Philippine Journal of Public Administration, Vol. XLII, Nos. 3 & 4 (July - October 1998)

Globalization, Organizations, and Public Administration

MA. OLIVA Z. DOMINGO*

Largely facilitated by advances in telecommunications, globalization is a potent and irresistible force that is shaping the current forms and contexts of organizations. To cope with the changing demands of the global environment, organization structures and designs, which were unimaginable before, have emerged. Thus, contemporary organizations now take the following forms: teams in a network (network organization); autonomous business units or self-managed teams akin to cells interacting with other cells to form a more competent organization (cellular organization); and ad hoc mini organizations set up for a particular purpose/set of activities rather than units within an office or building (virtual organizations). Other new organizational forms include joint ventures, strategic alliances, modular corporations, and linear chains, among others. These changes pose real challenges to the relevance of existing organization theories in particular, and to the theory and practice of public administration in general.

Introduction

Despite our greatest fears about globalization, we cannot alter the fact that it is now happening and is changing the shape of economies, political and social institutions, and culture. It is also providing the impetus for strengthening civil society and the growth of alternative social movements (Briones 1997: 2-4). It is a potent and irresistible force that is having tremendous impact on people, nation-states, and organizations.

To respond to the challenges and seize opportunities in an increasingly integrated world economy, organizations are currently undergoing radical transformations facilitated, to a large extent, by advances in telecommunications and information technology. Business enterprises, necessarily, have been quick to adapt and there is increasing pressure on public sector organizations to respond accordingly. Viewed from this context, organizations appear to be at the receiving end of globalization. The relationship between organizations and globalization, however, may be viewed as a two-way process

*Assistant Professor and Doctor of Public Administration student, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

because the "combined activities of all kinds of organizations stimulate, facilitate, sustain, and extend globalization" (Parker 1996: 484), thereby instigating global change.

Globalization is here and we are now experiencing its impact. This article focuses on organizations and the transformations that are occurring as they face the challenges of a global market economy; it does not argue about the benefits and hazards of globalization. The first part describes the changes in organizational structures, behavior, and processes. The second part is a brief presentation of theories of organization and their prospects vis-à-vis globalization. Finally, the challenges of these developments on public sector organizations are examined.

Globalization and Changing Organizational Forms and Contexts

The dismantling of economic barriers and the liberalization of trade are evolving new forms of transactions—among producers, suppliers, and consumers—which provide opportunities for organizations or firms of various sizes and shapes to participate (Alburo 1997). Whereas international trade used to be the domain only of the large transnational corporations, global economic integration has opened possibilities even to small players through easy access to markets. Naisbitt (1994: 16) describes this "global paradox," thus:

> As the world integrates economically, the component parts are becoming more numerous and smaller and more important. At once, the global economy is growing while the size of the parts are shrinking.

Organizations are social institutions that have planned activities and interrelationships logically drawn up to undertake specific objectives. The global organization is not a well-defined concept. The tendency is to study large organizations despite the fact that the potential to engage in global activities are not necessarily confined to large organizations. Sometimes the focus is on organizations involved in the movement of goods, capital, and services from one country to another, a perspective that would fall more within the limited view of internationalization rather than globalization.

The international/transnational/multinational organizations of yesteryears are not necessarily equivalent to the organizations operating in today's global village. Though this distinction may be discernible, the exact nature of the global organization is "far less clear and particularly less clear to practitioners" (Parker 1996: 489). Parker cites studies attempting to distinguish international organizations from multinational firms and transnational enterprises and how these differ from or are similar to what may be considered as global organizations. The use of different terminologies, however, has resulted in further confounding the search for meaning. This is a reflection of the complex changes occurring all over the globe. Parker's distinction between international organizations and global organizations is instructive. She characterizes an international organization as one whose headquarters are almost always based in a single country, although it might establish partial or complete operations elsewhere. Its culture and organizational structure are consistent with the practices and norms of the home headquarters country. It adopts standardized technologies and business processes throughout its operations, regardless of where they are located, and it relies on similar policies, especially regarding human resources, worldwide (Parker 1996: 488).

Global organizations, on the other hand, engage in different set of activities and create additional responsibilities for organizations than international firms. They operate in a nationless and borderless world where people, capital, and goods move about freely. They may be described as those that have the following characteristics (Parker 1996: 490-491):

- they establish a worldwide presence in one or more businesses;
- they adopt a worldwide strategy, i.e. they combine worldwide standards with local responsiveness;
- they are able to cross external boundaries of nations, as well as boundaries internal to the organizations such as: (1) the less tangible boundaries like culture, thought, or the relationship between the organization and others, and (2) those that pertain to functional assignment, task, rank, role, or attitude;
- except for a few standardized policies, its people, processes, policies, structures, and technologies are diverse.

Toffler was prescient in his 1979 book *Future Shock*, when he described the shape that organizations would take in the future. These radical transformations among organizations, whether they operate in the global village or not, are most discernible in terms of their structure and the behavior of individuals within them. These changes are discussed in the succeeding sections.

Organization Design and Structure

The bureaucratic organization popularized by Weber used to be the dominant structure for organizations. Characterized by hierarchy, centralization, division of labor, authority, dominance of rules, and impersonal relationships, it is criticized for its rigidity and red tape. Its promise of stability, order, precision, and predictability of results, however, has made it a rationale choice for organizational design and has led to what is sometimes referred to as a TINA tendency (There Is No Alternative) for organizational structure (Clegg and Gray 1996: 296). While the bureaucratic structure is still very much evident, more dynamic and responsive organizational forms are emerging.

Global competition demands speed and flexibility. It demands that organizations deliver high quality goods and services, be responsive to their customers, offer nonstandardized services, and be able to adapt swiftly. The rigidity of traditional structures render organizations helpless in the face of turbulence, uncertainty, and worldwide competition and are therefore giving way to more flexible forms. The "flex-firm" concept refers to a variety of ways of organizing people and activities other than the bureaucratic structure (Toffler 1991: 182).

In order to survive, companies are dismantling their bureaucracies. "Economies of scale are giving way to economies of scope, finding the right size for synergy, market flexibility, and above all, speed" (Naisbitt 1994: 14). Organizations have been downsizing operations through what Naisbitt described as the "ODD effect" or outsourcing, delayering, and deconstruction. Terms like rightsizing, acquisitions, takeovers, mergers, restructuring, or reengineering have become so familiar and commonplace. This trend began as early as the 1980s and has since spawned a variety of organizational forms that we see today. Organization structures have gone beyond the so-called "modern designs" such as the project structure or matrix designs. The emerging designs "totally abandon the classical, hierarchical, functional structure" (Luthans 1995: 486) and have evolved into the network, cellular, and virtual designs.

Rather than performing the entire sequence of functions (from planning, researching, designing, manufacturing, and marketing a product), organizations are linking with other organizations with critical expertise for specific projects. This modular organizational architecture allows firms to operate as teams in a network (Luthans 1995: 487). The **network organizations** provide the most efficient service at the different stages. By relying on their partners, network organizations are able to leverage their core competencies. Some firms are not simply utilizing the expertise of their partners but have even gone beyond this to embrace them as full partners. This allows for free flow of technical and market information, which ensures lower costs and the satisfaction of the individual organizations' goals as well as those of the network as a whole (Allred *et al.* 1996: 19-20).

Networks may exist simply for the purpose of exchanging information or may actually be involved in joint activities. There are advantages of this type of structure. It allows resources to be shared, avoids duplication of independent effort, and spreads out the risks. It is more flexible than the traumatic and costly alternatives of takeovers or mergers, and more appropriate for products with short life-cycle (Clegg and Hardy 1996: 9-10). Business enterprises and nongovernmental organizations have discovered the merits of networking many years back.

Information, communication, and transportation technology have effectively reduced if not eliminated the constraints of distance and time, thus enabling the component parts of a network organization to function as one wherever they may be located and allowing them to respond more readily to competition and other global challenges.

Another form that global organizations are taking is the so-called **cellular organization** which acts more as a facilitating mechanism, rather than employer. It is analogous to the living organism, the cell, which can perform all the functions of life alone but, by acting with other cells, is able to do more complex functions. A cellular organization is made up of autonomous business units or self-managed teams, etc., that interact with other cells rather than exist on their own in order to become a more competent organization. An example of this would be an organization that provides equity capital and expertise in exchange for ownership of product rights; another firm (or customer) which provides cash by placing an advance order in exchange for rights and input into the development process; and still another firm acting as the project leader. Under this arrangement, the funding, expertise, as well as information about the demand for the product are all obtained (Allred *et al.* 1996: 22). The project leader may involve other cells or organizations with appropriate expertise in the development process.

Technological advances are taking organizational structures even further—into the realm of the **virtual organization**. The term "virtual" does not come from the popular "virtual reality" but from "virtual memory" which is used to describe the computer's memory capacity that can be made to appear bigger than it actually is (Luthans 1995: 487). E-mail, mobile phones, computers, fax modems, and video conferencing no longer require people to be together in the same place at the same time. The organization is made up of ad hoc mini organizations set up for a particular purpose. They exist more as activities rather than units within an office or building. Charles Handy (1995: 42) predicts that the office of the future "will be more like a clubhouse: a place for meeting, eating, and greeting, with rooms reserved for activities, not particular people." With a telephone line, computer, modem, or other equipment, an office worker can perform his/her functions without physical presence in an office. They can do their work anywhere they choose to, and during their convenient hours. In fact, a sizeable number of contemporary entrepreneurs now have office addresses that are usually located in prestigious business districts or buildings that may appear impressive in business cards but are actually only virtual offices that perform as mail forwarders or message centers.

The key attributes of the virtual organization are: (1) *technology*, which links partners by informational networks based on electronic contacts; (2) *opportunism*, where temporary, less formal network of firms come together to exploit fast-changing opportunities; (3) *absence of borders* which allows them to operate in any environment; (4) the importance of *trust* between and among companies that must rely on each other; and (5) *excellence,* or the possibility of creating the "best-of-everything" because the companies bring in their respective core competence (Luthans 1995: 487-488).

A distance education program, like the University of the Philippines Open University (OU), operates like a cellular and a virtual organization. Its academic programs and policies are implemented with minimum face-to-face interaction among parties involved. Academic programs are developed individually or jointly by academic degree-granting units from the different autonomous universities (in Diliman, Manila, Los Baños, and Visayas) and students need not relocate on campus to attend residential classes. There are no fixed faculty, very few personnel, and the site of operations is not fixed in one place. The University is thus able to reach a wider public and provide learning opportunities with the least dislocation and disruption to career, community, or family life of the learner. There is great reliance on communications technology and multimedia resources to enrich the learning process. Students receive their learning modules upon enrollment and read their lessons and perform class exercises in the luxury of their homes or offices. They can fax their application forms and their class exercises, or e-mail their tutors. Their face-to-face interaction with the University is limited to the very few (three or four times a semester) "tutorial" sessions and examinations. Thus, faculty members assess the performance of students and give them grades while students are able to complete their degree programs through a "virtual" relationship.

Other terminologies for the new organizational forms include **joint ventures** and **strategic alliances,** which are cooperative arrangements that adopt a collective strategy enabling organizations to enter new markets, both domestic and global. Then there are the **modular corporations** which subcontract all non-core activities, like computer operations and cafeteria, to outsiders. They are equivalent to what Charles Handy refers to as "shamrock organizations." They maintain a small core of permanent professional workers who are guardians of the core competencies, on one hand, and, on the other, several independent contractors usually composed of part-timers and temporary staff to whom much of the organization's work is outsourced (Handy 1989: 70-92). A number of government agencies in the country have adopted this design through contracts for security (or blue guard) and janitorial services. **Linear**

chains, are more recent forms that involve connecting disparate organizations where the lead company imposes strict quality controls on subcontractors and subsubcontractors, who may in turn pressure management to improve innovation (Clegg and Hardy 1996: 9).

Regardless of the structure adopted, the trend is toward flat organizational structures and less hierarchy.

Developments in electronic and communications technology—linking telephones, computers, and cables lines; wireless technology such as satellite microwave; new messaging units; improvements in cellular phone technology; personal telecomputers which can be programmed to receive television and radio signals as well as telephone transmissions; more powerful personal computers (PCs) and the new network computer technology being developed in the West—open a whole range of other possibilities. Access to these is not limited to the large organizations because affordable models allow the small enterprises to benefit from these technologies as well. For Kenichi Ohmae (1995: vii), modern information technology has such tremendous impact that "no traditional strategy, no familiar line of policy, and no entrenched form of organization can stand untouched or unchanged."

Together with the challenges of a globalized market economy and advances in technology, the changes in the structure of organizations have brought about corresponding changes in behavior, processes, and culture within organizations.

Organizational Processes, Behavior, and Culture

The demand for flexibility is manifested not only in the new organizational designs but in the processes that occur therein. Developments in technology are facilitating work processes and standardizing equipment allowing for more flexible personnel arrangements. For instance, the best pharmaceutical companies in the world have virtually the same critical activities of drug discovery, screening and testing, such that scientists can move from one laboratory to another without experiencing any problems. They will find the equipment familiar, often supplied by the same manufacturer as the equipment they have used before. In the semiconductor industry, the machines, methods, software, and work stations have become "quite similar throughout the developed world" (Ohmae 1989: 154).

The workforce has become more mobile and more autonomous. Regular work hours and office restrictions are no longer acceptable givens and are viewed as dysfunctions. Flexible work schedules and assignments are, thus, becoming popular. This, too, is a response to the growing number of dual career households where both husband and wife seek jobs to support family needs. There is a wide range of alternatives to the traditional 8-hour workday/ 40-hour workweek which includes flexitime, compressed workweeks, and time sharing. Flexible opening and closing hours allow employees to factor in personal circumstance in choosing their office hours, provided a common core time for all employees is observed. Compressed work weeks and longer weekends provide them with opportunities for child care, community service, volunteer work, or the need to transact business with another organization on a regular work day and not having to be absent from work. Job sharing enables two people to share a single full-time job, either to expand work opportunities to more people or to accommodate those who cannot offer their full-time services. Output contracts do not require an employee's physical presence but simply sets a deadline for completion of a specific output. Telecommuting allows employees to do part of their work at home, send their output to the office through electronic means, and come to office only on specific days. Work and family responsibilities demand greater flexibility.

While such arrangements enable organizations to reduce the number of people who are in an office or building at any specific time and thus reduce the amount of office space needed to accommodate all the employees, there will be more complex problems of coordination or work.

Electronic data interchange which allows computer-to-computer communication between and among organizations—providers of goods and services and their suppliers, customers, and manufacturers—has other implications on human resources. Some jobs are being eliminated; remaining jobs have to be redesigned or revamped; and the employees who remain may have a feel of a growing sense of insecurity. While technology can reduce operating time, employees need reskilling and retooling to be able to cope with it. This will have implications on recruitment and selection policies and procedures, rewards and incentive systems, supervision, performance evaluation, motivation, and training and development. Employers must develop their less-skilled employees and managers must become more responsive to the needs of their skilled employees in order to keep them and deter them from being pirated by the competitor.

The composition of the workforce is also changing to reflect demographic trends. Even as aging workers continue until they are involuntarily retired, organizations are hiring younger employees. Because finding a job has become very competitive and also because there are wider opportunities for specialized training and graduate education, many of the young recruits are highly educated and better qualified. Aside from the need to bridge the generation gap, older employees may resent being supervised by the younger, but more qualified ones; while younger employees may see the older ones as a threat to their authority or as potentially difficult subordinates (Dressler 1994; Gomez-Mejia *et al.* 1995: 103-104).

As organizations restructure, the tendency is for human resources to decrease in quantity but increase in quality and in their value to the organization. But restructuring is also changing the concept of work as a lifelong career which has implications on employee commitment and loyalty. Career paths will need to undergo an evolutionary shift. And for all employees, but more especially for non-core employees, career planning will necessarily become more of a do-it-yourself project.

As organizations form alliances, become networks, and cells, the boundaries that formally circumscribed them are getting blurred. Just like nation-states, globalization is creating boundaryless organizations. These modern and "postmodern" organizations have very decentralized structures where responsibility for decisionmaking and quality control is brought down to lower levels. Interaction and coordination is no longer based on hierarchy but on horizontal relationships.

The development of new technologies that allow for the free and fast flow of information is eliminating many inefficiencies in the processes of organization and management. Simultaneously, it provides workers knowledge about how other workers in the global village are treated. For instance, information on compensation and benefit packages can be shared across borders leading to problems of equity and morale. These may cause tensions within organizations.

New organizational structures, new technologies, processes, and flexible work arrangements are changing the nature of employee relationships and behavior. Networks, cellular forms, and virtual structures which dismantle hierarchies demand greater versatility and diplomacy from workers. The decline in personal transactions as a result of greater reliance on electronic communication have profound implications on how workers behave in terms of performance levels, accountability, motivation, commitment, loyalty, and even socialization skills. In this setup, workers are more motivated by results and opportunities for creation, learning, participation, and flexibility. Operating in the global village likewise demands increased sensitivity to varied cultures and practices.

Emerging Boundaries in Boundaryless Organizations

As the traditional boundaries of hierarchy, function, and geography disappear, a new set of boundaries take over. These are more psychological rather than organizational for they do not appear on the organization chart but on the minds of its employees and officials. Thus, despite similarities in technologies and equipment, workers must contend with diversity and cultural differences. Our example earlier of the pharmaceutical researcher or semiconductor technician/engineer who moves from one organization or nation to another will be faced with diversity in age, gender, ethnicity, language, norms, culture, and traditions.

In the traditional organizations, position titles and departments are manifestations of differences in power and authority. Although the structure was rigid, it had the advantage of making the roles of managers and employees "simple, clear, and relatively stable" (Hirschhorn and Gilmore 1992: 104). Everyone knew who reported to whom and who was responsible for what. As discussed earlier, globalization is making this traditional organization map fade away. With the blurring of boundaries, "the roles that people play at work, and the tasks they perform become correspondingly blurred and ambiguous" and now pose the challenge of figuring out "what kind of roles they need to play and what kind of relationships they need to maintain" (Hirschhorn and Gilmore 1992: 105).

Breaking down organizational boundaries does not mean that differences in authority, skills, talents, and perspectives will cease to exist. On the contrary, they will become even more relevant in the new organizations without boundaries. These differences make up the psychological boundaries of flexible organizations. Hirschhorn and Gilmore (1992: 107-110) identify four psychological boundaries: (1) the authority boundary; (2) the task boundary; (3) the political boundary, and (4) the identity boundary.

The **authority boundary** refers to the distinction between leader and follower, between manager and subordinate. The authority structure in traditional organizations is clear. In flexible organizations, however, the leader may not necessarily have the best information required for speedy and effective decisionmaking thus subordinates may need to challenge their decisions. In this respect, there is a need for superiors and subordinates to work well together. The **task boundary** has to do with identifying the tasks, dividing up the responsibilities, allocating resources, and coordinating the individual tasks into team effort. Again, because of the flexible character of the organization spread over the global expanse the task boundary is a complex area to manage. The **political boundary** refers to the politics involved in the interaction among people and groups with different interests, backgrounds, and beliefs. The **identity boundary** is about individual and group values—about who is "us" versus "them." Relationships at the identity boundary may run counter to the allegiances necessary to work together, thus, the need to strike a balance between loyalty to group and respect for others.

Standardization of equipment and facilities will not do away with disparities in policies and practices among component parts of global organizations. Thus, boundary management becomes a difficult challenge. The key to productivity, innovation, and effectiveness lies in creating the right kind of relationships or developing the "creative tension" at the right time. However, this kind of creative tension does not happen automatically; managers must work for it. These four psychological boundaries interact dynamically with one another and managers must learn how to understand and manage them (Hirschhorn and Gilmore 1992: 110).

The emerging organizational structures and other global forces have tremendous implications on planning, leading, controlling and the other functions of management. Uncertainties in the global market make planning a more ticklish endeavor. Coordination and motivational techniques become more challenging in networks, cells, or virtual organizations. The issue of how to manage people we do not see arises. Unscheduled meetings may become more difficult; consultations among colleagues may have to be prearranged because they are no longer down the hall but elsewhere. The issues of supervision, performance evaluation, accountability, responsibility, and productivity are other critical areas of concern.

The next section looks into existing theories of organization and their relevance in these times of turbulence, uncertainty, and globalization.

Organization Theories and the Global Context

Theories about organizations are reflective of the historical and cultural realities and trends during the period in which they were generated. As Ott and Shafritz (1992: 2) put it, "contributions to organization theory vary over time and across cultures and subcultures." Some theories emerge to challenge earlier postulations; others build upon existing theories. What do existing organization theories have to offer to help managers of today cope with the challenges of the times? To obtain some answers, the highlights of major organization theories are presented briefly.

There are multiple paradigms of organization theory other than the functionalist perspective which believes that reality is objective and empirically observed. Other paradigms view reality as a product of one's experiences and therefore subjective. These include the radical structuralist, the interpretivist, and the radical humanist paradigms (Burrell and Morgan 1979: 22). Each of these perspectives proceed from different ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, and assumptions about human nature. Although the search for paradigms is a recognized dimension of organization studies, this paper does not intend to pursue the dilemmas associated with them.

The Basic Features of Organization Theories

The first well-developed ideas on organizations are generally referred to as **classical organization theory**. Besides its historical significance, it is essential to have an understanding of it because it lays down the foundation for the development of other theories on organizations and their management. This school of thought was preceded by Adam Smith's ideas on specialization and division of labor which greatly influenced the classicists and subsequent thinkers as well.

Classical organization theory emerged when there was considerable concern about productivity and the belief that the "one-best way" to do things could be found through scientific inquiry. A major approach of classical organization theory is the Scientific Management approach which is focused on work and the workers, particularly "the performance of routine and repetitive physical tasks" (Fry 1989: 3). It sprung from the studies conducted by Frederick Winslow Taylor, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, Henry Gantt, and Harrington Emerson. Taylor, the acknowledged father of scientific management, pioneered in time and motion studies aimed at searching for the "fastest, most efficient, and least fatiguing production methods" (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 30). Taylor believed that it was the responsibility of management to find the "one best way" of doing things and to teach it to employees so that productivity, and ultimately profits, would increase. If there is a one best way of performing tasks then, corollary to this, there is also one best way of designing the organization's structure.

Ott and Shafritz (1992: 27) identify the fundamental principles of classical organization theory as follows:

1. that organizations exist to accomplish production-related and economic goals;

2. that production is maximized through specialization and division of labor;

3. that there is one best way to organize for production, and that way can be found through systematic, scientific inquiry; and

4. that people and organizations act in accordance with rational economic principles.

The other approach to classical organization theory focused on managing the total organization and on ways to make it more efficient and effective. Foremost among the theorists were Frenchman Henri Fayol, German sociologist Max Weber, British Lyndall Urwick, and American Chester Barnard. Fayol is best known formally identifying the major functions of management which influenced many other subsequent theorists and for his 14 principles of management: division of labor, authority and responsibility, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to general interest, remuneration of personnel, centralization, scalar chains, order, equity, stability of personnel, tenure, initiative, and *esprit de corps* (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 30).

The bureaucratic structure attributed to Max Weber is characterized, among others, by specialization and division of labor, hierarchy, centralization, authority, a system of rules, recruitment on the basis of merit, discipline, security of tenure, and impersonal relationship. This form may be functional for certain types of activities and conditions but is heavily criticized for its dysfunctions. Specialization has been shown to create conflict and impede communication. Hierarchy limits participation, stifles initiative, and causes delays. Rules can obstruct fast and efficient operations. Impersonality sometimes translates to insensitivity and may lead to alienation and withdrawal. Despite its manifest dysfunctions, however, bureaucracies may still be relevant for certain operations.

The early classical organization theorists were criticized for neglecting the human dimension, the "coordination of needs among administrative units, internal-external organizational relations, and organizational decision processes" (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 97).

The **organizational** behavior perspective views the organization as the arena in which behavior occurs. Its major assumptions are: (1) that organizations exist to serve human needs; (2) that people need each other; and (3) that when the fit between the individual and the organization is poor, one or both will suffer (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 144). This perspective focuses on people, groups, and relationships among them and the environment. The Hawthorne experiments conducted by Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger form a major component of this approach. It highlights the need for workers to be recognized, to socialize, and to be treated as human beings.

The **"modern" structural organization theory** argues that the "best" or the most appropriate structure for any organization is one that takes into consideration the organization's objectives, the environment in which it exists (e.g. government regulations, suppliers, competitors, etc.), its product or services, and the technology used for its production. The theory further argues that the problems of an organization are a result of its structure and can, thus, be resolved by changing the structure (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 201-202). It assumes that "organizations are rational institutions whose primary purpose is to accomplish established objectives" and that the best way that this can be achieved is through rules and formal authority (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 343).

Systems theory views an organization as a "system" which consists of parts that are united by a system of relationships for the attainment of specific objectives. The parts which are dynamically interconnected and are continuously interacting include the inputs, processes, outputs, the environment in which it operates, and feedback loops. A change in any part or element of the system will affect other parts of the system. While classical organization theory may be said to view organizations as closed systems unaffected by the environment and thus focused on the functions of planning and controlling, systems theory views organizations as open systems which are affected by the environment.

Systems theory had a strong influence on a number of theories that followed. The **information processing view** of organizations is a product of systems theory. It proceeds on three assumptions: (1) that "organizations are open systems that face external environmental uncertainty... and internal work-related task uncertainty" requiring the mechanisms to cope with these uncertainties; (2) "given the various sources of uncertainty, a basic function of the organization's structure is to create the most appropriate configuration of work units (as well as the linkages between these units) to facilitate the effective collection, processing, and distribution of information;" and (3) that the different departments or subunits of the organization are important and coordination among them must be facilitated (Luthans 1995: 479-480). The focus of the information processing view is on information flows to enable the organization to cope with external and internal uncertainties.

Both the systems and information processing theories focus on environmental factors but succeeding theories put even greater emphasis on the environment than these two. The **contingency theory of organizations** is "analogous to the development of contingency management as a whole; they relate the environment to specific organization structures." It is concerned with "how the organization structure adjusts to fit with both the internal environment, such as work and technology, and the external environment, such as economy or legal regulation" (Luthans 1995: 480). It draws heavily upon systems theory which believes that "the effectiveness of an organizational action (for example, a decision) is viewed as dependent upon the relationship between the element in question and all the other aspects of the system—at that particular moment" (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 267). Nothing is absolute or universal; rather everything is situational.

The premise of the contingency theory is that the survival of an organization depends upon its efficient and effective performance, which, in turn, can be achieved if the organization responds and adapts to its environmental demands "appropriately." Matching the structure and other environmental variables is the "appropriate" response. The variables upon which the structure is contingent include the technology, size, environmental uncertainty, industry, strategy, and dependence (Tayeb 1988: 9-11).

Another approach, which some organization theorists like Glenn Carroll think should replace contingency theory, is the **population-ecology approach**. This view focuses on groups or populations of organizations rather than individual ones. It defines organizational effectiveness simply as the ability to survive and believes that, in the short-term, management can have little impact on the organization's survival. Since the environment has limited capacity, organizations will have to compete and either succeed or fail. Management's role is to adapt the organization structure to fit the changing demands of the environment (Luthans 1995: 480-481). The focus is on the reasons for organizational diversity, formation, survival, and death. It seeks to understand how social realities affect "the rates at which organizations and new organizational forms arise, the rate at which organizations change forms, and the rates at which organizations and forms die out" (Hannan and Freeman cited in Ott and Shafritz 1992: 267).

The **multiple constituencies/market perspective** challenges the assumptions of "modern" structural theory that the organization exists in order to pursue established utilitarian objectives. It posits that the organization "is only an extension of and a means for satisfying interests of the individuals and groups that affect and are affected by it" (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 344). The organization does not have goals or objectives but its constituencies, who may come from within or outside the organization, have objectives which they wish to attain through the organization.

The primary unit of analysis of the multiple constituencies/market perspective is the self-interested individual whose interests must be satisfied in order to maintain the nature of the equilibrium. Since constituencies have varied interests, an organization is a place where a "complex equilibrium process" occurs to determine how resources are to be allocated. Organizational goals change as often as participants' negotiations occur. The effectiveness of the organization is likewise based on the changing priorities of the constituencies. The multiple constituencies approach is also referred to as the market perspective, stakeholders approach, social contract theory, and negotiated order theory (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 343-349).

The **power and politics theory** is an application of the multiple constituencies perspective, which identifies power and political activities as the basis for influencing the bargaining and equilibrium process in organizations. Organizations are viewed as complex systems composed of individuals and coalitions with their own preferences and interests and are continuously competing for resources. Besides formal authority, there are other sources of power in organizations and power flows in all directions, not just top down. These include, power over control of resources, access to power centers, a pivotal role in any of the constituency groups, ability or knowledge about organizational procedures and processes, and credibility. Thus, power is relative to other actors in the organization (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 397-400).

The **culture perspective** in organization theory is relatively new which allows us to view organizations as a cultural phenomenon. Culture involves a complex mixture of assumptions, norms, beliefs, behaviors, stories, myths, and other ideas that fit together to define what it means to be a member of a particular society. Organizational culture is not necessarily equivalent to societal culture as the former is influenced by the organizational factors such as the leaders, the technologies, or the clients. The theory assumes that "many organizational behaviors and decisions in organizations are almost predetermined by the patterns of basic assumptions held by members of an organization" (Ott and Shafritz 1992: 482). The organization's view of itself and its environment is shaped by the basic assumptions and beliefs shared by its members, which operate unconsciously. Instead of being controlled by rules, authority, or norms of rational behavior, organization members are controlled by culture. This perspective is often referred to as a counterculture within organization theory because it challenges the assumptions of the structuralists.

The major strength of the culture perspective lies in its recognition of

> (a) the important role which culture plays in shaping work-related values, attitudes, and behaviors of individual members of various societies; (b) the fact that cultural values and attitudes are in different degree from one society to another, and (c) the fact that different cultural groups behave differently under similar circumstances (Tayeb 1988: 40).

Osborne and Gaebler's **reinvention** theory provides an alternative direction for public organizations. They identify ten major principles for infusing the entrepreneurial spirit in the public sector: (1) steering rather than rowing—or focusing more on catalyzing all sectors of society in solving community problems rather than assuming the role of providing service on its own; (2) empowering rather than striving—or pushing controls out of the bureaucracy into the community by empowering citizens; (3) injecting competition into service delivery; (4) transforming rule-driven government to one driven by goals; (5) funding outcomes, not inputs; (6) meeting the needs of the customers, not the bureaucracy; (7) earning rather than spending; (8) preventing problems before they emerge rather than simply offering cures; (9) decentralizing authority, reducing hierarchies, and embracing participatory management; and (10) preferring market mechanisms to bureaucratic mechanisms (Osborne and Gaebler 1993).

Other developments go beyond reinvention of the old science of administration into the reformulation and reconsideration of a new one for the 21st century. This is in the area of what is collectively referred to as the new sciences. **Chaos theory** is one of the new sciences (Overman 1996: 487).

In the 1970s, mathematicians, physicists, biologists, chemists, and other natural scientists, started studying the "irregular side of nature, the discontinuous, erratic side ... seeking connections between different kinds of irregularities." This movement later came to be known as chaos and spawned its own language, created special techniques of using computers to capture structures underlying complexity. It breaks the lines that separate scientific disciplines and because "it is a science of the global nature of systems, it has brought together thinkers from fields that had been widely separated" (Gleick 1987: 3-5).

Advocates of **chaos theory**, including Gregersen and Sailer, claim to have the best understanding of today's organizations. They argue that "prediction and control of systems behavior is unobtainable, even in extremely simple and deterministic structures, let alone in the increasingly complex and changing organizations of modern times" (Luthans 1995: 481). Chaos and complexity are not problems to be solved but are "meaningful aspects of a process which living systems adapt, renew, maintain, and transcend themselves through self-organization" (Overman 1996: 495). Overman (1996: 498) further characterizes a chaotic system as:

> . . . both self-referential and transformational. It adheres to a set of organizing principles to which the change process always reconnects to create an enduring, stable, recognizable, and evolving structure. Yet the structure itself is not deterministic as much as it is accommodating to the environment of which it is also a part.

Relevance of Organization Theories in the Global Context

The existence of all these theories indicate that arriving at a unified theory of organizations is difficult. In the context of globalization, how relevant are these theories in understanding organizational phenomena?

Table 1 identifies major features of organization theories and their relevance to current global challenges. It shows that despite the changes occurring in today's organizations, existing theories continue to manifest features relevant to understanding them better.

Gareth Morgan offers a fresh perspective for viewing theories of organization. He proceeds from the premise that "all theories of organization and management are based on implicit images or metaphors that lead us to see, understand, and manage organization in distinctive yet partial ways" (Morgan 1997: 4). The use of metaphors allows different ways of thinking about the nature of organizations. Since metaphors tend to highlight certain dimensions while forcing others into the background, they also necessarily create distortions. Therefore, Morgan (1997: 4-5) warns that any theory or perspective for studying organization and management, "while capable of creating valuable insights, is also incomplete, biased, and potentially misleading."

Table 1. Organization Theories vis-a-vis Globalization

Theories	*Features Relevant to Global Changes*	*Features Challenged by Global Changes*
Classical Theory	• search for the best way increases organizational competitiveness	• inflexibility of "one best way" of doing things • bureaucratic structure: hierarchy, centralization, system of rules • organizations as closed systems
Behavioral Theory	• organization as context in which behavior occurs	• relationships among people and groups
Modern Structural Theory	• best structure is based on objectives, environmental conditions, products/services, and technology • organizational problems can be solved by changing structures	• rules and formal authority
Systems Theory	• organization consisting of parts existing in an open system • input-output-feedback transformation process	• linking widely dispersed parts
Information Processing View	• creating the best structure to facilitate information gathering and distribution	• direction and flow of information • information overload
Contingency Theory	• adaptation to environment	• dynamic environmental changes
Population-Ecology Theory	• its focus on groups of organizations • focus on organizational diversity	• continuing changes in group composition and structure
Market Perspective	• organizations as locus of fluid interactions among stakeholders	• self-interest as determinant for resource allocation
Power and Politics Theory	• organizations as coalitions competing for organizational resources	
Culture Perspective	• behavior is determined by cultural norms and values	• shared beliefs difficult in global networks and virtual structures
Reinvention	• all principles	
Chaos Theory	• order in complexity	

Morgan explores different metaphors for thinking about the nature of organizations which can complement and build on the strength of one another. These are: (1) the image of the *organization as a machine* made up of interlocking parts that have defined roles in the functioning of the whole; (2) *organizations as organisms*, where the image of having different species found in environments most suitable for them, represents the different organization types and structures; (3) *organization as brains*, which provides a means of understanding modern organizations in terms of the significance of information processing, learning, and intelligence; (4) *organizations as cultures,* focuses on values, beliefs, ideas, rituals, norms, and other patterns of shared meanings in organizations; (5) *organizations as "psychic prisons"* where "people become trapped by their own thoughts, ideas, and beliefs or by the unconscious mind" and could explain the tendency toward control and other favored styles of management; (6) *organization as flux and transformation*, which focuses on four logics of change—a) the logic of self-production, b) the logic in chaos and complexity, c) the logic of circular flows of positive and negative feedback, and d) logic of dialectics; and finally (7) *organizations as instruments* of domination, which views organizations from the perspective of exploited groups (Morgan 1997: 4-5). The images presented by Morgan offer new insights for looking at organizations.

The theories outlined earlier may be viewed as different images and metaphors for looking at organizations.

Challenges to Public Administration

Changes in organizations are widely observed in private corporations and there has been increasing pressure for public agencies to follow in the same direction. The size and scope of operations of government bureaucracies used to be their source of power and strength. Do they still perform this distinctive role or should traditional structures be abandoned in favor of new organizational forms and processes?

In their seminal work, *Reinventing Government*, Osborne and Gaebler provide the answer as they paint the picture of government bureaucracies thus:

> The kind of government that developed during the industrial era, with their sluggish centralized bureaucracies, their preoccupation with rules and regulations, and their hierarchical chains of command, no longer work very well. They accomplished great things in their time, but somewhere along the line they got away from us. They became bloated, wasteful, ineffective. And when the world began to change, they failed to change with it. Hierarchical, centralized bureaucracies designed in the 1930s or 1940s simply do not function well in a rapidly changing, information-rich, knowledge-intensive society and economy of the 1990s. They are like luxury ocean liners in an age of supersonic

> jets: big, cumbersome, expensive, and extremely difficult to turn around (Osborne and Gaebler 1992: 11-12).

The traditional role of the state—regulation of the market, taxation, stabilizing the value of the currency, correcting economic booms and busts, etc.—are slowly being taken over by market forces. Globalization is demanding a shrinking of state involvement in national life. Already globalization is shifting more and more power from governments to global organizations and businesses. In the Philippines, this has resulted in privatization of public enterprises, deregulation of markets, and rapid liberalization of the economy.

The recent attacks on Asian currencies indicate the powerlessness of the state against world markets. Globalization demands a stronger state to help people reap benefits and mitigate its costs. Instead of less government, the appropriate response may be a government that shifts its focus to basic functions and pursues this mandate with zeal, competence, and effectiveness. Among these basic functions are: providing public goods such as law and order, national defense, macroeconomic management, education, health, property rights, and environmental protection (WB 1997: 7). Government should bear the responsibility of ensuring that the benefits of global integration are shared equally, especially by the poor (UNDP 1997: 89).

In performing these basic functions, public organizations must build a capacity for flexibility and adaptation. This necessarily demands effective structures and processes. It requires a professional core of civil servants who are aware of global issues and can adopt global perspectives. Policy decisions have to be enriched with regional and global dimensions. There needs to be greater flexibility in budgeting that focuses more on outcomes rather than inputs. This should be complemented by a retreat from rules and restrictions towards the development of standards for ensuring accountability and responsibility, as well as standards for fair labor, management, and business practices.

Just like business enterprises, public organizations should adopt structures appropriate for their operations. Networks with civil society organizations, already provided for in the Local Government Code of 1991, should be pursued with greater intensity. Networks with business, international, and global organizations can be further expanded. More non-core activities can be contracted out and only a lean but efficient core of civil servants should be maintained. A decent and competitive compensation package will help ensure that the government can attract and keep its competent civil servants. Considerations for family circumstances, such as dual career parents, single mothers, or mothers with children under six years of age, require greater flexibility in work arrangements. There will be the same demand for flexibility in decisionmaking.

The tools and technologies that are available to the private sector are also within the reach of government to utilize. This will allow public organizations to respond more rapidly and accurately to market forces. The same technology can, however, also be a source of frustration for government. Individuals or corporations may no longer seek permits and licenses to operate for they can transact business electronically. Taxation of electronic commerce will be a challenge. Entries of external funds and the rapid pull-out of these will be more difficult to monitor. But it will be in these areas that government's presence will be vital.

As it spins off the functions that are best undertaken by business, government will need to do well in performing its defined role. The contraction of government's role will allow it to infuse more funds on social programs, especially in developing a globally competitive workforce through massive investments in education and training.

With business organizations adapting roles previously played by government, there is growing expectation that they will assume greater social responsibility and accountability. There are, however, difficulties in enforcing responsible behavior from organizations but there is reason to be hopeful. In 1994, business leaders from Japan, Europe, and the United States gathered, worked on the integration of basic Eastern ideals of *kyosel* (living and working for the common good) and human dignity, and came up with the Caux Round Table Principles for Business which calls upon business leaders to assume greater social responsibility. In 1995, Transparency International was founded by 45 major nations to combat large-scale corruption involving corporations and holders of public offices around the world (Parker 1996: 498).

Still, it will be difficult to implement any global code of ethics because activities that cross boundaries may easily slip out of sight and therefore difficult to police. Furthermore, ethical standards vary from culture to culture leading to varying organizational behaviors and attitudes.

Other areas requiring government attention include: the formulation of strategies for the taxation of the global commons; increasing investments in social development to protect marginalized groups from the devastating effects of globalization; and enforcement of laws against international organized crime, pursuing criminals outside its territories.

More challenges await government. Unless it transforms its structure, processes, and behaviors, government will be unable to cope with the onslaught of global economic, political, and social forces.

The impact of globalization cannot be ignored by public agencies. Riggs challenges the "parochialism prevailing in public administration" and observes that:

> ... global forces are penetrating individual agencies in the United States at every level... Several points of interaction are emerging and individual agencies are finding themselves either defending their own interests against global penetration or aggressively engaging themselves in global integration (Khator and Garcia-Zamor 1994: 4).

The field of public administration must, therefore, respond to global challenges. Khator and Garcia-Zamor further define an expanded role for public administration:

> The approach to the study of public administration must not be reductionist. The reductionist tendencies of the past have led to parochialism, ethnocentrism, and isolationism. Public administration in the past has been reduced to the actions related to the executive branch of the government or to the implementation aspect of public policy or to civilians within the public sector or even to development managers .... Public administrators must be sensitive to their vulnerability to global, international forces at the outset, and they must also be aware of their potential influence in the global context. xxx
>
> ... no public policy are and no public agency is free from potential penetration of global forces, whether directly or indirectly [and] international and comparative aspects should become a natural and integral part of mainstream public administration (Khator and Garcia-Zamor 1994: 7-8).

The emergence of a New World Order—characterized by the end of the Cold War, U.S. military might, the globalized economy, cultural penetration, the dominance of the global environment, the centrality of the marketplace, the emergence of the United Nations as a collective legitimizing instrument, and the absence of a single superpower (Khator and Garcia-Zamor 1994: 6)—raises expectations for public administrators to function "in the complex web of global federalism by accepting vertically sensitive, horizontally open, and diagonally responsible relationships" (Khator and Garcia-Zamor 1994: 12).

The emerging New World Order "demands a public administration that is far less parochial and more genuinely globalized or internationalized" (Caiden 1994: 59). As the world "globalizes," the theory and practice of public administration must also globalize.

Conclusion

Whether large or small, business or government, global organizations, face the "same management challenges: creating organization-wide processes and structures in support of their global commitment" (Parker 1996: 490). Globalization is creating opportunities for people and organizations but it is difficult to explain what is happening and which tools and techniques are appropriate in managing a global enterprise. While some say that bureaucracy has lost relevance in a global world, others believe that it "has as much currency today as ever" (Parker 1996: 485-486). Global organizations appear to have developed beyond the capacity of a single discipline to explain it. The need is for multidisciplinary research and theory building to address the diversity and scope of global practices. "Both the theory and practice of organizations have changed substantially in recent years. In both cases, the changes have led to increasing diversity and fluidity, and decreasing certainty and structure" (Clegg and Hardy 1996: 11).

Organizations are too busy coping with change that there has been little time to explain what is happening. Changes resulting from global forces pose a different set of research questions for organization studies.

Reflecting on the 40 years of organization studies, Lyman Porter, identified a gap and noted that "an area of organizational studies that cannot point to a high level of accomplishment is the global dimension" and that "the time has more than come for the field to become much more globally focused" (Porter 1996: 266).

A review made by Adler in 1983 shows that throughout the 1970s, less than five percent of articles appearing in top management journals looked at organizational behavior issues from a cross-cultural perspective. Adler and Bartholomew looked at 73 academic and professional management journals from 1985 to 1990 and found out that publications on international human behavior and human resource management had not increased in two decades (Parker 1996: 487, 501).

Theories of motivation and the research samples from which they have been derived were developed mostly in the U.S. The same is true for leadership studies. But since there are many ways in which culture per se varies, there are also many ways in which behavior varies across cultures. Leadership processes and styles, for instance, may be similar across cultures, but the manner in which these approaches are used and successfully applied may vary from culture to culture. There is, therefore, an increasing need for multicultural research.

In societies like the Philippines where face-to-face interaction is a relational necessity, the new organizational structures pose additional challenges for research. How do you motivate a workforce in virtual organizations when you hardly see them? How do you ensure accountability and responsibility?

To what extent does the extensive use of technology destabilize relationships among workers, not to mention the hazards to health? As transactions move toward the impersonal (electronic and officeless), how can teamwork be created?

Globalization also calls for radical changes in the performance of the functions of management. Planning will depend largely on global information and on seeing the future in a different way, and less on historical analysis. What mechanisms of coordination and integration will be most effective? Will supervision be necessary?

Global organizations will face profound challenges for human resource management and development. Greater focus will be on developing employees with cross-border capabilities, those who cope with a diverse workforce. Which concepts of right and wrong will prevail in a global organization? With greater access to global information on how cellular and network organizations treat their workers in terms of pay, rewards, benefits, and training, what are the implications on management policies on the same? How will organizations cope with declining commitment and loyalty resulting from modular employee relationships?

Organizations—big or small, private, nonprofit, or government—will have to transform themselves into learning organizations,

> where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together (Senge 1995: 3).

References

Alburo, Florian A.
1997 Effects of Globalization on Growth and Equity in the Philippines: An Overview. Unpublished PA 291 reading material.

Allred, Brent B., Charles C. Snow, and Raymond E. Miles
1996 Characteristics of Managerial Careers in the 21st Century. *Academy of Management Executive.* 10 (4): 17-27.

Briones, Leonor M.
1997 Globalization, Nationalism and Public Administration: Challenge and Response. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration.* 41 (1-4) (January-October): 1-32.

Burrell, Gibson and Gareth Morgan
1979 *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis.* Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Caiden, Gerald
1994 Globalizing the Theory and Practice of Public Administration. In Renu Khator and Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor, eds. *Public Administration in the Global Village.* Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger. 45-59.

Clegg, Stewart R. and John T. Gray
1996 Metaphors of Globalization. In David M. Boje, Robert P. Gephart, Jr. and Tojo Joseph Thatchenkery, eds. *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. 293-307.

Clegg, Stewart and Cynthia Hardy
1996 Introduction: Organizations, Organization and Organizing. In Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, and Walter R. Nord, eds. *Handbook of Organization Studies.* London: Sage. 1-28.

Dessler, Gary
1994 *Human Resource Management.* Sixth Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Drucker, Peter
1992 The New Society of Organizations. *Harvard Business Review.* (September-October): 95-104.

1992 *Post-Capitalist Society.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Fry, Brian R.
1989 *Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo.* Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.

Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich, and James H. Donnelly, Jr.
1994 *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes.* Eighth Edition. Illinois: Irwin, Inc.

Gleick, James
1987 *Chaos: Making A New Science.* New York: Viking, Penguin, Inc.

Goffee, Rob and Gareth Jones
1996 What Holds the Modern Company Together. *Harvard Business Review.* (November-December): 133-148

Gomez-Mejia, Luis R., David B. Balkin, and Robert L. Cardy
1995 *Human Resource Management.* Sixth Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Griffin, Ricky W.
1987 *Management.* Second Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Handy, Charles
1995 Trust and the Virtual Organization. *Harvard Business Review.* (May-June): 40-50.

1989 *The Age of Unreason.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hatch, Mary Jo
1997 *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hirschhorn, Larry and Thomas Gilmore
1992 The New Boundaries of the "Boundaryless" Company. *Harvard Business Review.* (May-June): 104-115.

Khator, Renu and Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor
1994 *Public Administration in the Global Village.* Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Kiel, Douglas L.
1994 *Managing Chaos and Complexity in Government: A New Paradigm for Managing Change, Innovation, and Organizational Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Luthans, Fred
1995 *Organizational Behavior.* Seventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Morgan, Gareth
1997 *Images of Organization.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Naisbitt, John
1994 *Global Paradox.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Ohmae, Kenichi
1995 *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies.* New York: The Free Press.

1989 Managing in a Borderless World. *Harvard Business Review.* (May, June): 152-161.

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler
1993 *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* New York: Plume and the Penguin Group.

Ott, J. Steven and Jay M. Shafritz
1992 *Classics of Organization Theory.* Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Overman, E. Sam
1996 The Sciences of Administration: Chaos and Quantum Theory. *Public Administration Review.* 56 (5) (September-October).

Parker, Barbara
1996 Evolution and Revolution: from International Business to Globalization. In Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, and Walter R. Nord, eds. *Handbook of Organization Studies.* London: Sage. 484-506.

Peters, Tom
1994 *The Tom Peters Seminar: Crazy Times Call for Crazy Organizations.* New York: Pan Books.

Porter, Lyman W.
1996 Forty Years of Organization Studies: Reflections from a Micro Perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 41: 262-269

Pugh, D. S., D. J. Hickson, and C. R. Hinings
1973 *Writers on Organizations.* Second Edition. Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

Reed, Michael
1996 Organizational Theorizing: A Historically Contested Terrain. In Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, and Walter R. Nord, eds. *Handbook of Organization Studies.* London: Sage. 31-56.

Riggs, Fred W.
1994 Global Forces and the Discipline of Public Administration. In Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor and Renu Khator, eds. *Public Administration in the Global Village.* Westport, Connecticut: Praeger. 17-44.

Robbins, Stephen P.
1993 *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schein, Edgar
1992 *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* California: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Senge, Peter
1995 *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Stoner, James A. F., R. Edward Freeman, and Daniel R. Gilbert, Jr.
1995 *Management.* Sixth Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.

Tayeb, Monvi H.
1988 *Organizations and National Culture: A Comparative Analysis.* London: Sage Publications.

Toffler, Alvin
1991 *Powershift.* New York: Bantam Books.

1979 *Future Shock.* New York: Bantam Books, Inc. by arrangement with Random House, Inc.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
1997 *Human Development Report.* UNDP, New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Winslow, Charles D. and William L. Bramer
1994 *Future Work: Putting Knowledge to Work in the Knowledge Economy.* New York: The Free Press.

World Bank (WB)
1997 *World Development Report.* The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank. Washington D.C.: Oxford University Press, Inc.