

Research on Failure and Disintegration in Western Public Management

Based on the Perspective of Cultural Theory

Rui Liu

School of Public Administration
Jilin University of Finance and Economics
Changchun, China

Abstract—Public management has always been an important part of the management field, and errors and even failures in public management have always been indispensable. As an analytical method, cultural theory is devoted to grasping the public's respective preferences for "lifestyles" and linking these different preferences with the various types of organizations that may exist. This paper will use the four basic organizational methods defined by cultural theory and its analysis to analyze the failure and disintegration in public management. It is helpful to clarify the different and contradictory attitudes of political scandals and disasters, distinguish the responsible bearers and how to deal with things correctly.

Keywords—public management; government failure; cultural theory

I. INTRODUCTION

Public management, the art of this country, can be roughly defined as how to design specific services to provide public services and government administration. [1] Christopher Hood described the connotation and characteristic system of "new public management" as seven aspects. How to conduct detailed and objective examinations from public management is usually done in response to a rapid response to a disaster, rather than on paper, or on how to "create value" on white paper. How to apply the organizational prescription is generally rooted in the response to the failure (or perceived failure) of the existing organization. If a successful method is changed, it will often be considered a method for disasters. In front of the most pressing issues, some organizations are astoundingly lacking in vision and ability to act, which are far from rare in most societies, even though the extent of the impact of these stories (and the extent of exposure in the media) is currently. There is no accepted theory about the collapse and failure of public administration. Therefore, only by clarifying the failures in public management and how the organization can be disintegrated better to provide a better basis for taking measures in the future when public management problems arise.

II. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC MANAGEMENT DISASTERS

Some people say that public management is like a sewer. It usually only attracts people's attention after it smells bad. However, from the perspective of cultural theory, different people feel different about odor. Sometimes I think it's not smelly, but it may seem unaware of others. There is still no consensus on how to make a correct diagnosis and find the most correct prescription and how to judge when the treatment method is worse than the original "problem". From the perspective of cultural theory, failures are divided into four types: hierarchyism, egalitarianism, individualism, and fatalism. The following is a summary of the four types of condemnation and remediation measures following the disaster, and is aligned with the major organizational world views of cultural theory.

A. *Four Responses to Public Management Disasters Under the Framework of Cultural Theory*

1) *Hierarchical response*: In general, the most common response in the event of a disaster is that if the government and other public organizations make better coordination, have better procedures, or be able to make early warnings and plans. Some defects and problems can actually be avoided. Critics that need to be criticized are those who do not follow best practices and established procedures. The solution is to consolidate rules and authoritative structures, requiring more experts, stricter procedures, and stricter administrative controls to prevent repeating the same mistakes.

2) *Egalitarian response*: The egalitarians believe that the chief culprit in the disaster is these experts and authority. They are not the solution to the problem, it is precisely the root of the problem. Blaming the blame on those operators or managers who are just unruly rules will make us lose sight of the real culprit - the whole system. Those who are in a high-level position within the system often take a certain approach after the disaster to subtly blame others, so that they can escape their responsibility. Therefore, the egalitarian solution to the problem is to advocate giving the grassroots people more "democracy" and "power", so that

they have the ability to challenge experts and authority, and disagree with the so-called public concern.

3) *Individualist response*: In the vision of individualists, the failure and dislocation of public management is not due to too little collectivism and organization, but rather too much. They believe that the operation of society and institutions should rely on plans, authorities and rules, not price systems, tort law, "internal markets" or other incentives. Because the former often causes disasters due to the poor design of the incentive mechanism. The egalitarian program focuses on collective empowerment. The result is not to let those who are cranky and temperate all day to manipulate the organization, which leads to the emergence of "everyone has a share, everyone does not care". In their view, the only way to successfully complete public management is to rely on personal self-interest and work initiative. This means more emphasis on individual competition within or between organizations, while at the same time using market mechanisms or mechanisms similar to them.

4) *Fatalist response*: As the last of the four types, the fatalists see failure as an accidental single event. It emphasizes that most disasters are tragic and can be very embarrassing. They cannot be predicted well beforehand. Even the most cumbersome and largest system can't know which ones are unknown. Factors lead to disaster. In their view, the various estimates of how these factors work are prone to failure. Once the consequences are due to certain factors, the behavior of blaming mistakes and crimes on individuals or organizations can be considered extremely Arbitrary. The best remedy is minimal intervention, or a temporary response afterwards.

B. Enlightenment from Four Responses

First, for the "disaster" in public management, it is often impossible to identify it objectively and it is difficult to find a consensus. People define disasters as acid-base test strips that test their attitudes toward justice and condemnation. The attitudes of good and evil in public administration are not randomly distributed among the people, but may correspond to the established worldview. Second, even for things that everyone considers to be a disaster (and very similar), the improvements that people prevent from reappearing will vary from worldview to view and will appear in the form of an organizational plan [2].

III. FOUR TYPES OF FAILURE AND DISINTEGRATION

From the perspective of cultural theory, different types of failures in the organizational world are not randomly distributed. Each type of primary organization has its own "Achilles heel" (an intrinsic defect) or a unique way of disintegrating. Correspondingly, the main types of public management failures will also include these "Achilles heels."

A. Four Types of Organization "Achilles" Heel

The "Table I" lists the types of organizational biases in the four, the heels of Achilles (the intrinsic defects), and the types of problems that are easily attracted to help people identify the differences between the various types.

TABLE I. "ACHILLES' HEEL" IN FOUR TISSUE TYPES

Type Of Organizational bias	Heels Of Achilles	Easy To Incur
Individualism	Like to put personal interests above the collective interests	Failure stems from lack of cooperation and personal corruption
Egalitarianism	Unwilling to accept authority to open the knot	Failure stems from the inability to resolve the segmentation problem, and the coexistence of colleagues deteriorates
Hierarchyism	Excessive trust in authority and experts to make them highly mobile	Fantasy plans and projects fail
Fatalism	Unwilling to plan ahead, and do not take decisive measures in case of crisis	Failure stems from excessive negativity and inertia

B. Specific Analysis of the Four Types of Failure

1) *Getting private benefits from public institutions*: That is, individualism. In the Confucian tradition, the ruler should put the interests of others above his own interests. They must do so to put the various interests of the client on the basis of any personal work and interests. However, in the actual public management, there will be a big gap between these noble and idealized ideas. One of the most common public management failures or disintegrations is that they put their own interests first, while others' interests are placed in the second place or thrown into the sky. This leads to the conversion of public affairs into transactions in the private market, thereby transforming public organizations into personal private property. There are three types of failures that are most well-known among these types of problems.

Abuse of power, extortion and bribery is the most common failure in public management. They all share a common trait: using public institutions to gain private unlawful benefits, such as privately diverting public property, obtaining money from an attempted person (taking a bribe) or forcibly collecting property (ransom) from someone who is unwilling to help. Bribery and extortion in Western countries are the most arrogant of the police departments in big cities; especially in areas where police officers monopolize law enforcement (they have no competitors, frustrated victims have no complaints). In some areas, their infringement "has no victims" and the scope of personal actions is very small. From the earliest literature, abuse of power, extortion and bribery are considered central "problems" in the management (public and private) fields.

However, the absolute corruption in the eyes of some people is completely acceptable to others. Not only that, but some people think that the punishment of corruption is more harmful than the problem itself.

The first line abstained. Public service providers pursue their private interests in a subtle way, that is, when they are ugly, they are “not seen” and are more willing to put themselves in a comfortable and secure position. A common problem in public management is that providers of public services generally choose jobs that are simple to operate and that are suitable for them, rather than services that are stressful and accompanied by basic nature, even if they are Help them win the praise of the public. Anyone is willing to work with high-level people in a comfortable environment and during the working hours set by the state. There is sufficient “leisure in the office” and the freedom to choose the way of working instead of the opposite working environment. “Teaching avoidance” in universities and “management avoidance” in public service departments are common examples of first-line abstentions.

Solemn, self-indulgent and solo. In some people’s view, it is an unacceptable individual “solo dance”. In others, it may be a reasonable “part-time” behavior in the public management business model. Atali, a senior public entrepreneur, has marked a marked implication on the bureaucratic system which he leads, ignoring the sectarian pastor concept, and the boring and even self-defeating, sinister and orthodox public service model. His behavior typically has caused some very different explanations. In most OECD countries, the core of many reforms of contemporary public services emphasizes the importance of managers. Does this phenomenon only reflect the public's pursuit of more economic benefits and efficiency? Getting personal gain from public services will continue to be one of the most discussed issues related to public management failures.

2) *Excessive trust in the fiasco caused by authority and experts*: If the typical failure of individualism in public management is personal expenditures that are not happy with personal income, then the failure of hierarchyism is due to the collapse of public organizations caused by unconditional trust in experts and authority. These mistakes can account for “group thinking”, resulting from overconfidence in key problem-solving methods, resulting from excessive trust in the top leadership, which may be an authority in the scientific and social world, or a professional. Due to the responsibility sharing mechanism, the nature of the authoritative organization is inevitably conflicting with the possibility of learning and learning. The reason is not difficult to explore. Since the authoritative organizations themselves are the product of psychological resistance, they are the masters of the pressure to transfer responsibility. The method is to deny, rationalize, find scapegoats, or a combination of the three. These practices often achieve their goals. [3]The result is that those who are truly responsible will never admit defeat or organizational *incompetence*.

Therefore, measures cannot be taken to avoid repeating the same mistakes.

3) *Surviving conflicts and the struggle between the two*: Among the well-known public management failures, the third type of organization, which is the type most likely to occur in egalitarian organizations, lacks the ability to resolve conflicts or exert effective authority. In an organizational system that lacks such capabilities, there is often a state of internal war that has been unsolvable for decades and a state of separatism. At the same time, due to the lack of any central authority to deal with tough individuals and powerful local aristocrats, these organizations may also be in a state of partial embarrassment. This symptom is very typical. Before the 1971 Constitution was enacted in Poland, when the nobility enjoyed immunity, it could compete with the law, and it could use the open rebellion to deal with the king. The free veto power allowed any of the 460 parliamentary representatives to oppose the decision made by the parliament (This situation led to a stalemate in the country and the outbreak of civil war, which led to the intervention of foreign troops, which eventually made Poland cease to exist as a country and continued until the end of World War I). Some observers believe that this challenge to public authority will undermine a democratic and effective government. Others analyze public management from a cultural bias. They are likely to believe that the upper public management is willing to challenge organizations with established concepts and misguided or corrupt, which is a moral rather than a vicious one. Indeed, if the orders given by the superiors contradict the higher moral laws, public officials have a moral obligation to disobey the superiors. This “disobedience obligation” is often swayed by those who are doing nothing and other civil servants who believe that order is contrary to conscience and that the political system is morally unacceptable.

d. Indifference and inertia: lack of planning, creation and foresight

The fourth type of public management failure is loosely linked to the “destination” worldview. Lack of enthusiasm, lack of deployment of future events that clearly account for responsibility and planning, these factors mix together to form the fourth type of failure.

Because there is no reliable correlation between individual performance and status in an organization, this system will not be able to motivate senior officials to work harder and more efficiently. Therefore, this system will develop a corrosive culture of indifference and incompetence, which is very similar to the current situation. For example, the leaders of many international organizations today are appointed according to international political hackers and asylum relationships; the highest-ranking civil servants in some countries do not rely on any track record of management capacity, but rather acquire positions by political relationship.

When public management seems to fall into some unsuitable procedures and cannot cope with extreme situations, an associated problem will be highlighted. This is the old topic of organizational theory, that is, "the organizational process undermines the purpose of the organization when it is first built." These actions are often exposed when dealing with disasters. The earthquake that took place in Kobe, Japan in 1995, claimed more than 5,000 lives. Due to the vigilant role of the earthquake, the public authorities were unprepared, unplanned, and unable to effectively grasp the direction during the rescue process. The hidden problem is that even in the most extreme situations, this requires public organizations to have bold decisions and correct leadership, while public organizations are still only passive, and even reluctant to give up normal work procedures [4]. Indeed, when faced with the need for strategic action, it is impossible to act and fall into failure in the process of collaboration and change, often seen as the opposite of management.

IV. ESTIMATING THE FAILURE OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

No basic organizational type can avoid collapse and failure. The core issue of public management design is how to structure the government and public services, and prevent those organizations from inheriting various types of failure. [5] One of the central tasks of public management theory is the need to make correct estimates of organizational disintegration and failure, which is another gap in the study of this discipline today. Cultural theory, based on its multivariate analysis, contributes to this issue. Each type of failure discussed in the text represents a series of obvious shortcomings that often appear in different contexts and manifest themselves in different forms. These analyses help to get inspiration to solve or avoid these flaws. Indeed, if the network-group theory can successfully capture the fundamental characteristics of the organization's "lifestyle", then the various issues mentioned above should include some common shortcomings that public management often faces.

From the perspective of cultural theory, the types of failures discussed above are often related to the four-pole model of organizational methods. Some organizations face obvious disasters, but they still lack initiative and fall into untimely routines, unable to plan and take action. Others are caused by over-confidence in the "big ideas" in policy or technology, leading to large-scale mistakes because they do not take into account the overall behavior of people. What is more likely to happen is that such organizations can cause disasters at the level of society as a whole. There is a perception that if any person who is independent in an organization, it is difficult for such an organization to realize the public interest. When people over-confess this view, disasters can easily happen. Such organizations generally do not directly cause such catastrophe, and the problems they generate are more likely to provide non-market factors to ensure that market and individual competition can function effectively.

In the pure form of the four-pole model of organizational life, each has its own internal disintegration, and in the other case, in order to maintain its own organization, each organization needs to match the attitude with the organizational structure. In order to replace this process, the prevention mode will be mixed with each other. At this time, failure and disintegration will also occur. Similarly, in the seemingly egalitarian structure, peer groups have the ability to protect individuals who make mistakes, and this relationship can also become an unstable interdependence between individuals. Mixing itself can also be the source of disintegration.

V. CONCLUSION

Public organizations are involved in the life of citizens all the time. Public management is a matter of learning and the art of the country. Recognizing the failures in public management is both the way forward for the country and the progress of government agencies. Cultural theory aims to provide people with different tools and tools for analysis and research, so that some core issues in public management can be analyzed efficiently and accurately and figure out how the organization is on the path of failure in public management. The four types of organization in cultural theory analyze the causes of failure and disintegration of public management, and then open different prescriptions. Cultural theory can be seen as a tool for analyzing public management, but it cannot be assumed that this analytical approach is perfect. As an analytical framework for public management, cultural theory cannot surpass all criticism. Some people regard cultural theory as a "children's toy" and think it is too simple. It needs to be acknowledged that there is no flaw in the analysis. As a way of thinking about creative thinking about possible organizational forms, cultural theory analysis can provide more useful things for the "art of the country" in exploring the diversity of the concept of "what" between government and public organizations. Perhaps this is the charm of cultural theory [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] Chen Z.M. Disciplinary Positioning and Knowledge Growth of Public Management, *J. Administrative Forum*, 2010, (04): 31-34.
- [2] Christopher Hood. "The Art of the Country: Culture, Rhetoric and Public Management", M. Peng Bo, Shao Chunxia, Trans. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2004: 24-50.
- [3] Xu Y, Zhao Y.S. Multi-narrative of Public Administration: A Review of Christopher Hood's Group Culture Theory, *J. Public Administration Review*, 2017, (06): 174-190.
- [4] Zhao Y.S, Xu Y. Review of Christopher Hood's Public Management Thoughts: Theme, Contribution and Enlightenment, *J. Foreign Social Sciences*, 2012, (04): 120-122.
- [5] Shao R.W. The Theory of Public Management Culture — A Review of Christopher Hood's "The Art of the Country: Culture, Rhetoric and Public Management", *J. Southeast Academic*, 2009, (05): 20.