

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT: A GENERIC APPROACH

Hüseyin GÜL
Ayşe ALİCAN
Süleyman Demirel University

ABSTRACT

Major changes have always been witnessed in the environments of organizations. Organizational and managerial efforts to manage and adapt to change and to capitalize on it have increased since the 1970's. Such efforts confirmed the need for effective leadership and skillful management of change. Several theories have been developed to grasp the changes in the environment, their impact on organizations and the styles of leadership to manage change effectively such as human relations approaches, behavioral theories, open system model, organizational development (OD) movement, organizational culture theories, TQM, public governance and postmodernist views. Recent discussions on leadership, organization culture and change emphasize such traits and tenets of organizations and leaders as environmental awareness, flexibility, visioning, participation, empowerment, teamwork, creativity, innovation, continuous improvement and organizational learning. Most of these themes have had significant impact on the way we see and think about organizations and leadership and culture in organizations. Having a generic approach, the paper aims to review theories on leadership and organizational culture, and develop a new model of effective leadership in a rapidly changing environment. In this review, first an analysis of values, processes and dynamics shaping leadership styles, organizational change and culture in today's organizations is presented. Second, leadership and organizational culture in a rapidly changing environment are reviewed, and transformative leadership as a model of new leadership is presented. Third, the trends in the public sector and their similarities to the trends in the private sector are explored. Fourth, some implications for effective leadership in changing environment are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The milieu of organizations had always changed; but, the pace of change was much faster in the 20th Century, particularly in the last four decades (Peters, 1987; and idem, 1994; Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990; Osborne and Gaebler, 1993; Peters and Savoie, 1995; Gül, 1998; and idem, 1999). The dominance of neo-liberalism and its view of individuals as the relentless seekers of their personal interests, the advent of governance and its techniques (contracting out, privatization, public-private partnerships, etc.) globalization, increased emphasis on competition, new technological advances, shifts in the preferences and demands of citizens, among others, are some major characteristics that organizations and leaders face today. These transformations have led organizations, corporations and public sector agencies to contemplate about how to manage and adapt to these changes and how to profit from them.

Starting with human relations and behavioral approaches, continuing with open system, organizational development and organizational culture theories, TQM, public governance and postmodernist view, several approaches have been developed to capture the changes in the environment and their impact on organizations and organizational management. In these approaches, there is a special attention paid to leadership, organizational culture and change. Besides, emphasis on some of the traits and tenets of organizations and leaders has increased such as environmental awareness, self-awareness, quality, visioning, participation, teamwork, strategic management, flexibility, choice, design, continuous improvement, organizational learning, leadership development, empowerment, flatter organizational structures, innovation, competitiveness, diversity,

among others. Most of these themes and tenets have had significant impact on the way we see, design, organize, and think about organizations, leadership and culture. Today there are more burdens placed on the shoulders of the managers of the organizations due to rapid change. Rapid change requires leadership, adaptability and learning abilities. Besides, it means change in organizational culture and values. For example, cultural change in a broader sense seems to emphasize market values such as diversity, individual choices, competition and consumption, among others. In such an environment, organizations need effective leadership, flexibility, organizational learning and change in order to survive. Accordingly, a new model of leadership described as transformative leadership has replaced a leadership function confined to top management. Besides, organizational culture and change have become critical issues for transformative leadership. In fact, Schein (1992: 15) argues that “culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin.” Yet, the author (1992: 15) maintains: “If the cultures become dysfunctional it is the unique function of leadership to perceive the functional and dysfunctional elements of the existing culture and to manage cultural evolution and change in such a way that group (or the organization) can survive in a changing environment.”

In this paper, a generic approach on organizational issues is utilized; thus, not only the trends in the private sector but also the public sector and a comparison of the two sectors are explored. The premise of the paper is to analyze theories on leadership and organizational culture and change and develop a new model of effective leadership in a rapidly changing environment. For this purpose, first a review of values, processes and dynamics shaping leadership styles, organizational change and culture in today’s organizations is presented. Second, leadership and organizational culture in a rapidly changing environment are reviewed, and transformative leadership as a model of new leadership is presented. Third, the trends in the public sector and their similarities to the trends in the private sector are explored. Fourth, some implications for organizations and leaders functioning in rapidly changing environments are discussed.

LEADERSHIP, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CHANGE

A Review of Values, Processes and Dynamics Shaping Leadership, Organizational Culture and Change

We have been witnessing dramatic shifts in the lives and environments of organizations since the World

War II, especially within the last three to four decades. Modern society is best described as highly turbulent, subject to sudden and dramatic shifts, highly interdependent, requiring cooperation across many different sectors. Technological developments, the preferences of citizens, values, and others, crises, globalization and other factors force organizations to adapt to these changes and require them to produce creative and integrative solutions for the problems in such a rapidly changing environment (Denhart and de Leon, 1995). The themes of recent discussions on leadership, organization theory, change and culture could be classified according to values, processes and dynamics. These values, processes and dynamics are presented below.

Values: Values could be defined as the principles that guide systems. Some of the principal values important for organizations and leadership comprise environmental awareness, quality, efficiency, responsiveness, tolerance, trust, flexibility, self-awareness, and choice (Peters, 1987; and idem, 1994; Gardner, 1990; Covey, 1991; Parker, 1992; Swiss, 1992; Bergquist, 1993; Carr and Littmann, 1993; Kanter, Stein and Jick, 1993; Senge, 2004).

Processes: Process could be defined as the course in which systems flow. Processes include, but not limited to, adaptability, innovation, visioning, creativity, imagination, discontinuity, ambiguity, uncertainty, variation, chaos, reconstructive thinking, leadership development, organizational learning, participatory decision making, self-directed individuals/teams, transformative leadership, teamwork and flatter organizational structures (Argyris and Schön, 1978; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Peters, 1987; and idem, 1994; Gardner, 1990; Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990; Katzenbach and Smith, 1993; Plas, 1996; Drucker et. al., 1998; Borins, 2000; Gümüşsuyu, 2005; Esen, 2006).

Dynamics: Dynamics are the forces and motions that characterize systems. Some of the main dynamics contain change, competitiveness, risk and initiative taking, decentralization, coalition building, employee empowerment, continuous improvement, shifts toward knowledge based high-tech service sectors, pluralism and diversity (Peters, 1987; Kiel 1993 ve 1994; Kuhnert 1993; Hassard and Parker 1993; Reed, 1993; Drucker et. al., 1998).

Leadership and Organizational Culture in a Changing Environment

Most of the above-mentioned values, processes and

dynamics have had significant impact on the way we see, design, organize, manage and think about organizations today. “Leaders think longer term, grasp the relationships of larger realities, think in terms of renewal, have political skills, cause change, affirm values, achieve unity” (Palmer, 1988: 66, quoted in Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990: 219). Today, the importance of organizational culture for an effective leadership is well established. “The bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead” (Schein, 1992: 15). According to Schein (1992: 12), organizational culture is “a pattern of shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, has worked well enough to be considered as valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.” Robbins (2001: 510–511, cited in Senior, 2002: 126, Illustration 4.1) lists the characteristics of culture as innovation and risk taking, people orientation, analytical thinking, team orientation, competition, stability, aggressiveness. Linguistic paradigms, shared meanings, climate, behavior patterns, beliefs, values, attitudes, norms, rules, symbols and symbolic actions, ethical codes and history are seen to constitute the key ingredients of organizational culture (Brown, 1995: 8; Schein, 1992: 8–11).

In organizational culture perspective, it is recognized that “people make or break” organizations. Accordingly, an understanding of management as controlling enterprise and employees has been replaced by a view of leadership bringing out the best in people and responding quickly to change as the main principle of organization (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990: 218). Thus, a participatory and distributed leadership style is advocated. In this style, sharing responsibilities and authority, empowering employees, inspiring trust and commitment as well as promoting creativity and initiative taking among teammates or employees, among others, all become critical for effective leadership (Argyris, 1970; Golembiewski, 1969; and idem, 1993; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Peters, 1987; Katzenbach and Smith, 1993; Pascarella, 1994). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985: 17), effective leaders can move organizations from current to future states by creating visions for their organizations, mobilizing energy and resources towards this vision, inspiring commitment to organizational vision and change and building new values and strategies in organizations. Yet, “effective leadership must also monitor the external environment, tracking trends,

markets, technological change, and product cycles in an increasingly global 1990’s” (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990: 219).

Two of the critical contributions of the recent leadership theories include the ideas of organizational learning and continuous improvement. Effective leaders are successful not because they do not make mistakes but because they learn from their mistakes. Besides, Kuhnert (1993: 199) argues that leaders in today’s world should understand the complex internal/external relationships among organizational subunits and between the organization and its environment. He maintains that this would help leaders manage flexibly, foster creativity among their employees, realize multiple causes and effects of events, accept non-rational bases of decisions and recognize the role of organizational culture (or beliefs, values, and emotions etc.) for the success of organization. According to Kuhnert (1993), effective leaders are the ones who create a vision, influence and move people toward this vision through shared beliefs and values rather than through exchange relations or the use of authority. Thus, it is generally agreed that leaders, not managers, are what organizations need in order to cope with the complexities of today’s world (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990: 218). Management is seen as an essentially modernist activity rooted in the application of formal logic to problem solving (Carter and Jackson, 1993).

One can argue that there are several useful values and principles among these to be applied to the public sector, as well. For example, teamwork, responsiveness to consumer needs, participation, creativity, innovation, continuous improvement, organizational learning, trust and some others may be useful ideas for the public organizations. Besides, the private sector’s experience on these ideas may provide useful insight into the reform and change efforts in the public sector. However, a majority of the scholars are mainly concerned with organizational issues, leadership, organizational change and culture in the private sector, or, at best, put forth generic ideas on these matters. This focus on private sector in turn brings about increased concerns with such issues as maximizing profit, boosting market share, keeping organization’s competitiveness high, increasing employee motivation, performance and productivity, maximizing the responsiveness to consumer needs along with organizational change, flexibility and unity. Such concerns may have a legitimate base; yet, they are mostly appropriate for organizations with only one bottom line: *profit maximization*. However, this bottom line is often not proper for the public organizations. Public organizations differ from private counterparts

because they have many bottom lines such as the access of the disadvantaged groups to the public services, social justice and equality, the equality of opportunity, the provision of basic public services, accountability the elected, among others. However, such differences in the basic missions and bottom lines between the public and private sectors should not prevent efforts to come to some generic conclusions about leadership, organizational change and culture.

What is Organizational Change and Organizational Development?

Change happens. The important thing about change is to predict and be ready for it (Peters, 1987; Senior, 2002). Unplanned change occurs outside the control of an organization and involves economic and political shifts, social movements, improvements in the quality of life, technological breakthroughs, recent revival of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism, among others. These changes going on in the environment randomly have to be observed, addressed and dealt with in order for organizations to survive. A conscious awareness of environmental factors permits leaders to respond more wisely to the demands and challenges of the external environment and to align their organizations accordingly. Thus, change has to be planned and some related designs on how to manage change have to be developed in all the organizations. And this requires continuous organizational development efforts on part of leadership. The commonly addressed goals in organizational change and development include the need for organizations to adapt themselves to changes in their environment, to be more rational, effective and efficient, to reduce organizational pathologies, and to reduce conflict and redirect it in constructive ways. In managing change, each of these goals should be given proper, but not necessarily equal, attention depending on the situation.

As a member of the generation rocked by the hardships of a catastrophic economic depression of the 1930s, Gaus (1947) saw environmental (or in his terms “ecological”) factors as very relevant not only to the scholars of administration and theories but also on-the-line practitioners of administration and leaders. Lewin defined change as the process of adaptation to the environment and movement to a new and hopefully more desirable pattern of behavior, performance or operation. He provided the classic interpretation of change management as unfreezing the existing situation, moving to new pattern and refreezing the new pattern. He cautioned that moving too quickly

into the change phase before the older situation was completely unfrozen could lead to serious resistance to change. (Lewin, 1951; Burnes, 2004)

Argyris (1970) pointed out that organizational change and development triggered by external forces and transformations would also require an external interventionist or coach in managing change. This coach would typically work with the leadership of an organization either to improve the effectiveness of the existing interpersonal relationships or to facilitate the implementation of planned changes in the organization. Argyris (1970: 12–13) recommended that the primary tasks of the coach would include the following: (1) To help generate valid and useful information in a participatory manner; (2) To create conditions in which the members of an organization could make informed and free choices; and (3) To help managers and employees develop an internal commitment the choices made through a participatory process. However, Argyris cautioned that the role of the coach in this process would not be to impose one’s own values and approaches, but to assist personal and organizational learning. According to Argyris and Schön (1978), the organizational learning was the critical issue in managing organizational change and achieving development. Their basic argument was that organizations and people working in these organizations faced with change, complexities and turbulence in modern life would constantly inquire into their own capacities to learn effectively and improve their adaptability.

In much the same way, Golembiewski (1972: 60–66) emphasized that successful implementation of interpersonal strategies in organizational change and development was very critical for effective leadership. He proposed five strategies for personal and organizational change and development that included the following: (1) Acceptance of inquiry based on mutual accessibility and open communication; (2) Expanded consciousness and recognition of choices especially the willingness to experiment with new behavior and choose those that seem most effective; (3) A collaborative concept of authority, emphasizing cooperation and willingness to examine conflicts openly and with an eye toward their resolution; (4) Mutual helping relationships with a sense of community and responsibility for others; and (5) Authenticity in interpersonal relationships. In general, Golembiewski’s suggestions point to a collaborative-consensual system of leadership based on openness, confrontation, feedback and shared responsibility.

Some Implications for Organizations and Leaders

In recent years, there has been a shift from modernist (old, orthodox or classical) management and organizational approaches to postmodernist and post-bureaucratic theories in response to the changes in the environment and their impact on organizations and management (Argyris, 1962; Cleveland, 1985; Naisbitt and Aburdene 1990; Gergen, 1992; Parker, 1992; Carter and Jackson, 1993; Thompson, 1993; Bennis, 1994). Some argue that a fragmenting dynamic pushes in the direction of plurality, ambiguity, contingency, and arbitrariness (Bennis and Nanus, 1985: 8–10; Gergen, 1992; Kiel, 1993; and idem, 1994). Modernist organizations were based on division of labor, standardization of rules and procedures, mechanistic and hierarchical structures of control and command, centralization, norms of efficiency and economy, and specialization. Mainly based on the writings of the authors like Weber, Taylor, Gulick and Fayol (Shafritz and Ott, 1996), classical or rational organization theory did make an enormous contribution to our understanding of organizations (Gül, 1999). It was believed that the rational design of organizations would minimize indecision and maximize efficiency. In the rational model, disorder and uncertainty is believed to be handled by hierarchies, rules, spans of control, specialization, command systems, and division of work. In order to control and make things orderly at the bottom of the hierarchy and predictable over time, designs and policies become increasingly specialized and fragmented (Barth, 1996: 187). During most part of the 20th century, modernist approaches immensely contributed to the efficiency of individual jobs and raised the overall level of productivity.

However, today the causes of numerous organizational problems are traced to these modernist approaches. These problems range from poor communications, confusing bases of authority, mechanistic structures, dispersed or abandoned responsibility, divide and deskilled labor, boredom, and poor employee morale (Child, 1984; Clegg, 1990: 177; Gül, 1999). To cope with differentiation, organizations develop integrative mechanisms and procedures to ensure successful production and enhance cooperation. Management oversight, planning and standardization are relied on as techniques for integration. However, these mechanisms work best only under conditions that are stable and predictable, and the added costs of such functions are substantial (Kuhnert, 1993: 192).

Cleveland (1985) argues that in the age of micro-computers and telecommunications the advent of

abundant, easily accessible and affordable or costless information has changed the nature of management and leadership. With universally accessible information, leadership has become more a function of eliciting purposeful team action based on shared information and responsibility rather than a function of the power associated with controlling resources and information. Similarly, Kotter (1988: 30) points out that the requirements for effective leadership in complex environments include broad knowledge of the industry and the company, strong interpersonal skills and a keen mind, high integrity, a high energy level, and a strong drive to lead. In a similar fashion, Kouzes and Posner (1987: 14) argue that effective leadership involve searching for opportunities, experimenting and taking risks, envisioning the future, fostering collaboration and trust, inspiring and empowering employees and lower level managers, setting role models, planning small wins, recognizing individual contribution and celebrating accomplishments.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) argue that ambiguity and complexity have a profound impact on the decision-making environment of organizations. In such an environment, involvement and participatory decision-making will be necessary. They offer five strategies for effective leadership: (1) Attention through vision; (2) Meaning through communication; (3) Trust through positioning; (4) The deployment of self through positive self-regard; and (5) Empowerment (Bennis and Nanus, 1985: 26–86).

Habermas (cited in Reed, 1993) uses the term “creative destruction” to refer to transformations in cultural norms and values. It was these transformations that made possible the transition to modern industrial societies. The same process now undermines the modernist theories and changes the way we see the world and organizations toward a postmodernist perspective which is characterized by the end of meta theories, unpredictability, decentralization, flexibility, hyperreality or fragmentary and plural character of reality. Power is seen to have no clear center or spatial location. The new diversity and rapid change require a combination of strong cultures and information networks in order to hold organizations together. The main ideas of postmodernist thinking come from the writings of Habermas, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault, Thompson and Lyotard (Hassard and Parker, 1993). And, today many scholars writing on organizations and leadership are significantly influenced by postmodernist views or accepted and applied these ideas to their writings. In postmodernist approaches, there is an obvious shift toward the definition of organizations as unique, interrelated

cultures with complex symbolic dimensions as construed by their members. This shift also seems to increase awareness about organizational culture, change in culture and values and techniques to adapt to change. All these in turn seem to increase the need for a new style of leadership.

A New Leadership Style in a World of Rapid Change

A review of the literature on leadership indicates some general characteristics of a new leadership adequate for today's organizations and management operating in rapidly changing environments. This new leadership style can be called as transformative leadership (Burns, 1978; Rainey, 1991: 167), catalytic leadership (Kiel, 1994: 193) or leadership as a change agent (Hitt, 1988: 12). Building on Jantsch's (1980) ideas on self-organizing and transformative change and leadership, Kiel (1994: 15) sees the world of management as full of complexity, variation, disorder and transformative change that break up organizations. Thus, organizations "seek entirely new forms and structures" and improve their self-learning capacity to adapt to transformative change (Kiel, 1994: 15). In self-organizing organization, catalytic or self-organizing managers are liberators rather than controllers (Kiel, 1994: 193). Organizational learning and renewal, commitment to change, and acceptance of uncertainty are critical issues for public managers to succeed in shaping their organizations for the future (Kiel, 1994: 16). Some other characteristics of transformative and self-learning organizations and leadership can be listed as follows:

- More flexible and integrated but less bureaucratic structures rather than restricted, differentiated and hierarchical structures are appreciated. (Kuhnert 1993, 199)
- Formal roles and positions are seen as inadequate for effective leadership. Transformative leaders must look beyond existing organizational structures, roles and missions and immediate cause-and-effect relations (Bergquist 1993; Reed 1993).
- Dedifferentiation and job enrichment (versus modernist specialization and division of labor) are suggested as effective techniques for transformative leaders in coping with change (Kuhnert, 1993: 190).
- In a rapidly changing environment, the situation may require leaders to act reactive and make remedial, irrational and emotional moves triggered by the inherent uncertainty and disorder in the environment (Cooper and Burrell, 1988).

- Disorganization, paradox, indeterminacy, heterogeneity, chaos, discontinuity and the loss of unity and integration are seen as the parts of the ordinary operations of organizations in a changing environment. Thus, rethinking the taken-for-granted aspects of organizational culture and values is seen crucial whereas the pursuit of unshakable foundations for analytic truth is viewed as a fruitless attempt (Morgan, 1986; Bergquist, 1993; Reed, 1993; Peters, 1987; and idem, 1994).
- Self-awareness and environmental awareness, risk and initiative taking, continuous improvement, reconstructive thinking, participation, empowerment, teamwork, tolerance of disloyalty and failure, 'strategic forgetfulness' adaptability and openness to learning are seen as very important values, processes and traits to be considered in leadership (Argyris and Schön, 1978; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1988; Clegg, 1990; Covey, 1991; Bergquist, 1993: 101; Kanter, Stein and Jick, 1993; Kiel, 1994; Drucker et. al., 1998; Senge, 2004).
- Transformative leaders strive for flexible, self-organizing, self-learning and self-regulating organizations with logically integrated and interrelated jobs and tasks, assigning responsibility and demanding accountability on the basis of the 'whole' rather than the segments of a job (Bergquist, 1993; Reed, 1993).

All these themes, values and characteristics of management suggest that there is certainly a trend from modernist thinking to postmodernist flexible thinking and leadership especially adequate for ambiguous, complex, chaotic and rapidly changing environment. Yet, Bergquist (1993: 101) cautions that today's leaders should supplement flexibility with a commitment to learning in order to be effective.

TRENDS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR AND THEIR DIFFERENCES FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Trends in the Public Sector

Public organizations have been seen to operate in a relatively more closed environment less prone to the changes in this environment. Yet, increased involvement of the third sector and private sector organizations in the provisions of the public services

and the changes in the environment seem to transform the way public organizations operate (Kettle, 2000). Thus, there is a trend in the public sector toward a model of “*governance*.” Kettle (1993a: 21–22) argues that “Government’s role has changed. Government is less the producer of goods and services, and more the supervisor of proxies who do the actual work.” According to Frederickson (1997: 85), “In governance, the network of action involves the full range of public organizations –governmental, nongovernmental, for-profit, nonprofit, state, and parastatel.” Governance is seen to include hyperpluralism with complex interactions among political parties, legislative bodies and their subdivisions, interest groups, intermediaries, organizations, clients, the media, vendors, and so forth (Frederickson, 1997: 86).

Similarly, Drucker (1989: 216–218) points out that public administrators are very experienced and comfortable managing command-and-control organizations. However, they do not know very well how to create a unified vision in an organization where knowledge resides in specialists on the line or how to devise an appropriate management structure for an organization of task forces, where boundaries, roles, and lines of authority are more fluid. In governance, public managers are seen as leaders and policy entrepreneurs in multi-institutional settings. “Their work in a governance setting is more freewheeling, more political, more inclined to taking risks, more creative and empowered; and less organizational, hierarchical, rule-bound, and managerial than is the work of traditional public administrators” (Frederickson, 1997: 86). Similarly, Agranoff (1991) argues that public administrators will not be successful leaders as long as they continue to perceive and define their world in terms of separate and distinct organizations. He suggests that public administrators should begin to think in terms of a “*transorganizational management*” perspective that places emphasis on the development and operation of interactive and collective systems. Yet, it is not enough to approach and see the world in terms of interconnected systems and collective action. It is also necessary to begin thinking in terms of interconnected systems and collective action (Barth, 1996: 190).

New governance is characterized by high levels of delegation and decentralization mixed with fuzzy boundaries between sub-elements of the organization, its clients or customers, and other organizations. Besides, front-line workers are empowered in decision making processes (Frederickson, 1997: 86). Moreover, there is more emphasis placed on market mechanism, incentives, choice and competition. Recent

developments toward government by proxy (privatization) make it more difficult for public administrators to control and manage organizations as well as change. Thus, effective public management cannot rely on control through the hierarchy, the use of budgeting and personnel techniques, or other management techniques that emphasize internal bureaucratic control. Public management spilled beyond the borders of the government agency. In the classical theory, political power is to be centralized in the hands of elected executives who exercise control over professional public administrators, who in turn are held accountable for what their agencies do. However, today government officials have responsibility for programs that they do not really control (Frederickson, 1997: 69–72). Therefore, the environment in which public administrators work has become more complex and more difficult to manage than it was ever before.

Evolution from classical organization theories to public choice oriented approaches such as public management or public governance is also accompanied by a change in the view of public interest from a commitment to public interest, common good, and the needs of the other parts of the society to a self-interest and exchange theories (Galbraith, 1992). The self-interest and profit-making motif almost always constitute the bottom line in the private sector. Thus, one could argue that the emphasis on equity, fairness, and the needs of underprivileged and those who are not able to enter market is reduced, particularly by the models incorporating choice and exchange. In short, recent literature calls for public sector organizations to be more open and flexible, participative and interdisciplinary.

Differences between the Public and Private Sectors

The environment of public organizations is somewhat different from the general environment (Riccucci, 2001). For instance, the public administration operates in a highly politicized environment. It is not easy to determine where politics ends and market begins (Gwartney and Wagner, 1988: 8). Interconnectedness, governance and public law shape the environmental context of public administration. Public action occurs in expanding and crowded policy environments in which everything depends on everything else, and power is dispersed and shared by a multiplicity of public and private actors (Kettl, 1993b: 1994). Yet, public administrators will not operate effectively in this increasingly interconnected world until they undergo a shift from a frame of references based on

differentiation, rule and boundary maintenance to a “*transorganizational*” frame of reference. The term is used to convey the basic orientation or lens through which individuals see the world (Barth, 1996: 186). Increased utilization of cross-cutting, matrix, and flatter decentralized organizational structures as in the private sector is advocated in the public sector, as well. Some of the other basic characteristics of the environment of the public organizations operate could be presented as follows:

- Current rhetoric is against public administration but pro private sector and pro free market. This rhetoric focuses on cutting red tape, shrinking public administration, making government less expensive, viewing citizens as consumers, stimulating entrepreneurialism and interjecting more competition into government (Niskanen, 1971; Kettle, 1993a; Osborne and Gaebler, 1993; Barth, 1996: 195). This forces public managers to work with smaller budgets and bureaucracies. Besides, public indifference, partisan attacks, and increasingly noncompetitive rates of pay and fringe benefits have lowered morale and dampened enthusiasm for careers in the public sector.
- Profit motive is dominant in the private sector organizations, but it does not serve as the main incentive in public organizations. Providing the necessary services to the public is the primary goal for public sector rather than making profit out these services. Besides, public administration is concerned with income redistribution, equality of opportunities, anti-discrimination, citizen participation and the equal distribution of public services, among others. Moreover, public administration also has to be sensitive to the needs of the underrepresented or unrepresented needs of the disadvantaged groups and minorities (Frederickson, 1971: 304–331; and idem, 1997).
- Productivity and efficiency serve as the ready standards for evaluating performance and previous decisions in the private sector. The market also provides an environment for such evaluation. By contrast, few public-sector organizations have any direct way of evaluating their outputs in relation to the cost of the inputs used to make them (Downs, 1967: 30). An absence of economic markets and price mechanism for outputs is frequently faced in the public sector. For public administrators, compliance with the law is often the ultimate measure of performance (Moe, 1994: 112).
- Many problems in public sector are primarily political, not administrative. According to Golembiewski (1969) public administrators work under a much greater degree of public scrutiny than managers in the private sector.
- Accountability in the public sector is more complex than it is in the private sector because public agencies are accountable to higher-level administrative officials, to the chief executive, to legislators, to the courts, and ultimately to the public (Wamsley and Zald, 1983: 502–503; Frederickson, 1997).
- Contrary to the expectations, the environments of public organizations can be more dynamic and turbulent than the environments of their private sector counterparts. Once many private organizations establish a market niche and successful product line, they are not inclined to disturb it. In contrast, public administrators deal with programs that wax and wane, and that are subject to constant change (Wamsley and Zald, 1983: 502). On the one hand, it may be exciting for public administration to be made bold, legitimate, and engaged as a form of governance across the full range of governmental processes; but, it is risky (Frederickson, 1997: 90).
- The rotation rate for high level public administrative positions makes it hard to implement long term policies or fallow and achieve a vision.

Because of these above mentioned differences, leadership in the public organizations is not easy and requires more talent. Managers in the public sector are bounded by the laws and the elected politicians to whom they have accountability. Even though the new developments offer new opportunities, the notion of competition that is stimulated by entrepreneurialism can be problematic in the public sector. The implication of living in an interconnected world is the need for more teamwork, collaboration, and communication, not increased fierce competition (Barth, 1996: 195). Emphasis on inter-institutional coordination, entrepreneurial creativity, risk taking, experimentation shadows often-highly prized features of public organizations such as predictability, stability, responsibility, equity and order. There is also little emphasis on responsibility and accountability (Frederickson, 1997: 87–88). Moreover, the creation of entrepreneurialism in the public sector implies customers and markets rather than social responsibility and citizenship, blurring the reality or ideal condition that citizens are real owners of the state (Frederickson, 1971). Emphasizing choice, competition, and decision-

cost perspectives tend to be favorable to those who are in a position to make free choices and who can compete in the free market (Frederickson, 1997: 87–88).

Decentralization and the empowerment of employees may increase involvement and creative solutions. Yet, matrix structures, the diffusion of responsibility to work groups or teams and decentralization of decision making may be seen as threats to processes of democratic accountability (Levine et al., 1990: 273). Reducing the rules governing bureaucracy along with decentralization involves the risk of the reemergence of patronage (Cohen and Eimicke, 1995: 10). Rules and accountability are not designed to ensure rapid and efficient operations in the public sector. They are designed to fight against fraud and improper political influences (Cohen and Eimicke, 1995: 16).

The passion for downsizing, cost-saving and economy results in the suffering of public institutions from diminished capacity. Efforts to advocate reduction in the number of middle-level managers throughout government to empower front-line bureaucrats and to meet the downsizing goals in management rolls undercut critical public management capacity and led to weaker public institutions than they has ever been. And because they are weakened, we more clearly see the need for strong leaders. Moreover, it produced a demoralized public workforce with a reduced commitment to public service (Frederickson, 1997: 91). New approaches focusing on the top of the hierarchy as well as the needs of the customers seem to miss the problems of citizens and employees such as alienation, polarization and the like (Frederickson, 1997: 88).

Privatization and contracting out are favored in governance because of a belief in that private and nonprofit organizations can provide public services better and more economically. However, there is little evidence that business can perform public tasks more efficiently or economically than can public organizations (Kettle, 1993b; Frederickson, 1997: 91). Similarly, the governance approach to public administration implies that the problem with government lies in the failure of public administrators to view citizens as customers. However, a narrow use of the customer image has serious pitfalls for public administrators. “For example, thinking of yourself as a customer demanding service does not foster concern with the public interest or common good, only with whether you are getting what you want or need out of government. Similarly, if public administrators think of citizens primarily as customers, the tendency

to focus on the needs and wants of the loudest or wealthiest is strong. The customer image also easily translates to “selling” rather than “educating,” precisely the phenomenon exhibited by politicians and the media today” (Barth, 1996: 185).

Do the Experiences of Public Organizations Have Anything to Offer for the Private Organizations?

Despite all the efforts to get the management and/or leadership in the private sector organizations accept sharing their power with lower level managers and empowering employees and involving them in decision making, one still cannot argue that this notion of shared leadership is the case in many private sector organizations. Many successful big, international companies are one man companies. Employee participation in decision making is still not widespread. One of the best ways of achieving shared leadership may be allowing employees to elect their managers. Top executives may be excluded from this process, but it could be done for middle and lower level management positions. This would also bring the informal and formal structure together. And this can be learned from the experiences of public organizations, especially from the experiences of public entities at the local level.

Public sector organization has been much more successful in fostering diversity in public sector organizations, as well. Yet, this is more often not the case for private organizations. Turkish public administration is considered as very successful in employing relatively much higher proportions of female at a rate of around 30 percent in general. Similarly, in the United States federal white-collar employees pretty well represent the breakdown of the society along the racial, ethnic and gender lines (Sallan Gül and Gül, 1996–1997). Besides, public sector organizations have been much more successful in providing secure jobs. Yet, most of the private sector employees complain about their lack of peace of mind and underinvested futures. These positive examples in the public sector may be a source of inspiration for the private organizations.

It is hard to defend inequalities and the polarization in socioeconomic life. There are things that could be done for the betterment of the world in which we live together, not only for fortunate but also misfortunate. There are many things that the private sector can learn from committed public sector leaders and bureaucrats

who dedicated themselves for the society, particularly for the disadvantaged groups. Without learning how to make social contributions to the society and how to share the wealth they create by using their society's resources with their employees working for them and with the rest of the society, a sustainable and transformative leadership and a truly participative decision making environment are not easy and may not be successfully practiced.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Change is a major trait that organizations and leaders have to consider today. The current prevailing 'neo-liberal economic ideology' is given as an example of polarization and the resulting disconnectedness in society because it turns human beings into relentless market maximizers, thereby undermining commitments to values and the needs of the others, especially those who are underprivileged. Morality changes greatly from one segment of the society to another. Ethnicities, preferences, demands etc. vary. And all these require coping with diversity, change and polarization. Organizations ought to take into account the dominant themes of today's rapidly changing world in order to increase their ability to adapt to changes. But more importantly, such environments require leadership in order to be able to capitalize on them. However, there are several downsides to and shortcomings in the dominant themes in today's studies on leadership, organizational culture and change. Such downsides may not directly concern individual organizations. Yet, it could be considered beneficial to take them into consideration in the studies on organizational culture and leadership mainly for their social consequences. Besides, taking these downsides into account would add to the strength and adaptability of the organization in a changing environment. Some of the important downsides or weaknesses could be listed as follows:

- Despite the increased concern for consumer choice, there is a lack of consideration for those who are not able to enter the market, become a consumer and make free choices. This tends to leave out the disadvantaged groups from socioeconomic life and public decision making process. This situation calls for social responsibility on the part of not only public organizations but also private organizations (Barth, 1996: 170–172).
- Public administrators are seen innovative entrepreneurs. Yet, they are also educators and facilitators. As facilitative leaders, they achieve authentic contact and integration among groups and involvement of citizens in policy making process (Barth, 1996: 169). This would help create a shared meaning and serve as a source to which citizens can go for unbiased information if politicians are loose with the facts in order to support their particular interests. Greater understanding of the complexity and difficulties of public policy and management issues will help eliminate both superficial ideological stands and increase citizens' appreciation for the difficulty of these issues. Today, public sector has to deal with such problems as crime and violence, discrimination, welfare, homelessness, poverty, and more that are often intractable because solutions either are not known or involve serious costs, trade-offs, or value conflicts (Barth, 1996: 178). Yet, the role of educator for public administrators may conflict with their subordinate position to their elected superiors, particularly when the truth about policies and programs does not serve public interest (Barth, 1996: 194).
- In spite of the increased concern for diversity, upper level managerial and executive positions are still predominantly occupied by males. The most important reason for this is because we still live in a man-dominated world, indicating the influence that general social features have on organizational patterns. Therefore, the needs and preferences of the half of the population is not adequately represented and taken into consideration in the decision making processes.
- Despite the rhetoric or discourse for shared leadership, teamwork and empowerment of the employees, the managers at the top levels are often not ready or willing to give up their power. Besides, teamwork and participation is seen important principles for increasing the performance of organizations, but not for increasing the satisfaction and real contribution of the employees (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993). This tends to create problems on the way to effective leadership.
- Management driven views of leadership theories tend to be too much focused on how to get organization members do their task more efficiently. However, there is not much concern with how to provide the employees more meaning and self-actualizing opportunities in their jobs.
- There is an increased emphasis on how to increase market share, wealth and profit, and how to become more competitive in the market. Yet, there is little

talk about how to share the gains of growing productivity generated through a collective effort including employees. Barth (1996: 196) argues that focusing on infusing competition, entrepreneurship, and decentralization in the public sector leads to failure in noticing the equally fundamental importance of cooperation and working across organizations and sectors that are critical to success in the increasingly complex and interconnected world.

- Despite increased interest in changing organizational culture and, thus, values, beliefs and preferences, change in organizational culture and values is often difficult to impose. Thus, often change in culture is put aside in organizational change and reform efforts. Besides, even if change in culture and values are taken into consideration, new culture also tends to become imbedded in people and become steady and solid over time, hindering continuous change and improvement that is required by changing environment. Thus, leaders who seek success in managing change would need mechanisms to keep track of organizational learning, change and development.
- Overwhelming concern with rapid change and how to adapt to it lead to ignore the importance of having some sort of institutionalized forms of self-consciousness, trust and personal tranquility. This deficiency tends to further prevent leaders and people themselves from deconstructing the way they see the world and reconstruct it, resulting in failure to learn continuously.
- Assuming that nothing exists outside signs, symbols, metaphors, and beliefs may function to cover the reality. Uncovering the difference between appearance and essence is still the prime purpose of intellectual inquiry even though there is still a need to breakdown taken-for-granted assumptions, see inequalities, and uncover the interest and power structures that underpin most of the relations and positions. For example, there are real and present facts and problems of urban decay, deprivation, unemployment, human and labor rights violations, regional disparities, income and wealth inequalities, among others. These facts indicate that the state and public leaders take action on the part of the disadvantaged. Berg (1989: 214) argues that “In organization and management science today it is not important whether a statement is true or false, but whether the fact or statement is accepted, saleable or valid for a larger audience.”

One of the main reasons for why one would take into account such downsides or weaknesses in discussions on organizational culture and leadership is that such shortcomings directly influence the way organizations operate through their impact on employees, relations in the workplace and families, etc. Another main reason is that organizations that take such traits into account could be expected to satisfy the needs of their employees, customers as well as the demands of the society in which they operate. In turn such organizations would be more competitive and successful than their competitors.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, Robert (1991) "Human Services Integration: Past and Present Challenges in Public Administration," *Public Administration Review*, 51 (6), pp. 533–542.
- Argyris, Chris (1970) *Intervention Theory and Method: A Behavioral Science View*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- _____ (1962) *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness*, Irwin-Dorsey Press, Homewood, IL.
- Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schön (1978) *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Barth, Thomas J. (1996) "Administering in the Public Interest: The Facilitative Role for Public Administrators," in *Refounding Democratic Public Administration*, (eds.) Gary L. Wamsley, and James F. Wolf, pp. 168–197, Sage, London.
- Bennis, Warren (1994) "Leading Change: The Leader as the Chief Transformation Officer," in *Leadership in A New Era: Visionary Approaches to the Biggest Crisis of Our Times*, (ed.) John Renesch, pp. 103–110, Sterling & Stone, Inc., San Francisco.
- Bennis, Warren, and Burt Nanus (1985) *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
- Berg, Paul O. (1989) "Postmodern Management? From Facts to Fiction in Theory and Practice," *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 5 (3), pp. 201–217.
- Bergquist, William (1993) *The Postmodern Organization: Mastering the Art of Irreversible Change*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Borins, Standford (2000) "Loose Cannons and Rule Breakers, or Enterprising Leaders? Some Evidence about Innovative Public Managers," *Public Administration Review*, 60 (6), pp. 498–507.
- Brown, Andrew (1995) *Organizational Culture*, Pitman, London.
- Burnes, Bernard (2004) "Kurt Lewin and the Planned Approach to Change: A Re-appraisal," *Journal of Management Studies*, 41 (6), pp. 977–1002.
- Burns, James MacGregor (1978) *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Carr, David K., and Ian D. Littman (1993) *Excellence in Government: Total Quality Management in the 1990's*, 2nd Edition, Coopers & Lybrand, London.
- Carter, Pippa, and Norman Jackson (1993) "Modernism, Postmodernism and Motivation, or Why Expectancy Theory Failed to Come Up to Expectation," in *Postmodernism and Organizations*, (eds.) John Hassard, and Martin Parker, pp. 83–100, Sage, London.
- Child, John (1984) *Organization: A Guide to Problems and Practice*, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
- Clegg, Stewart (1990) *Modern Organizations: Organization Studies in the Postmodern World*, Sage, London.
- Cleveland, Harlan (1985) "Twilight of Hierarchy," *Public Administration Review*, 45 (1), pp. 185–195.
- Cohen, Steven, and William Eimicke (2002) *The New Effective Public Manager: Achieving Success in a Changing Government*, 3rd Edition, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Cooper, Robert, and Gibson Burrell (1988) "Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction," *Organization Studies*, No. 1, pp. 91–112.
- Covey, Stephen (1991) *Principle-Centered Leadership*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Denhardt, Robert B. (1991) *Public Administration: An Action Orientation*, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove, California.
- _____ (1995) "Great Thinkers in Personnel Management," in *Handbook of Public Personnel Administration*, (eds.) Jack Rabin, Thomas Vocino, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller, pp. 21–41, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
- Downs, Anthony (1967) *Inside Bureaucracy*, Little-Brown, Boston.
- Drucker, Peter (1989) *The New Realities*, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
- Drucker, Peter, Tom Peters, Stephen Covey, Ken Blanchard, Kenichi Ohmae, Peter Senge, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Gary Hamel, Michael, Hammer, John Maisbitt, and Warren Bannes (1998) *The Secrets of*

Shared Leadership, A Lessons in Leadership Program, A Video of Video Conference, Lessons in Leadership.

Esen, Erol (2006) "Koçluk: Yöneticiler İçin Özel Bir Danışmanlık Modeli," *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 39 (2), pp. 117–134.

Frederickson, H. George (1997) *The Spirit of Public Administration*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

_____ (1971) "Toward a New Public Administration," in *Toward a New Public Administration*, (ed.) Frank Marini, pp. 309–331, Chandler Publishing Company, Scranton, PA.

Galbraith, John Kenneth (1992) *The Culture of Contentment*, Sinclair-Stevenson, London.

Gardner, John W. (1990) *On Leadership*, Free Press, New York.

Gaus, John (1947) *Reflections on Public Administration*, University of Alabama Press, Birmingham.

Gergen, Kenneth J. (1992) "Organization Theory in the Postmodern Era," in *Rethinking Organization*, (eds.) Michael Reed, and Michael Hughes, pp. 207–226, Sage, London.

Golembiewski, Robert T. (1993) *Approaches to Planned Change: Orienting Perspectives and Micro-Level Interventions*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, N.J.

_____ (1972) *Renewing Organizations: The Laboratory Approach to Planned Change*, F. E. Peacock, Itasca, IL.

_____ (1969) "OD in Public Agencies: Perspectives on Theory and Practice," *Public Administration Review*, 29 (4), pp. 367–377.

Gül, Hüseyin (2001) "An Analysis of the Value Patterns and Issue Positions of the New Right on Poverty and Economic Security within the Context of United States," *DEÜ İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (1), pp. 1–23.

_____ (1999) "Kamu Yönetiminde Piyasa Temelli Yeni Model Arayışları ve Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Toplam Kalite Yönetiminin Uygulanabilirliği," in *Kamu Yönetiminde Kalite 2. Ulusal Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, pp. 15–30, 21–22 Ekim 1999, TODAİE, Ankara.

_____ (1998) "Decentralization, Local Government Reforms and Local Autonomy: A Comparative Analysis of Recent Trends," in *Proceedings of the Comparative Development and Administration Seminar for Eastern European Scholars: Studies in Comparative Analysis*, (eds.) Rod Erakovich, and Dick Grisby, pp. 9–43, The Center for Economic Development, Research and Service, The University of Texas, Arlington, Texas, USA.

Gümüşsuyu, Çağdaş (2005) *Yaratıcı Örgüt Kültürü: Kuram ve Bir Örnek Olay Çalışması*, TODAİE, Ankara.

Gwartney, James D., and Richard E. Wagner (1988) "Public Choice and the Conduct of Representative Government," in *Public Choice and Constitutional Economics*, (eds.) James D. Gwartney, and Richard E. Wagner, pp. 3–28, JAI Press, London and Greenwich, Connecticut.

Hassard, John and Martin Parker (eds.) (1993) *Postmodernism and Organizations*, Sage, London.

Hitt, William D., (1988) *The Leader Manager: Guidelines for Action*, Battelle Press, Columbus, Ohio.

Jantsch, Erich (1980) *The Self Organizing Universe: Scientific and Human Implications of Emerging Paradigm of Evolution*, Pergamon Press, New York.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, Barry A. Stein, and Todd D. Jick, (1993) *The Challenge of Organizational Change*, Free Press, New York.

Katzenbach, Jon R. and Douglas K. Smith (1993) *The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Kettle, Donald F. (2000) "The Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government," *Public Administration Review*, 60 (6), pp. 488–497.

_____ (1993a) "Public Administration: The State of the Discipline," in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, (ed.) Ada W. Finifter, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

_____ (1993b) *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Markets*, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Kiel, L. Douglas (1994) *Managing Chaos and Complexity in Government: A New Paradigm for*

- Managing Change*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- _____ (1993) "Nonlinear Dynamical Analysis: Assessing Systems Concepts in a Government Agency," *Public Administration Review*, 53 (2), pp. 143–153.
- Kotter, John (1988) *The Leadership Factor*, Free Press, New York.
- Kouzes, Jim, and Barry Posner (1987) *The Leadership Challenge*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Kuhnert, Karl W. (1993) "Leadership Theory in Postmodernist Organizations," in *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, (ed.) Robert T. Golembiewski, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
- Levine, Charles H., B. Guy Peters, and Frank J. Thompson (1990) *Public Administration: Challenges, Choices, Consequences*, Scott, Foresman and Company, Glenview, Illinois.
- Lewin, Kurt (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*, (ed.) Dorwin Cartwright, Harper, New York.
- Maccoby, Michael (1981) *The Leader*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Moe, Ronald C. (1994) "The 'Reinventing Government' Exercise: Misinterpreting the Problem, Misjudging the Consequences," *Public Administration Review*, 54 (2), pp. 111–122.
- Morgan, Gareth (1986) *Images of Organizations*, Sage, London.
- Naisbitt, John, and Patricia Aburdene (1990) *Megatrends 2000: Ten New Directions for the 1990's*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York.
- Niskanen, William (1971) *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*, Aldine-Atherton, New York.
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler (1993) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Penguin Books, London.
- Palmer, Russell (1988) "Leadership," *Fortune*, (October, 24), p. 66.
- Parker, Martin (1992) "Postmodern Organizations or Postmodern Organization Theory?" *Organization Studies*, 13 (1), pp. 1–17.
- Pascarella, Perry (1994) "Winning Trust," in *Leadership in A New Era: Visionary Approaches to the Biggest Crisis of Our Times*, (ed.) John Renesch, pp. 269–276, Sterling & Stone, Inc., San Francisco.
- Peters, Guy, and Donald J. Savoie (eds.) (1995) *Governance in a Changing Environment*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal and London.
- Peters, Tom (1994) *The Tom Peters Seminar: Crazy Times Call for Crazy Organizations*, Vintage Books, New York.
- _____ (1987) *Thriving on Chaos*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.
- Peters, Thomas, and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
- Plas, Jeanne M. (1996) *Person-Centered Leadership: An American Approach to Participatory Management*, Sage, London.
- Rainey, Hal G. (1991) *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Reed, Michael I. (1993) "Organizations and Modernity: Continuity and Discontinuity in Organization Theory," in *Postmodernism and Organizations*, (eds.) John Hassard, and Martin Parker, pp. 163–182, Sage, London.
- Riccucci, Norma (2001) "The 'Old' Public Management versus the 'New' Public Management: Where Does Public Administration Fit in?" *Public Administration Review*, 61 (2), pp. 172–175.
- Robbins, Stephen P. (2001) *Organizational Behavior*, 9th Edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Sallan Gül, Songül (2006) *Sosyal Devlet Bitti, Yaşasın Piyasa!* 2. baskı, eabil Yayınları, Ankara.
- _____, (1999) "Kamu Yönetiminde Kalite, Piyasa ve Müşteri Arayışlarının İdeolojik Temelleri," *Kamu Yönetiminde Kalite 2. Ulusal Kongresi*, pp. 69–84, TODAİE, 21–22 Ekim, Ankara.
- _____, (1996–1997) "Equal Opportunity for Women in Government Employment: The Cases of the United States and Turkey," *Turkish Public Administration Annual*, Vol. 22–23, pp. 119–140.

Schein, Edgar H. (1992) *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 2nd Edition, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Senge, Peter (2004) *Beşinci Disiplin*, 11. Baskı, Yapı Kredi Yayınları (No. 226), İstanbul.

Senior, Barbara (2002) *Organizational Change*, 2nd Edition, Prentice Hall, Harlow, England.

Shafritz, Jay M., and Steven Ott (eds.) (1996) *Classics of Organization Theory*, 4th Edition, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont.

Swiss, James E. (1992) "Adapting Total Quality Management (TQM) to Government," *Public Administration Review*, 52 (4), pp. 356–362.

Thompson, Paul (1993) "Postmodernism: Fatal Distraction," in *Postmodernism and Organizations*, (eds.) John Hassard, and Martin Parker, pp. 183–203, Sage, London.

Wamsley, Gary L., and Mayer N. Zald (1983) "The Environments of Public Managers: Managing Turbulence," in *Handbook of Organizational Management*, (ed.) William B. Eddy, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.