the government-owned contractor arrangement whereby a contract is generated that shifts operational responsibility of a facility to a contractor but the facility remains in the government’s hands. An example of this is found in Ontario’s commuter rail and bus system known as GO Transit. GO Transit is government-owned but the trains and buses are operated and maintained by private operators.

In other cases, governments give the task of delivering a particular service to not-for-profit or community enterprises through a contract with government. These exist primarily in areas of human capital development, such as job training and immigrant integration. There are also franchise and licensing arrangements where business people can provide a service previously handled by a government or Crown corporation. This occurred with Canada Post when many postal outlets opened in shopping malls and drug stores.

Finally, there are a number of arrangements in public service delivery that involve the private sector—namely, outright privatization, contracting out, and public–private partnerships. Privatization is defined as “the transfer of government ownership of parts of departments or of Crown corporations to the private sector” (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000, 101). This definition simply states the process for the government to liquidate all control for a service. However, contracting out is often viewed as part of the greater realm of privatization (Bingman and Pitsvada 1997). Contracting out essentially means that the government is relinquishing its role in providing the service but it still controls the design of the program through a negotiated contract (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000). Thus, a private company delivers a good or service under the terms and conditions set out by government. The final form of delivery is the public–private partnership. Commonly known as P3s, these partnerships are collaborative arrangements between government and business, community organizations and other third parties that the government chooses to partner with in order to provide a service to the public (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000).
The end result of new public management is that it is a highly influential perspective that drastically changed the face of public administration and how services are delivered. We have moved significantly away from the classical Weberian model of bureaucracy to a very different arrangement. On the basis of that alone, it stands to reason that contemporary approaches to public administration and service delivery are more influential than classical approaches.

**Understanding Total Quality Management**

In a similar light, the contemporary approach to total quality management (TQM) was also born out of a desire to adopt private sector management principles and apply them to the public sector. W. Edwards Deming (1986) was the pioneer of TQM in the private sector. He set out to counter the predominant American version of manufacturing, which sought to increase the amount of production and have a separate group of inspectors determine the quality of the final product. TQM, conversely, suggests that individuals working in the chain of production should be responsible for their own quality control. Although this process has the tendency to significantly slow production, the end result is that the overall quality of the product is better, which then leads to future cost savings because there will be fewer product recalls or repairs made to defective ones. Deming applied TQM to the Japanese manufacturing sector, which was then contrasted to the output-driven American manufacturing sector.

The question for those who studied public management was whether this private sector management practice could be adapted to the public sector. Certainly, there were many complaints about inefficiency in the public sector through the 1970s and 1980s, which the elected officials began to use in their rhetoric, as the Reagan discussion above noted. Would providing a service right the first time alleviate some of these chronic issues and complaints and save money? The allure of this prospect was significant in the late 1970s and 1980s. Gregory Inwood (2009, 197) suggests that these ideas were instituted in several federal departments, including: “Energy Mines and Resources; the Office of the Auditor-General; and the department of Industry, Science, and Technology.” There was a fairly extensive experiment with TQM in Canada, but it was met with only marginal success.

One of the ideas that TQM brought to public administration is known as “participatory management.” The goal of participatory management is to empower employees during organizational decision making. While senior managers still retain final decision-making authority, front-line public servants are encouraged to voice their opinions about their working conditions. To make participatory management work, public servants need to be sure that the ideas and perspectives they are presenting are welcomed, and that they are protected from the middle managers who might criticize them in the process.
Much like NPM, the TQM movement gained momentum because of the perceived failure of classical public administration. There was an underlying assumption that “bureaucracy has reached its limits” (Heckscher 1995, 16). Orienting top-down decision making has its limitations. One such limitation is the speed at which decisions can be rendered on a particular instance will be slower if an administrator has to consult a superior for a decision that is a special circumstance. The classical position of scientific management states that automated responses can occur. This might be true for standard decisions when considering a normal, everyday circumstance. Yet, some people have unusual situations, and those unusual situations often come without precedent. It is far more efficient to empower field-level workers to make those decisions than to go through the chain of command (Carroll and Siegel 1999). As Heckscher (1995, 16) points out, “The simplicity and power of top-down, rule-based administration created competitive advantage in the past, but it blocks the responsiveness and continuous innovation that are the keys today.” Although Heckscher sees many drawbacks to the implementation of participatory management in both the private and public sectors. He emphasizes the point that participatory management was created to respond to the ineffectiveness of traditional bureaucratic organization.

Both the TQM and NPM approaches, in addition to other contemporary theories and approaches, have breathed new life into the study of public administration. These approaches have spurred quite a debate in public administration, and the bureaucracy has changed significantly since the 1970s when it was thought to be bloated, inefficient, and operated outside any serious oversight.

**Influence in the Canadian Context**

When we try to assess the level of influence that both NPM and TQM have produced versus the classical approaches to public administration, there are both theoretical and applied examples that can be discussed. On a theoretical basis, some of the issues that continue to be discussed include whether alternative forms of service delivery lead to more efficiency, how conceptions of accountability have evolved, and the resulting changes to organizational structure that seem inevitable with these new perspectives.

On the question of efficiency, studies have sought to understand how we can effectively measure it. For example, Steven Globerman and Aidan Vining (1996) argue that contracting out is justified only when production and transaction costs can be reduced. They find that although contracting out has a definite effect in lowering production costs (i.e., delivering the actual service is cheaper), it is difficult to ascertain whether it does the same for transaction costs (i.e., costs associated with negotiating a contract and monitoring progress). This point can be supported by looking at the literature on contracting out. For example, James
McDavid (2001) suggests that contracting out of residential solid waste collection will be associated with lower unit costs than those of public providers of similar services. Also, in local governments where providers are in competition with each other, there is a tendency to have public and private providers and this creates competition, which lowers delivery costs in both organizations through greater efficiency. Finally, in local governments that have contracted waste collection services, the unit cost of the service will be lower where the bidding process is more competitive. All of these are directed at unit costs and keeping down the cost of delivery. It does not mention the other costs of bargaining and opportunism, which are costs of governance. On that note, Globerman and Vining (1996) suggest that bargaining costs occur when both parties are acting with self-interest but in good faith. Opportunism, on the other hand, is behaviour by a party to change the agreed terms of a transaction to be more in their favour. By changing the way we organize and deliver public services, we are inevitably opening the door to further study on the effect of these newer organizations.

Naturally, with the way the public sector is evolving, other public administration concepts, such as accountability, are also changing. Ewan Ferlie (1996), for example, believes that there is a change in accountability to what he calls market-based forms of accountability. Some of the characteristics of this type of accountability include the empowering of users and consumers as customers, marginalized political accountability, setting performance targets, using audit systems to usher in new levels of accountability, and management through contract. Sproule-Jones (2000) suggests similar initiatives to improve accountability. He states that one solution is to manage the performance of units and report the findings to their hierarchies. Second, some units should evaluate performance and publicly report their findings so that consumers can judge the unit for what they have done. Finally, there is the option of obtaining an independent organization to monitor the program. Either of these steps for improved accountability have their associated financial costs.

Aucoin (1995) goes further in exploring the changing understanding of accountability. The push for a decentralized public service has raised the question of whether ministers can or should be accountable for the actions of public servants who have increasing discretion. The traditional conception of accountability is evolving. The Westminster parliamentary system has difficulty acknowledging whether deputy ministers or Cabinet ministers are accountable (Aucoin 1995). Much work has been undertaken to understand the two types of accountability being developed: one being ministerial and the other public service. This has been brought about as a result of the fact that ministers cannot know everything that goes on in their departments. Not only that, but with newer forms of service delivery that rely on external organizations to assist a department, the
minister has even more difficulty understanding what is going on. Because of this, deputy ministers appear to be increasingly charged with the affairs of the department and this has led to their answerability to Parliament.

Aucoin (1995) goes on to suggest that public service accountability is tampered with in turn by constitutional protections of ministerial responsibility and the confidential advice that senior civil servants give. The effect of this is that ministers do not resign when something goes wrong. If the ministers are not to blame for the problems in their department, they are quick to blame their officials for the problems rather than take responsibility. This inevitably leads to blame avoidance at the highest level of the hierarchy, which produces a significant burden on the middle managers who are in turn getting blamed. The major issue with this, beyond the lack of responsibility at the top, is that it may wrongly assume that the problem lies where the blame is being placed. Once again, this change with regard to our understanding of accountability has emerged as a result of the influence that the contemporary approaches to public administration have had on the theory and practice of public administration in Canada.

Finally, in terms of the evolution of organizational form that has been brought about by total quality management and other organizational development movements, we see that there are a number of new conceptions of old terms that the public sector needs to revise. For example, the TQM movement calls into question the role of middle and senior managers. In the traditional bureaucratic organization, middle and senior managers were the focal point between the discussions that occurred within their organizational units. They acted as mentors, coaches, facilitators, and decision-makers on the basis of the information they had available. Under TQM and other movements to decentralize decision making, delayering of the public sector began to occur. Delayering is the term used to describe the push for decentralizing management, which has made some layers of bureaucracy under the traditional hierarchy unnecessary. Instead of having some coordinating layers of management at the middle of the hierarchy, decentralization suggests that workers in the field be given more latitude to meet citizen demands without the delay in acquiring consent through the chain of command of the traditional bureaucratic structure (Carroll and Siegel 1999). With this, middle managers lost the need to engage in direct supervision because the scope of subordinate activity was now broadened, which rendered their positions useless (Pollitt 2003).

Heckscher (1995) agrees that the restructuring of organizational form as a result of participatory management disrupts middle managers’ traditional forms of involvement and collaboration. However, he goes further by suggesting that restructuring pushes them into a defensive mentality, which does not engender a productive relationship. Because employees are themselves taking ownership
of the project, it really leaves no useful role for these managers to perform. And because employees may indeed criticize a manager, animosity sets in which makes the experiment too difficult to understand.

On a more practical level, we can see the face of public administration changing. Governments are grappling with how to cope with fiscal constraints on an ongoing basis. We constantly see questions being raised about what role government should play in society. The federal government grapples over what to do with Atomic Energy of Canada, for example. Provincial governments across the country talk about whether utilities should be privatized. Municipal governments try to determine whether it is more cost effective to employ people in-house or to contract out for private sector expertise. It is an ongoing process with no definite end in sight.

**A New Wave of Organization Theories**

The focus of the discussion to this point has been on how far we have moved beyond classical organization theories and adopted new ways of thinking about public administration. However, as Evert Lindquist (2009) suggests, the study of public administration has tended not to pay adequate attention to the ways in which organization theory can be used to illuminate this field, and he laments that many students of public administration are missing out on exciting developments that have been occurring within the domain of organization theory. The debate in this chapter may reinforce Lindquist’s point to some extent, in that we have chosen to lay out our arguments on a more traditional axis, but we do want to recognize that there are other aspects of this discussion that students could and should explore.

Part of the problem can perhaps be linked to an identity crisis within organization theory. Students may have difficulty understanding whether organization theory is a study unto itself, or should be one of a range of different perspectives within a solid education in public administration. Lindquist’s approach to resolving the problem is to highlight some of the contemporary literature based on Hodgetts’s (1972) method of using metaphors to understand public administration, and he points to the exciting ways in which contemporary authors such as Peter Aucoin and Herman Bakvis (1988), Doug Stevens (1993), James Desveaux (1995), Lindquist (1996), and Barbara Wake Carroll and David Siegel (1999) are moving forward using organization theory. Within these new developments, students are offered the opportunity to move beyond established theories and approaches and shift their focus to what is happening in the here and now.

Unfortunately, space does not permit a more elaborate discussion of these theories (interested readers are encouraged to begin with Lindquist’s work from 2009 in the list of suggested readings). However, these new approaches to organ-
ization theory support the overall argument in this particular essay—namely, that the classical organization theories discussed in Ohemeng’s piece, while very important for the student of public administration to know and understand, continue to diminish in influence over time. In their wake, new generations of theorists have provided various new tools, and metaphors, for the next generation of scholars in this field.

Conclusion

Once again, influence can be measured in any number of ways. One way to measure influence is to ask whether anything has changed as a result of the new approaches to public administration. There is no question that the look and feel of the public sector is different today than it was 40 or 50 years ago. The way we deliver public services has changed, and continues to do so. The private sector plays a larger role, governments have sought to move beyond the silos of their departmentalization, and the role of individuals within the bureaucracy has changed, which essentially has decentralized decision-makers and given field-level civil servants more discretion. We can also see from the kind of literature now being published that the questions that are being asked revolve around understanding the significance of reforms and the effect they have on service delivery. Many researchers no longer talk about the classical approaches. They are being influenced by the good and the not so good results of public sector reform over the past 30 years or so.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Is government still considered to be the problem (i.e., bloated, inefficient, etc.) or is it now seen as being the solution to the problem?
2. What is your first impression when you hear the word “bureaucracy”?
3. Are private sector management practices still seen as superior to public sector management practices?
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The Ongoing Influence of Traditional Theories

Frank L.K. Ohemeng

Introduction

In recent years, contemporary organization theories, such as total quality management, new public management, and new public governance, seem to have had a stranglehold on Canadian public administration (CPA). These theories seem to have been applied in such a vigorous manner that many believe they have completely changed public administration not only in Canada but globally (Coblebatch 1998; Borins 1995; Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000). Indeed, these scholars believe that CPA has transitioned from the old, classical way to a new and modern way of managing the public sector.

There are other scholars, however, who believe that in spite of the emergence of new organization theories, which seem to have influenced CPA, the argument that CPA has been hoodwinked by them is a fallacy, and the facts on the ground do not support such an assertion (Savoie 1995; Phidd 2007). In short, this school rejects the fundamental idea that the shape of the current public sector system can best be explained by looking at more modern theories, rather than at the classical approaches to organization.

Based on these two schools of thought, one is bound to ask the question: do contemporary organization theories of public administration have more influence than traditional ones? A casual look at the prevailing environment and the influence of neo-liberal ideas may lead one to simply answer “yes.” A closer examination of present CPA, however, reveals that this is not the case and that in spite of all the noise about the influence of contemporary theories, the traditional or classical theories, I will argue, still hold much sway in Canada, and the CPA system is still much the same as it was a century ago. In a nutshell, I unequivocally reject the claim that modern theories have had more influence on public administration in Canada than have classical ones. I will substantiate this claim by looking at three main issues: the organizational structure, including the administrative decentralization of CPA; merit, efficiency, and effectiveness values; and CPA performance management.

This essay is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the theories that are considered traditional or classical. Here, I focus on bureaucratic,
scientific management, and administrative management theories. In the second section, I examine the influence of these theories on CPA from the early 1920s through to the late 1960s. I conclude with an examination of what I describe as the resilience of these theories as they relate to the present public administration system.

Defining Organization Theory:
A Laborious Adventure?

Understanding and explaining what constitutes organization theories, and more or less identifying what constitutes classical and modern theories, is not an easy assessment or simple categorization. It is quite difficult to place all the theories we know about organizations into one or two baskets and then pick and choose from them. Furthermore, the difficulty in such categorization has been compounded by the fact that many consider these theories as management theories rather than simply as organizational ones (Morgan 2006). Nevertheless, it is essential for one to be able to identify and explain what may be considered as classical and modern theories. Before identifying them, one must first define what organization theory is, and this is a necessary but not a simple task. As explained by Hatch and Cunliffe (2006, 5), the subject matter “embraces multiple perspective as it draws inspiration from a wide variety of other fields of study, and because organizations will remain too complex and malleable to ever be summed up by an single theory.”

Be that as it may, we may define organization theory as a collection of general propositions about organizations that seeks to describe, compare, and evaluate organizations at the macro level of analysis. Organization theory provides a theoretical framework for understanding and predicting organizational outcomes, and helps to explain or predict how groups and individuals behave in differing organizational arrangements. We may thus differentiate organizational theory from organizational behaviour, in terms of where the focus of each lies. One must, however, concede that this distinction is not watertight because the study of organizations does not only concern structural analysis but the behaviour of the organization and the personnel in it. The difference becomes clearer when one examines an organization from the big- and small-picture perspectives—that is, at the “macro” and “micro” levels (Robbins 1990; Stern and Barley 1996).

From these perspectives, organization theory is said to deal with the study of organizations at the macro level—that is, the unit of analysis is the organization itself. Here, it is more concerned by the “organization’s ability to adapt and achieve its goals” (Robbins 1990, 7). On the other hand, organizational behaviour looks from the micro-level perspective. At this level, attention is directed to the
individual working in the organization. As explained by Robbins (ibid.), organizational behaviour “focuses on behaviour in organizations and a narrow set of employee performance and attitudes including employee productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction.” It does not therefore matter what position the individual has within the organization. In this essay, I am more interested in organization theory than organizational behaviour, and in particular changes that public sector organizations continue to experience, especially in the last 30 years or so.

**The Perspective of Classical Organization Theory**

With organization theory defined and distinguished from organizational behaviour, the theories that constitute classical organization theory will now be examined. Classical organization theory includes those theories propounded by Max Weber (bureaucratic theory), Frederick Winslow Taylor (scientific management), and Luther Gulick and Henry Fayol (administrative management theory). I use the term “classical organization theory” in similar fashion as Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2005). Theories are considered classical because they were the first theories of their kind, they are considered traditional, and they continue to be the base on which other schools of organization theory have been built, especially modern management theories (Morgan 2006; Shafritz et al. 2005).

These classical theories originated during the Industrial Revolution and can be attributed to a group of professionals who practised mechanical engineering, industrial engineering, and economics. The influence of their scientific backgrounds on their thinking led them to portray organizations as machine-like systems with little recognition of how organizations might reflect history or temporary environmental conditions (Morgan 2006). The fundamental belief of classical organization theories is that “organizations provides a principle of structural design and a practice of operational control that can be rationally determined and formalized in advance of actual performance” (Reed 2006, 24). As a result of this thinking, classical theorists sought to provide simple solutions to all organizational problems. It is, therefore, not surprising that their theories have been described as a “one-size-fits-all” or “one best way” to organizational analysis (Morgan 2006). Shafritz et al. (2005) have summarized the basic tenets of classical organization theory as (1) organizations exist to accomplish production-related and economic goals; (2) there is one best way to organize for production, and that way can be found through systematic, scientific inquiry; (3) production is maximized through specialization and division of labour; and (4) people and organizations act in accordance with rational economic principles.

In what follows, I will describe these scholars’ ideas. I must, however, caution the reader that the presentation here is by no means exhaustive.
Frederick Winslow Taylor and Scientific Management Theory

One of the earliest scholars to have theorized about organizations is Frederick Winslow Taylor. Taylor was a trained engineer who was employed at the managerial level of the organization where he worked (Clegg and Dunkerley 1980). Based on his workplace experience and observations, he developed his scientific management theory, which has proved to be one of the most influential theories of organization and management (Morgan 2006). Taylor was extremely concerned about management efficiency in the workplace. This is not surprising because the era in which he lived was characterized by recurring management and labour conflicts that negatively affected productivity. He, therefore, sought to find ways to minimize such conflicts in order to create an environment conducive to work and organizational productivity (Kernaghan and Siegel 1999; Tompkins 2005).

Scientific management theory called for increasing output by systematizing work processes, dividing work into narrowly defined tasks, determining the one best way to perform each task, training workers in the one best way, measuring their performance, and offering economic incentives for surpassing daily production quotas (Kernaghan and Siegel 1999; Morgan 2006; Robbins 1990). All these systems, Taylor believed, could be achieved by shifting all responsibility for the organization of work from the worker to the manager, using scientific methods to determine the most efficient way of doing work, selecting the best person to perform a designated task, providing training so that the worker could do the assigned work as efficiently as possible, and monitoring workers’ performance to ensure that laid-down work procedures are adhered to, which will lead to the achievement of desired results (Morgan 2006, 23).

A key contribution of Taylor to organizational analysis is the issue of efficiency (Schachter 2007). To Taylor, efficiency could only be realized through increased productivity. Hence, finding the best way to increase productivity was considered paramount for managers. Taylor’s efficiency ideas resonate today, not only in the private sector but much more in the public sector as a result of dwindling government revenue, the perceived waste in government, and citizens’ abhorrence to paying more taxes while at the same time ensuring the prosperity of society. As noted by Rimer (1993, 272), “efficiency and prosperity can occur only through increased productivity.”

Max Weber’s Bureaucratic Theory

In the study of organizations, and in particular public sector organizations, perhaps no one has had more influence than Max Weber. He is well known for his development of an “ideal type bureaucracy,” which can be found in almost every facet of organizational life, be it public, private-for-profit, or private-not-for-profit,
although it has also been widely criticized in a number of areas. His bureaucratic
theory was formulated on the basis of his observation of “the mechanization of
industry and the proliferation of bureaucratic forms of organization” (Morgan
2006, 17).

Weber’s ideas of bureaucratic organization emerged from his observation of
authority in the social, political, and economic environment of the time. He was
interested in finding the basis on which men and women exercise authority over
others (Pugh, Hickson, and Hinings 1981). From his observations, he described
three typologies of authority—charismatic authority, traditional authority, and
legal-rational authority—and then matched these three types of authority with
different kinds of office holders.

Charismatic authority is derived from a leader’s appeal and is based on a
belief in the divine or inordinate attributes of the person exerting authority. In
the traditional form of authority, orders are obeyed because the person giving
them is invested with authority through custom or convention. Charismatic and
traditional authority are not codified in impersonal rules but are usually invested
in a hereditary line or invested in a particular office by a higher power or the
personality traits of the leader. The third form of authority, legal-rational au-
thority, is derived from the law. Under this form of authority, orders are obeyed
because the person exercising the authority is authorized to do so through legal
means. As noted by Pugh et al. (1981, 21), “it is legal because authority is exer-
cised by means of a system of rules and procedures through the office which an
individual occupies at a particular time.” There is, therefore, nothing personal
about this authority as compared with the traditional and charismatic forms of
authority.

From these observations, Weber concluded that many early organizations
were inefficiently managed because organizational decisions were based on per-
sonal relationships and loyalty. He proposed a new structural model of organ-
ization called a bureaucracy, which he contended would lead to the efficient
management of organizations. Thus, according to Weber, this structural model
is the most efficient means by which organizations could achieve their objectives
(Robbins 1990, 37). The bureaucratic organization is also supposed to be more
efficient because the means used to achieve its goals are unencumbered by the
personal whim of the leader or by the traditional or charismatic authority models
(Pugh et al. 1981, 22).

The ideal bureaucracy comprises a number of attributes, including: a well-
deﬁned sphere of competence, clearly demarcated from those of others; offices
ordered in a hierarchical manner with lower levels being supervised by a higher
one; restricted authority to ofﬁcers’ duties; ofﬁcers appointed on the basis of
competency with a contractual relationship existing between themselves and the
organizations; ofﬁcers selected on the basis of their qualifications; ofﬁcers have
a career in the organization; officers are separated from the means of production; officers’ activities are regulated by general, consistent, and abstract rules; officers’ duties are undertaken in a spirit of impersonality; and, finally, the organization is headed by a non-bureaucratic head (Phidd 2007, 181).

Weber’s primary aim was to establish clear lines of authority and control that will lead to the achievement of the organization’s goals in an efficient manner. He, therefore, placed much emphasis on the need for a hierarchical power structure, which will help differentiate managers who will have to make decisions from subordinates who will have to respond to such decisions. An essential component of his theory is the importance of division of labour and specialization. A formal set of rules is bound into the hierarchy structure to ensure stability and uniformity. Weber also put forth the notion that organizational behaviour is a network of human interactions, where all behaviour can be understood by looking at cause and effect (Tompkins, 2005).

In spite of numerous criticisms, many believe that the bureaucratic form of organization is the most important model for modern society and that it will survive; indeed, it has survived all that has been thrown at it (Aucoin 1997; Goodsell 2003; Hales 2002; Meier and Hill 2005; Olsen 2006; Pollitt 2009).

**Administrative Management Theory**

No single author is credited for developing administrative management theory. Writings from a group of well-known scholars are attributed to this theory’s development. The most prominent of these scholars are Henry Fayol, Luther Gulick, and James Mooney and Allan Reiley. In view of the difficulty in pointing to a single scholar for the development of this theory, there is no real starting point to which scholars can identify the emergence of the theory (Hatch and Cunliffe 2006). Although some scholars believe that administrative management emerged from the writings of Fayol (Hodgetts 1976); Koontz 1961; Shafritz et al. 2005), others have credited the work of Mooney and Reiley as the originators of the theory (Clegg and Dunkerley 1980; Tompkins 2005).

Administrative management focuses on management processes and the principles of management. In contrast to scientific management, which largely examines jobs and work at the individual level (i.e., the shop floor), administrative management provides a more managerial view of administration (Clegg and Dunkerley 1980). Administrative management, however, shares a commonality with scientific management and bureaucratic theories in the sense that it emphasizes the establishment of a universal set of management principles that can be applied to all types of organizations. According to Morgan (2006, 18), the basic thrust of administrative management is “a process of planning, organization, command, coordination, and control.” Koontz has succinctly summarized the objectives of administrative management. Koontz (1961, 175–176) is of the view that
management theory perceives management as a process of getting things done through and with people operating in organized groups. Its aim is to analyze the process, to establish a conceptual framework for it, to identify principles underlying it, and to build up a theory of management from them. It regards management as a universal process, regardless of the type of enterprise, or the level in a given enterprise, although recognizing, obviously, that the environment of management differs widely between enterprises and levels. It looks upon management theory as a way of organizing experience so that practice can be improved through research, empirical testing of principles, and teaching of fundamentals involved in the management process.

One of the well-known scholars to have developed administrative management theory is Henry Fayol. Fayol was a management practitioner who used his experience to explain the functions that management has in an organization. He was most interested in the role of the manager rather than the worker in enhancing organizational efficiency and productivity and therefore developed a number of principles for his theory.

To Fayol, managers are essentially expected to perform five main functions in an organization and these functions are universal in nature. The functions are planning (managers need to plan for the organization’s tasks and objectives); organizing (they must find the labour and capital necessary for the achievement of the organizational goals); commanding (they must regulate the activities of workers so that they follow in the direction that will ultimately lead to the realization of the organization’s objectives); coordinating (managers provide the means to integrate or unify and harmonize every activity of the members of the organization); and controlling (they instruct all employees to conform or comply with established organizational rules, directives, plans and schedules) (Tompson 2005).

From this, Fayol developed his 14 management principles, which enable him “to initiate the much-needed dialogue about managerial effectiveness” (Tompson 2005, 99). Fayol conceded, however, that “there is no limit to the number of principles of management, every rule or managerial procedure which strengthens the body corporate or facilitates its functions has a place among the principles so long, at least, as experience confirms its worthiness” (Fayol, in Shafritz et al. 2005, 48). The 14 principles include: division of work, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interests to the general interest, remuneration of personnel, centralization, scalar chain (line of authority), order, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, initiative, and esprit de corps (Fayol, in Shafritz et al. 2005, 48; Robbins 1990, 36; Tompkins 2005, 100).

An important contribution of Fayol to organization theory is his belief that “the need for managers to learn and to be trained, and that managerial organ-
Luther Gulick has also been identified as one of the key writers on administrative management theory. Gulick served as one of the members of US President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s committee on administrative reforms appointed in 1936 to suggest a comprehensive and balanced program for dealing with the overhead organization and management of the executive branch of government. It is from the work of the committee that Gulick developed his theory on organization, which built on Fayol’s work. Gulick was interested in how to rationalize work processes to enhance administrative and organizational capacity.

Gulick’s interest in the administrative process of governments stemmed from the fact that governments face special problems of organizational design, and these problems had been ignored by earlier theorists. Because governments are responsible for carrying out many dissimilar, complex tasks, this calls for a new approach to reforming them, an approach that differed from the prevailing “shop floor” theories.

Gulick was primarily concerned with an organization’s division of labour, especially with the number of personnel that a supervisor must control to ensure efficiency and effectiveness for the organization. To him, for organizations to achieve the complex tasks they perform, these tasks must be divided among the labour force. In this way, one supervisor can supervise any small number to avoid organizational slack or free-riding among labour.

Gulick is, however, well known for his reformulation of Fayol’s managerial principles into seven identifiable management functions known as POSDCORB—planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. According to Hatch (2006, 35), Gulick’s “work highlights one of the central tenets of modernism—that universal rules and principles can be found and applied to any organization, in this case any administrative institution whether it be a business, hospital, government, prison or school.”

The Development of Canadian Public Administration

Now that I have discussed the classical approaches to understanding organizations, this section addresses how these theories have had, and continue to have, significant influence on CPA. I will briefly sketch the development of CPA from the 1900s through to the present time and then show the effect of the classical theories on it even in the so-called era of post-bureaucratic or managerialist environment.
Although the development of CPA dates back to the signing of the *British North America Act* in 1867, it was not until the early 20th century that it began to take shape. Between these periods, CPA was dominated by a system of patronage—that is, appointments to the public service were made on the basis of whom you know rather than on a person’s competence; and although some efforts were made to change this trend, nothing concrete came out of these efforts until the early 1900s (Adie and Thomas 1987; Julliet and Rasmussen 2008; Kernaghan and Siegel 1999). The patronage system created a number of efficiency and effectiveness problems for the public sector, which became a serious concern to the government (Julliet and Rasmussen 2008).

The government started promoting the idea of merit in the service in the early 1900s. To do so, it established the Civil Service Commission (CSC) in 1908 to act as the guardian of the merit principle and passed a new *Civil Service Act*, which provided the impetus for eliminating the patronage system. This was necessary because, according to Aide and Thomas (1987, 69), “the deleterious effects of [the patronage system, especially during] the war years on the Canadian civil service system were evidenced by frequent gross inefficiencies and scandal.” The Act also created a situation where “the Crown prerogative was reduced and there was no formal separation of personnel administration from general management” (Julliet and Rasmussen 2008, 49).

By the middle of the 20th century, the merit system had become enshrined in the public services. The system, however, began with the classification of over 50,000 positions by the US consulting firm of Arthur Young & Co. (Kernaghan and Siegel 1999, 47–48). This led to the reorganization of the entire bureaucratic apparatus, including the reduction of the number of departments and agencies of the government. The work undertaken by Arthur Young had, and continues to have, a lasting impact on the classification of public offices. Its detailed classification plan continued to build up over the ensuing years, making the public service into a highly complex system (Hodgetts 1976, 24).

A significant development of the public service was the growth it experienced from the 1920s through to the 1960s. During this period, as a result of the creation of the welfare state with a number of public service programs and increases in immigration, the public sector doubled in size (Hodgetts 1976; Kernaghan and Siegel 1999). This growth had an enormous impact on public administration. It affected the functioning of the administrative system and its overall performance. It was during this period that the government established the Glassco commission on reforming the public administration with the view of promoting “efficiency, economy, and improved service in the despatch of public business” (Hodgetts 1982, 480). Subsequent reforms were gradually introduced into the public administration system and these reforms are still in effect today.
Classical Organization Theory and Its Influence on Canadian Public Administration

One of the most profound influences on the CPA system has been Weber’s bureaucratic theory. Weber’s bureaucratic theory, as noted earlier, is very much concerned with the creation of an administrative structure to enhance efficiency. To this end, he called for a hierarchical structure with delineated authority, a career system, separation of official functions from personal work, and other attributes already discussed. Weber’s system has continuously been applied in CPA, notwithstanding the various reform adventures and the coming into existence of what some scholars have described as post-bureaucratic organization (Borins 1995; Kernaghan 2000; Kernaghan et al. 2000). In a nutshell, the post-bureaucratic organization has not in anyway dislocated Weber’s structural prescription on Canadian public administration. Phidd (2007) has also noted how Weber’s organization theory has influenced the various changes in industrial relations laws and the elimination of or reduction of patronage, which was the hallmark of CPA from the 1800s to about 1920. Inwood (2009, 103) succinctly summed up Weber’s influence on the CPA when he noted, for example, that “the 1918 reforms to the public service very strongly reflect a Weberian sensibility. Those reforms introduced the concept of merit into the public service and entrenched hierarchy, a job classification system, professionalism, competitive exams, etc. the intent—true to Weber’s ideas—was to put the Canadian public service on a more rational basis and operate according to prescribed rules and regulations.”

Taylor’s scientific management theory has also had a strong influence on CPA in a number of ways (Hodgetts 1982; Wilson 1982) Taylor, as noted earlier, was very much interested in the systematization of work, division of labour, finding the one best way to perform organizational tasks, providing the necessary training for workers, performance measurement, administrative efficiency, and motivating workers through economic incentives. Since the early 1900s, Taylor’s theory has affected CPA in areas such as the introduction of the merit system, job classification, and the focus on administrative efficiency. Indeed, since the 1900s, administrative efficiency in public organizations has been well invoked in all aspects of organizational life (Inwood 2009). Commenting on Taylor’s influence on CPA, Wilson (1982, 321) noted, “emerging out of the early popularity of ‘Taylorism,’ or the efficiency management movement, there came the tendency to treat the labour force as one of the instruments of production. … The impact of the efficiency movement was directly felt by the bureaucracy for it resulted in the introduction of a complex classification system into the civil service after the First World War.” This efficiency idea has been so prevalent in CPA that some scholars have described Canada as being “enthusiastic adherents to the idea of
administrative efficiency” (Sutherland and Doern 1985, 30) and this enthusiasm is still prevalent today.

The merit approach discussed by Taylor continues to prevail in CPA notwithstanding the various reforms and changes to personnel management such as those found in the Public Service Employment Act of 2003. In fact, Taylor’s classification and merit ideas provided the impetus for the attack on the patronage system that had been in existence in early CPA. As explained by Wilson (1982, 549):

[T]he classification movement tied in with the rising support for the merit system and the attack on patronage. Obviously if the merit system were to be practical, a scientific classification of the duties of all positions as well as a precise description of the qualifications necessary to fulfill these duties was a prime requirement. Economy and efficiency in the administration of government would obviously be enhanced if all functions were clearly specified and lines of authority clearly drawn.

More so, the current obsession with performance measurement in CPA, which dates back to the 1960s, can be attributed to Taylor (Dewar 2000). According to Phidd (2007, 191), “the influence of Taylorism is well reflected in the development and utilization of performance measurement techniques within the public service.”

An important dimension of public administration is the question of centralization—decentralization, which, according to Aucoin and Bakvis (1988), has become a conundrum in Canada, and to which Kernaghan and Siegel (1999, 55) describe as “a very important issue in a country as large and heterogeneous as Canada.” Decentralization has various meanings, but in this context, I am interested in administrative decentralization, which can be conceived as the decongestion or the disbursement of administrative offices and personnel from one central location to other parts of a country.

In the Canadian public administration system, two types of decentralization may be discerned—regional or geographical decentralization and internal decentralization. Regional decentralization consists of the moving of administrative branches of an organization to other parts of the country, while internal decentralization refers to the subdivision of organizational functions. Decentralization of the first kind was undertaken with the idea that people from all parts of the country could receive the same service without having to travel to the head office of the organization in Ottawa for it. Administrative decentralization was well articulated in the recommendations made by the Glassco commission in the 1960s. According to Hodgetts (1964, 415), when the Glassco commission came to examine the responsibility of the civil service commission, especially its additional and comprehensive authority over most of the personnel management
field, it found that departmental managers had been caught in the pincers of centralized agencies and have had to operate in that atmosphere of distrust which had been responsible in the first place for the imposition of such controls. The commission, therefore, called for a more decentralized system of management; since then, decentralization has become a major part of the Canadian administrative culture. Subsequently, various governments have pursued it to the best of their ability (Aucoin 1988).

As a result of this approach, CPA is well decentralized with offices and personnel across the length and breadth of this country. As observed by Hodgetts some years ago, “for most of this century, anywhere from two-thirds to three-quarters of national personnel has been located outside the National Capital Region (NCR). As of 1985, for example, 32 percent were located in the NCR and 68 percent outside” (Hodgetts 1982 in Brown 1987, 546). Apart from geographical decentralization, to provide managers the needed authority to make decisions, there has also been decentralization within organizations themselves. Decentralization is more prevalent today than ever before (Kernaghan and Siegel 1999).

Administrative decentralization is a product of administrative management theory, especially its focus on the scalar chain or the limitation of the number of people one supervisor can supervise. In other words, the administrative decentralization idea pursued in Canada is the result of the ideas on organizational effectiveness, with much focus on process, purpose, and people (Kernaghan and Siegel 1999).

**Conclusion**

This essay demonstrates the influence of classical organization theories over modern theories in Canadian public administration. It identifies and explains the classical theories and then examines in brief the trajectories of the development of public administration in Canada and how this development has been, and continues to be, informed by classical organization theories.

Understanding the issues discussed is of utmost importance because many believe that modern organization theories have overshadowed the influence classical theories have had in Canada. Although I do not object to the influence made by modern organization theories, I reject the assertion that these theories have overshadowed the classical ones because the facts available do not support that argument. It may even be said that what are considered as new organization theories are themselves not new but a radical reinforcement of the ideas pronounced by early organization theorists. Thus, there is nothing really new about these modern theories.
We see the prevalence of classical thinking in a number of ways, including the public service structure, the focus on merit in employment, the unquestionable adherence to issues of efficiency and effectiveness, and administrative decentralization. In short, modern principles or theories of organization, with particular emphasis on managerialism and competitive markets, have not in any meaningful way replaced mainstream ideas of public administration in Canada. It may be argued that managerial principles as found in the new public management philosophy have been added to, rather than substituted for the classical influence of public administration in Canada. Thus, I concur with Wilson (1982) who argues that Canadian public administration has been well influenced by such theories as scientific management, which calls for efficiency and effectiveness in management. To him, therefore, the qualities of efficiency and economy have become more operational concepts than political slogans, and this is because of the contribution of scientific management, which has endured up to the present day.

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

1. Explain how the Industrial Revolution influenced the development of classical organization theories.
2. What accounted for the massive growth in the size of the Canadian public service in the middle of the 20th century? How might the social, economic, and political values of that era, which allowed such growth, be different from those that are most prominent today?
3. What forces have encouraged decentralization in the Canadian public service? What are the benefits of decentralization? Can you think of any negative effects?
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