

But is it Public Administration?: The Place of Voluntary Sector Management in the Discipline

LEDIVINA V. CARIÑO*

They must learn to lead, manage and govern. This is what the various organizations in the Philippine voluntary sector need to inculcate among themselves in order to carry out if not serve more effectively their respective missions and correspondingly, their own constituents. As we look more closely into the purpose and objectives of the different groups across the country engaged in more or less volunteer work, it is instructive to make a comparison among business administration (BA), public administration (PA) and voluntary sector management (VSM) with emphasis on their differences ranging from market vis-a-vis state operations, profit-orientedness or public service commitment, social, economic or personal fulfillment, personnel administration and last but not the least, fund generation and fiscal administration. Also, a point not to be overlooked is the publicness-privateness continuum in VSM, wherein it like all other organizations, has both public and private characteristics.

Introduction

The College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines (CPA-UP) is in the process of developing a specialization in voluntary sector management within its Master of Public Administration (MPA) program. Since we first broached the idea, we have received nothing but encouragement from all sides. After all, the Philippine voluntary sector is large and growing, and many of its organizations are in the process of institutionalization. Thus, the demand to learn how to manage their operations systematically and effectively, though now untapped, is real and strong. Besides, the significant role of civil society in governance is becoming increasingly recognized, propelled in diverse ways by the trends towards democratization and globalization.¹ There is just one point that gives them pause: is it *really* public administration?

My answer is a clear and brief yes, but the justification will take a little longer than even I had expected. I had thought it would be easy to quote chapter and verse of well-known scholars' treatises to assist me in this redefinition of the field. After all, academic programs dealing with the

*University Professor of Public Administration and System Director, Ugnayan ng Pahinungod/Oblation Corps, University of the Philippines.

administration of what have been variously called the "voluntary sector," "non-profits," "nongovernmental organizations" (NGOs) or "civil society organizations" have been increasing in recent years throughout the world. Besides, the home department or college of choice has been public administration (Crowder and Hodgkinson 1992). Yet I have found nothing so far in the theoretical literature that explicitly posits voluntary sector management as an integral part of the field or explains why that should be the case.² Thus it may be up to us in the Philippines to draw the conceptual and theoretical linkages.

This paper argues that voluntary sector management (VSM) belongs properly to the field by intensive explication of the two elements of the term: "public" and "administration." As regards the first concept, I invite the reader to join me in an intellectual journey to trace the evolution of the meaning of "public" in "public administration" and its implications for the scope of the field. Next and still on "public," I show that in the publicness-privateness continuum, the voluntary sector hews closer to the civil service than to business firms. The third task is to focus on "administration." Here I analyze the management concerns of the voluntary sector and compare them with those of government and business administration. Finally, having — I hope — established that voluntary sector management belongs to public administration, I then try to show how its inclusion can enhance the established discipline.

The Meaning of "Public" in "Public Administration"

The "public" in "public administration" is the organizing concept in delineating the field. As Waldo (1965: 24) stated:

But unless it can be shown that there is something distinctive and important about "public," then the phrase indicates only an administrative convenience, a pragmatic adjustment to supply and demand, and perhaps not even that, but a resultant of the accidents of inertia, resources and personalities.

I contend that the word "public" in the name of our discipline is not accidental and should remain a significant organizing principle. The refinement of our understanding of its meaning should then allow us to expand or contract its scope as appropriate and substantively acceptable.

"Public" is a term in common use in contexts other than the name of the discipline. Its basic underlying concept is the idea of "the collective" in a nation. That has been manifested in at least three distinct ways. As each is discussed, I will describe its implications on the definition of the field. I also wish to call attention to the fact that although all these meanings of "public"

have been in wide use through the hundred years of life of the discipline, a peculiar meaning of the "public" in "public administration" may be discerned as affecting our view of the elements of the discipline in certain periods of its history.

*Public Administration as the Management of
Governmental Organizations*

The first meaning of "public" is as a synonym of "government," the collective embodied in the central authoritative institution. This is its meaning in the following phrases: "public school," "public hospital," "public agency," "public funds," and "public official." This is also the original meaning of the modifier "public" in "public administration." As such, public administration has been originally understood as "governmental management." This is well recognized in our history as traditional public administration. Its main management concerns focus on how the human, fiscal and organizational resources of government may be used and distributed in the most economical and efficient way.

*Public Administration as the Provision of
Public Goods and Services*

The second meaning of "public" refers to the collective as beneficiary of "public goods," those whose benefits are indivisible and with significant externalities, e.g., "public utility," "public health" or even "public policy." In Jones' terms, the public includes:

those affected by indirect consequences of transactions to such an extent that it is deemed necessary to have those consequences systematically cared for (Jones 1984: 39).

These problems cannot be solved privately. In taking note of this meaning of "public," the discipline has moved from an advocacy for the use of a specific mechanism — the governmental bureaucracy — to greater concern for the "throughput." With public administration as "the provision of public goods and services," it has begun to study the possibility of alternative delivery systems, since public health, for instance, does not connote health administered by the government, but a desired end that not only may be reached through the government's health offices, but through individual or community effort. The discipline, viewed in this light, has also raised, as public choice theorists did, issues on supply and demand of public goods, the structure and structuring of markets, and rules on allocation and distribution.

There is no special name attached to this view of the discipline, although we can mark its sway from the 1970s, around the period of Minnowbrook's "new public administration." The influence of political economy and public choice theory is especially evident (Ostrom and Ostrom 1971). This was also the time when public administration moved both deeper and wider: deeper as "implementation" was recognized as a neglected area in the field, and wider as the whole public policy process — from formulation to implementation to evaluation — became its special focus.

CPA-UP opened its program on public policy and program administration (PPPA) in 1978, broadening the field beyond a focus on staff functions. The reaction of American universities was even more radical: leading departments of public administration reorganized themselves into schools of public policy, practically abandoning "bureaucracy" but also casting the net wider by including political parts of the policy process, zeroing in on program administration, and recognizing non-bureaucratic ways by which public goods are produced and delivered. In many ways, this process marked the first entry of NGOs into the consciousness of scholars of public administration.³

Public Administration as Governance for the Public Interest

The third meaning of "public" in "public administration" is as "the people," the presumed beneficiary of government and of providers of other public goods (the first and second meanings), as well as the embodiment of the collective in a nation. This is not a new concept, since the philosophy of public administration, and public philosophy as a whole, have always given a central place to the people as embodied in ideas of "the public interest" or the "public good" (note: *not* "public goods"). This is the public that is envisioned in the phrase "public service," the commitment not only of "public officials" but of all professions and professionals ("sense of public service" being one of their defining qualities), all universities ("public service" completing their triadic mission, with instruction and research), if not, in fact, all citizens. There is a connotation here of the public not only as recipient or beneficiary, but also as creator and participant in the process.

This meaning of public has been couched in the language of the "turbulence of the environment" rather than in public interest terms. It may be recalled that Biller (1971: 93-121) stated that "any unit is public to the extent that it is hosted in a turbulent field." He contrasted this with private organizations which can make fairly accurate and predictive statements about customers and supply, the key elements of their environment. Meanwhile, public organizations have more indeterminate environments and continually shifting concerns. These concerns are decided in the crucible of openness and

confrontation involving the exercise of power and resulting in authoritative allocation of resources. These are undertaken not only by agents of sovereign power (the first meaning of public). Rather, it involves all with participation in and responsibility for the definition and advocacy of the public interest, accountability to the public at large, and responsiveness and representativeness to society. The turbulence of the public sector is thus different from the predictability of the private in the fashioning of decisions for the public good.

The ascendancy of this concept of public has coincided with a rethinking of the other word in the phrase, the expansion of "administration" to "governance." The advent of the "public policy period" freed public administration from exclusive concentration on the bureaucracy to the higher reaches of the legislature and the presidency, and also to the outskirts of the political realm, local governments, communities, the business sector, the people. But it continued to focus on administration.

The "governance period" sets up new challenges. "To govern" is much more than "to administer": the former leads in the attainment of goals, the latter undertakes to attain them. If public administration is to be involved in governance, it must contemplate a theory of the role of the state and not just of the bureaucracy. More than that, the theory must explain how the role of the state is diminished or reinforced by forces outside it.

The new key players are the market and civil society. The recognition of the role of civil society is a 1990s phenomenon, the culmination of people's power revolutions of which the Philippines in 1986 was a dramatic early example. However, the insertion of the market in public administration thinking has an older provenance, indexed by the demand for privatization and liberalization of international development agencies, and championed by such leaders as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan. In governance, one recognizes that sectors outside the bureaucracy and the formal political hierarchy play a role not only in providing services (that is, the narrow administrative role). They also take political roles — in envisioning the good society and defining the public interest, in acting as representatives of the people, in reinforcing public values and standards, in becoming vehicles for the socialization of the citizenry for social responsibility and public service. Public administration in this light is "governance for the public interest." It is in this notion of public administration that management of the voluntary sector, nonprofit, or civil society organizations (whatever the desired appellation) can take a rightful place.

But if governance allocates roles for the state, market and civil society, why is the market being ignored in drawing up the new boundaries of the discipline? Is it because it already has an established field of discourse in

business administration while management of civil society organizations is a new field looking for a home?

The inclusion of the voluntary sector in public administration is not a matter of a market lag in supplying education for these organizations. Rather, it is propelled by the historical development of the discipline and the theoretical import of its role in society. Market and civil society play different roles in governance and thus touch the discipline in different ways. Institutions of the market get involved in governance by being more quintessentially themselves: the private sector. They attempt to show that unhampered competition results in the efficient production of goods and services, and that the law of supply and demand upholds individual choice. Thus, if a public interest rationale must be found for it, the market can point to freedom and liberty for citizens of the state, and more judicious use of the nation's resources. It intersects public administration as a model of an alternative delivery system and as a focus of regulatory concern — when market failure occurs, when distributional concerns are significant, when the sector itself seeks government intervention for its own interest.

Beyond showing another model of delivery and another possible concern of regulation, organizations of the civil society insert themselves into the realm of governance by becoming more like a political institution. They consider themselves vessels of the public interest and representatives of the people (in addition to or as a better substitute for elected officials). They advocate public policy not only for the good of their organization, but on behalf of those who do not speak out. They attempt to correct distributional problems by consciously seeking out the marginalized. Indeed, New York University's (NYU) Wagner School of Public Service assumed away the problem of explaining the change of the name of its Program in Public Administration to the MPA Program in Public and Nonprofit Management and Policy by simply saying that it "reflects the growing importance of nonprofit organizations in our nation's *public sector*" (italics supplied). It did not attempt to redefine the field; it merely recognized these organizations as a part of the public sector.

I hope that does not mean that this discussion has simply been a longer attempt to state what NYU assumes is obvious: that the voluntary sector is public and its management a legitimate aspect of public administration. Rather, I have tried to show that this is a culmination of the evolution of the field and that there are good theoretical reasons for its inclusion. Public administration at its core will probably always be governmental management if only because no other field will accept that as its central subject matter. But the discipline cannot now retreat from the enhanced responsibility of describing and analyzing governance for the public interest. And that will always mean including in the purview of its analysis the nonprofit organizations and other parts of the public sector that make significant political and administrative contributions towards its attainment.

Table 1. The Meaning of "Public" in Public Administration

<i>Meaning of Public</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Definition of the Field</i>
Government	public schools public funds public officials	Governmental management
Beneficiary of public goods	public utility public health public policy	Provision of public goods and services
The people	public service public interest	Governance for the public interest

The Voluntary Sector in the Continuum of Publicness-Privateness

Barry Bozeman (1987), in a seminal book, claims that all organizations are public. If that is true, the obverse (although he did not claim it) would also be true: all organizations are private. Bozeman argues that some government organizations are private in that:

- Some of their goods are "purely private (that is, divisible, exclusionary, conveniently priced in the market)" or intermediate between the purely private and purely public (1987: 50).
- Public ownership is diluted (that is, taxpayer-owners — and even their representative politicians — lack direct control), thus power is delegated to managers (1987: 54).
- "Some administration motive is self-interest, even when the stated organizational motive is not" (1987: 53).
- "A public manager will have great opportunity to increase his well-being at the expense of the owner's [that is, the taxpayer's] wealth to a greater extent than a manager of a proprietary concern because it is relatively less costly to do so" (Bozeman 1987: 53, quoting Davies 1981: 115).

If even government agencies can be private, it is clear that publicness-privateness is a continuum. An organization is public to the extent that it exerts or is constrained by political authority, and private to the extent it exerts or is constrained by economic authority. Economic authority is represented by the operation of market forces and the primacy of technology. Political authority concerns accountability to external political actors, increased interdependence,

concern with externalities, closer ties to political cycles, increased public visibility and increased concern with equity and other social goals. Note that "only in the case of the political constraint is there involvement with a broader purpose and a generalized constituency.... It is the breadth of purpose that makes the political constraint important" (Bozeman 1987, quote on 93).⁴

Members of the voluntary sector, like all other organizations, have public and private characteristics. They are public in their involvement in serving the public interest and in their critique or advocacy of public policy. In this light, they have the broad purpose and generalized constituency underscored by Bozeman as a key quality of publicness. Some of them are public in that they provide goods and services that are indivisible and have high externalities. Others are meant to generate income which places them in the market. However, since the profit is not distributed to the members as individuals, the organizations retain their public quality.

Civil society organizations also have elements of the private in that they have private initiative and funding. However, while these come from private persons, they are mediated not by market forces but by values of philanthropy and commitment, thus, not private in Bozeman's sense. A second element of privateness is their nature as unelected representatives. Thus, while claiming broader constituencies, they are criticized as representing only themselves in public policy discussions. This is an empirical question, however, that can be resolved, not in the market, but in the political realms. On balance, therefore, the publicness of civil society organizations outweighs their private qualities.

Comparison of Business, Public and Voluntary Sector Management

Even though voluntary sector management is accepted as part of public administration in its enlarged definition as governance for the public interest, it is not wholly like the generic field of public administration. That is not a disqualification since other aspects of public administration, such as local government administration and public enterprise management, differ from each other and from the typical government agency not only in the substantive program they are focusing on, but also in major personnel, fiscal and organizational concerns. For instance, local government management is the most political sphere of public management: it has a different mix of political and administrative officials than the rest of the bureaucracy, undertakes taxation, and has to tackle legislative-executive relations and lawmaking that the rest of public administration does not. Public enterprises have more market characteristics than regular agencies; these place their management at the intersection of public and business administration. Thus, the entry of voluntary sector management only makes an already complicated field even more exciting.

Nevertheless, it is instructive to make a comparison among business administration (BA), generic public administration (PA) and voluntary sector management (VSM), for three reasons. First, it will show that voluntary sector management is closer to public administration than business administration. When they are different, the management issue tends to be one where PA and BA are similar. Second, it will bring out the major differences which public administration scholars must watch out for when they discuss a Philippine administrative system which includes the voluntary sector. Third, these differences may provide lessons for changing the other types of administration. Given the purposes of this paper, I concentrate on how voluntary sector management may be the source of insights for the enhancement of the theory and practice of public administration.

The three types of administration may be compared along several dimensions: their sphere of work, their purpose, and various management concerns.

In terms of the first, business administration operates in the market, public administration in the state, and voluntary sector management in civil society. The sphere location has wide-ranging implications on their workings that should be the subject matter of another paper. Here, let it suffice to call attention to this difference.

BA differs from the other two in terms of purpose: it is for profit, while both PA and VSM is for public service. The voluntary sector has a secondary purpose not shared by PA: the fulfillment of its members, whether that be economic (the aim of cooperatives), social (a sense of community) or personal (fulfillment of selfhood through philanthropy). This secondary purpose is also present in business firms and government as it is the implied goal of human resource development in whatever organizations it is sought. However, it is more consciously pursued among NGOs.

In personnel administration, BA and PA follow the bureaucratic rules: recruitment of paid staff based on technical qualifications, retention based on performance, a system of pecuniary and similar rewards and incentives, the expectation of a career, and discipline based on rules. While volunteers seem to be the peculiar preserve of the nonprofit sector, PA is starting to use volunteer staff, primarily to extend the reach of government in the delivery of social and political services (e.g., barangay health workers, barangay tanods). VSM adds to technical qualifications the requirement of commitment to the causes of the organization, for both paid and volunteer staff. Career is not expected, and staying on the job is dependent on commitment and interest. Income is primarily psychic. Although rules and contracts also govern discipline in the voluntary sector, they tend to put greater reliance on moral suasion, self-regulation and an organizational code of ethics.

Table 2. Comparison of Different Kinds of Administration

	<i>Business Administration</i>	<i>Public Administration</i>	<i>Voluntary Sector Management</i>
Sphere of Operation	Market	State	Civil Society
Purpose	For profit	For public service	For public service For members' fulfillment
Personnel Administration			
Qualifications of staff	Technical	Technical	Technical value commitments
Retention of staff	Based on performance	Based on performance	Dependent on interest and commitment
Reward system	Largely pecuniary	Largely pecuniary	largely psychic
Discipline	Based on rules	Based on rules	Moral suasion and self-regulation
Client Participation	Through buying of goods	Originally as passive recipients	Promotion of involvement of citizens
Fund Generation	Profit-making	Taxation	Philanthropy, income generating projects, some public funding
Structure to whom Accountable	Bureaucracy Owners	Bureaucracy Public, through government officials	Association Public, through its boards

Clients affect a business firm by the level of their effective demand, that is, their ability to buy the goods and services it offers. With that mechanism absent, government can provide services independent of demand, such that expected beneficiaries are passive recipients and the target of do-gooding efforts. When they are more aggressive, government in the past has viewed their claims as non-legitimate and unhealthy protests. However, citizen participation has gained legitimacy in recent years, and the role of stakeholders and the citizenry at large in planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation is being encouraged. NGOs have led the way in promoting the involvement and empowerment of citizens.

The three differ in their fund generation and fiscal administration. BA relies on profit, which is tied to efficient production and knowledge of the market. PA is dependent on taxation, and the amount of appropriations is not necessarily correlated with productivity and performance. VSM here is more

similar to BA than PA: not-for-profit organizations still endeavor to produce a surplus, although it is not profit in that it is not for the accumulation of wealth of the owners or members. In the use of the philanthropic mechanism, VSM's ability to generate funds is more tied to performance than an agency receiving tax money. But to the extent that the production of money is necessary for survival rather than the reason for existence, voluntary sector management is kin more to PA than BA.

However, there is a fiscal point in which VSM and PA converge — many voluntary sector organizations are highly dependent on government for funding. Voluntary sector organizations justify seeking and receiving public funds because they undertake many public functions. Thus, in acting as alternative delivery systems, they claim to produce public services at lower costs and in a more compassionate, humane approach. Besides, they serve as private (or more correctly, nongovernmental) instruments for public tasks such as political socialization and recruitment, political communication, and interest articulation and interest aggregation. They are source and analyst of public policy. Moreover, they act as a safety valve, a forum for venting frustration and despair over governmental and societal failure, through their critique and advocacy of reform.

The typical organizational structure under BA and PA is the bureaucracy while VSM would tend to have an association of more or less equal members, with staff operating under a flat, matrix-type structure. The organization is accountable to owners and their boards in the case of business, and the public in the case of government. The voluntary organization is intermediate here, accountable to the public in its understanding of its goals, like PA, but formally to its board as surrogate to owners, like BA.

It may be seen that, to paraphrase (and turn around) Allison, public administration and voluntary sector management are alike in all the important respects. They share goals, the sense of purpose and accountability. Where they are different, the voluntary sector exhibits features that if transferred or imitated can enhance the government bureaucracy. It is to this issue that we now turn our attention.

Ways the Management of the Voluntary Sector Can Enrich PA

To reiterate: the major differences in the administration of government and the voluntary sector relate to the qualifications of staff, the reward system and the method of discipline, the role of clients, the means of fund generation, and the organizational structure. In each of these, recognizing what nonprofit organizations do may help in understanding and producing more effective and satisfactory public administration.

Personnel and Human Resource Issues

Take the case of the qualifications used as prerequisite to recruitment. Weberian theory — and PA doctrine — states that only technical qualifications matter and should be used. But wouldn't a commitment to public service values, in addition to technical skill, produce more satisfactory civil servants? This is in line with the vision of the kind of graduate our College hopes to produce (Cabo 1994) and what the Civil Service Commission (CSC) tries to ingrain through its values education workshops. Meanwhile, this is the kind of staff VSM routinely seeks and employs. More than that, this is the combination of qualities volunteers bring to the organization. As Keaveney (1991: 21) states: "Volunteers ... bring with them experience, skill, dedication, clout, passion and an unparalleled ability to reach out to the ... public."

The strong reaction against using any qualification other than technical arose from the excesses of the Jackson administration when political partisanship had its heyday. Surely, however, the discipline has recognized the complexity of the meaning of politicization and can distinguish between partisan qualifications and those committed to politically-neutral high social ideals (Etzioni-Halevy 1985).

For persons in the voluntary sector, whether paid or unpaid, pecuniary rewards take a backseat to psychic income. This is because, as already stated, a goal of volunteer management is to keep volunteers challenged, happy and motivated in their work, a kind of fulfillment which is not a goal of market and state organizations. The lesson for PA here is not to remove regular salary and other benefits. Rather, it is to be more conscious of the fact that "one does not live by bread alone" and to develop better schemes to recognize the contributions of the staff. VSM can be helpful here since its managers, lacking "the usual incentive of money and the usual controls," are forced to be creative in motivating their staff (Geber 1991: 21-26, quote on 24).

The same goes for discipline. Contrary to popular assumptions, even volunteers in the nonprofit sector are expected to undertake certain responsibilities on a regular basis. For instance, they cannot promise to be in a streetchildren's caring program and then just not show up. Their credo of rights and obligations is just as extensive as those in PA and BA. Effective VS managers deal strictly with violations of rules and performance shortfalls. The difference lies in the fact that they rely, less on formal controls and disciplinary processes, as on techniques of moral suasion. Nevertheless, the former can be activated when deemed necessary. In many cases, Philippine government administrators also resort to these less formal and more humane alternatives. However, they are not as well recognized as legitimate means of dealing with problems in the domain of PA as in VSM.

The inclusion of VSM in PA will not redound only to an enrichment of its methods of personnel administration. Rather, it will force us to deal with the role of values in motivation and discipline that PA as a field tends to ignore. I imagine new research to focus on such issues as the role of idealism in public service, how that may be nurtured over the entire career of government officials and nonprofit sector personnel, and how value-based leadership and followership can make a difference in public administration.

The Role of Citizens in Governance

The boundaries of the voluntary sector are permeable by the demands of citizens, many of whom can also choose to be members and, thus, influence the organization from without and from within. Clients are encouraged to voice out their concerns at all stages of the policy cycle, an interaction already sought by government to be institutionalized in its own processes. VSM, being located in civil society, is the role model in this regard.

Citizen participation has found a hospitable reception in PA research. What the entry of VSM would add is not a new focus, but a greater understanding of the causes and consequences of the involvement of the societal sectors in democratization and governance. The growth of the voluntary sector cannot really be appreciated apart from the push for democracy, whether that takes place in a setting of regular meaningful elections or in an authoritarian regime. The study of the voluntary sector can thus illumine the role of the state and the growth of civil society, an understanding that is crucial as PA moves beyond administration to governance.

The Generation of Financial Resources

In matters of fund generation, PA can take a leaf from VSM and BA both of which have performance-based financing. There is no theoretical reason for agency allocations to be based only on the previous year's budget or on political savvy. Although taxes are collected without reference to a specific agency's performance, popular confidence in the government affects the level of tax receipts. Therefore, the budget office should connect its level of financing to how well an agency contributes to that level of confidence, that is, to how well it performs. The voluntary sector regularly puts its performance on the line when it seeks funds through philanthropy, grants or loans from government and international agencies, and its own entrepreneurial projects.

The theoretical contribution of VSM here would be in the study of philanthropy and gift-giving (Schervish 1993). "Philanthropy" originally meant "love for humankind." Over time, it gained a connotation of doling out, tax evasion and avoidance, and pragmatic altruism, i.e., giving with strings

attached. Meanwhile, gift-giving has sometimes been viewed as legitimized corruption, where a person, anticipating an unwarranted policy decision in his favor, gives a pre-decision bribe. Nonprofits are not naive, but recognizing that altruism is not necessarily diluted, have started to study philanthropy in a more neutral, academic sense. Conceivably, the analysis of philanthropy and gift-giving can assist in tax collection, and their basis on performance and track records crosses over to the budgeting processes of governmental agencies. In addition, it would aid in the measurement of performance of organization-beneficiaries which do not have a profit structure, such as government and NGOs.

But quite apart from financial as the main type of resource, studying voluntary sector management brings up the issue of "social capital." Its advocates contend that it is every bit as important as material resources, but it does not involve the exchange of money. Rather, social capital network of human relationships allows a society to be formed and to grow (Putnam 1993; Cox 1995). Without social capital, the social purpose that undergirds the actions of people to work for the public good, without pay or recognition and often at great sacrifice, would not be attained.

Organizational Structure

The usual organizational structure of the voluntary sector is an association. Relationships tend toward equity rather than hierarchy. The division of labor — much of which is project-based — is propelled by the need to be responsive to people rather than the imperatives of procedures and controls. Its staffing would tend to be flat and modular. These features recall the alternative to bureaucracy recommended by the "new public administrationists." It can teach volumes about how to energize and humanize the government bureaucracy.

In addition, studying the civil service and nonprofit organizations side by side can further operationalize what a steering government means (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). Already, PA is studying the co-production of goods by government and NGOs, as well as their possible competition, complementation or collaboration (Cariño 1995). In fact Wise (1994) sees PA as moving from institutional management, with its exclusive concern for single organizations (whether one government agency or an entire civil service system) into what he calls "transorganizational management." Under this concept, PA takes place across organizational and sphere boundaries. Because of this, the coverage of PA becomes a "public service configuration" including government, private for-profit and the voluntary sector, all engaged in public policy and implementation. This requires alterations in the design and management of government organizations, as well as the establishment of new institutions that cross sectoral (or sphere) boundaries.

Table 3. How Voluntary Sector Management can Enrich Public Administration

PERSONNEL ISSUES	Inclusion of commitment as a qualification Role of values in motivation and discipline Nurturance of idealism in public service Value-based leadership and followership
ROLE OF CITIZENS IN GOVERNANCE	Role model for citizen empowerment Causes and consequences of involvement in democratization and governance Understanding role of the state and growth of civil society
FUND GENERATION	Performance-based financing Analysis of philanthropy and gift-giving Social capital
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	Alternatives to bureaucracy What Steering means Co-production of goods by government and NGOs Public service configuration

Conclusions

All that being said, the management of the voluntary sector is not without its problems. Some of those stem from the very features discussed above: the reliance on staff and citizen commitment and interest precludes long-term careers in the sector, the absence of which may mean organizations lacking stability and institutionalization. Its emphasis on values and ideals inspires, but, by that token, it may become based on charisma and personalism which would negate the rise of the causes it seeks to promote. Being propelled by values, a voluntary sector organization may so focus on making people happy that it fails to perform.

This is where being part of an administrative field is helpful. Administration, if nothing else, provides processes towards performance. As Peter Drucker reminds us, the job of all organizations is to allocate scarce resources for results. Nonprofits have the responsibility to create vision, standards, values and commitment, and human competence toward the causes they have embraced. These, as have been repeatedly said here, are causes in the service of the public interest. In other words, they must not simply "squander their resources on being righteous" (Drucker 1990: 112). They must learn to lead, manage and govern. The new academic specialization on voluntary sector management in the MPA program is meant to assist them to do just that.

Endnotes

¹Democratization promotes the idea of citizen sovereignty and empowerment in which NGOs and other parts of civil society are among the most articulate and effective mechanisms. Globalization provokes citizen participation as an assertion of the centrality of personhood and community in the face of the anonymity, homogenization and technocracy it fosters.

²However, the promotional brochures downloaded from the Internet can provide insights as to why nonprofit management is taught within an MPA program. For example, the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service of New York University offers an MPA Program in Public and Nonprofit Management and Policy. It gives two reasons for the change of its name from the MPA Program in Public Administration: first, "to reflect the growing importance of nonprofit organizations in our nation's public sector," and second, because "even those intent on government service will undoubtedly spend part of their careers in nonprofit institutions." Meanwhile, the Center for the Study of Philanthropy and Voluntarism of Duke University was created to recognize that philanthropy and voluntary organizations "are worth serious attention." The Center is part of the Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy which has "an interdisciplinary research program and a professional master's degree in public policy analysis and management." Students of American public administration education may recall that from the 1970s onward, many PA programs were created or reconstituted as public policy, enriching a largely political science sub-field with theoretical contributions from political economy, economics, law and philosophy. Please note the following: (a) the designation of the "public sector" as including the voluntary sector; (b) the reference to the expected career changes of professionals as a reason for offering the course; and (c) the interdisciplinarity of the field as a factor in making it a hospitable home for a new object of study and discourse "worth serious attention."

³One may parenthetically note that many of these scholars have already been resurrected as public policy specialists, and were no longer public administrationists.

⁴Wilson (1989: 115-118) also put forward a theory of constraints as a means of distinguishing between public and private organizations. According to him, government bureaucracies have three main constraints: (1) they cannot lawfully retain and devote to the private benefit of their members the earnings of the organization; (2) they cannot allocate the factors of production in accordance with the preference of the organization's administrators; and (3) they must serve goals not of the organization's own choosing.

References

- Allison, Graham
1987 Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? In Jay Shafrits and Albert Hyde, eds. *Classics of Public Administration*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Biller, Robert P.
1971 Some Implications of Adaptation Capacity for Organization and Political Development. In Frank Marini, ed. *Toward a New Public Administration*. New York: Chandler Publishing: 93-121.
- Bozeman, Barry
1987 *All Organizations are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories*. San Francisco and London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cabo, Wilhelmina L.
1994 *The Meaning of UP Education: KAVS CPA Unit Report*. Volume 2. Quezon City: Education Research Program, University Center for Integrative and Development Studies and the University of the Philippines Press.

- Cariño, Ledivina V.
1995 Complements, Competitors or Collaborators: Government-NGO Relations. In Romeo B. Ocampo and Oscar M. Alfonso, eds. *Alternative Delivery Systems for Public Services*. Manila: Association of Development Research and Training Institutes of Asia and the Pacific (ADIPA): 99-113.
- Cox, Eva
1995 *A Truly Civil Society*. Sydney: Boyer Lectures, Australian Broadcasting Corp.
- Crowder, Nancy and Virginia Hodgkinson
1992 An Update on Teaching about Philanthropy, Voluntarism and the NonProfit Sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*.
- Davies, D.G.
1981 Property Rights and Economic Behavior in Private and Government Enterprises: The Case of Australia's Banking System. In R.O. Zerbe, Jr., ed. *Research in Law and Economics*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Drucker, Peter
1990 *Managing the Non-Profit Organization: Practices and Principles*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Etzioni-Halevy, Eva
1985 *Bureaucracy and Democracy: A Political Dilemma*. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Rev. ed.
- Geber, Beverly
1991 Managing Volunteers. *Volunteer Resources*. 4: 21-26.
- Jones, Charles O.
1984 *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co. 3rd edition.
- Keaveney, Susan
1991 Volunteers as Customers: A Service Quality Perspective. *The Journal of Volunteer Administration*. 21-30.
- Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler
1992 *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Ostrom, Vincent and Elinor Ostrom
1971 Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 203-16.
- Putnam, Robert D.
1993 *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, New York University
1997 Leading Programs for Public Service. New York University.
- Schervish, Paul
1993 *Taking Giving Seriously*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.

Waldo, Dwight

1965 The Administrative State Revisited. *Public Administration Review*. 25: 5-30.

Wilson, James Q.

1989 *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. USA: Basic Books.

Wise, Charles

1994 The Public Service Configuration Problem: Designing Public Organization in a Pluralistic Public Service. In Ali Farazmand, ed. *Modern Organizations: Administrative Theory in Contemporary Society*. Westport, Conn.: 81-103.