Co-production between ministry and citizens

New challenges for program management

Jean-Marie Buijs, Jurian Edelenbos

Paper for the 45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association
"Special Session on Co production in Spatial Area Development"
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam 23-27 August 2005

Key words: co-production, program management, barriers for change, public managers

Drs. Jean-Marie Buijs
Erasmus University Rotterdam
Centre for Public Management
Room M8-05
P.O. Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
Email: Buijs@fsw.eur.nl

Dr. Jurian Edelenbos
Erasmus University Rotterdam
Centre for Public Management
Room M8-06
P.O. Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
Email: Edelenbos@fsw.eur.nl

Abstract

In this paper we will elaborate on the first round of our study for the Policy with Citizens program management. It contains an exploration of barriers at different levels that the program management has to deal with. Co-production with citizens demands a changing role for involved public managers. We assume policy makers at central level will have to overcome barriers at personal, program and organizational level in order to let their organization become extern oriented to a greater extent. Besides first empirical results we want to give insight in this role for public managers by contributions from literature on c-production, program management and public managers.

1. Introduction

Interaction between government and citizens can be seen at all government levels: local, regional and central. In this paper we discuss a co-production experiment that deals with direct interaction between a department and citizens: the program Policy with Citizens of the ministry of VROM. This paper has the aim to explore these barriers as well as theoretical as empirical by describing the program and showing the first results of our study of the Policy with Citizens program. These first results are the outcome of a broad exploration of barriers the program management and / or the organization has to deal with. It is part of a larger enquiry, which exists of three integrate rounds. In relation to the Policy with Citizens program the focus is on the following interrelated questions: *What are the barriers VROM-employees have to deal with before they will turn over towards citizen-orientation?*; *What are possibilities for overcoming these barriers?*; And furthermore, *How can organizational changes be accomplished?*.

At the moment of writing this paper we have ended the first explorative phase and we are in the middle of the second phase, a more in depth study of the barriers we have found in the first round. The last phase we will go deeper into organizational learning. The whole project has been set up from an action research perspective, in line with Argyris (1995), Buijs (2003, 2004), Levin (2004) and Phelps and Hase (2002). In this approach empirical study and scientific research are interwoven.

In the explorative phase we have started with a short literature study in the field of organizational/system learning, development and change with a focus on barriers, impediments and bottlenecks. Besides of this literature study we have done a document analysis. The program management had an open mind to provide written information to us, which resulted in a large amount of memoranda, evaluations, and other kind of reports. Some of these were useful to our study, but certainly not all of them. The focus of this analysis has been to find out what are the barriers the program management has to deal with on individual, program and organizational level. This grouping is inspired on the defensive routines as divided by Argyris (1993) and applied to the context of the program. The analysis has been supplemented by an observation of the program team

during a course day[1] and an observation of a meeting with citizens, part of the project 'Met het oog op morgen' (With a view to tomorrow). This document analysis and these observations have not only resulted in an overview of the barriers in the co-production between citizens and ministry, but have also gained us insight into the program (management), her tasks and her performance. By means of documents and interviews we have also explored earlier programs of the ministry of VROM with a focus on external orientation. At last we have organized a group session with the program team. This has given us the opportunity for a better understanding of the barriers the program team has experienced. Interaction and reaction between the members of the team is seen an asset in this process.

The rounds after the exploration will consist of a more in depth study. First we will go deeper into the barriers we had come across during the exploration. This will be mainly conducted by in depth interviews with VROM-employees and reflexive project-observations. The third round of the enquiry will continue in the direction of organizational learning. An interactive learning process will be initiated by organizing group-sessions, which will be combined with a more extensive search in literature for strategies of change and learning. Later on in this paper we will elaborate on the results of the first round. In this paper we want to give insight in the role of the public manager at central level in a co-production process with citizens and the dilemma's they meet. We will discuss the institutional barriers they have to overcome and what competences they need in order to act successfully in co-production processes. We will use contributions from theories of co-production, program management and public managers.

2. Co-production with citizens

In Public Administration literature co-production between government and other actors are divided in three core sections. Co-production can be seen in the relation between government and citizens, government and private organizations and also between governmental organizations among each other (Teisman et al., 2004). In this paper the focus is at the relation between government and governed (citizens). In literature these

[1] The program team has followed the course 'Burgergeoriënteerd werken'. This course is in a certain way part of the program. It is a new initiative for training managers for upcoming citizen-oriented projects.

co-production processes are often called Interactive governance, which can be defined as: *"A way of conducting policies whereby a government involves its citizens, social organizations, enterprises, and other stakeholders in the early stages of public policy making."* (Edelenbos, 2005, 111)

These co-production processes fit in a trend of government shifting to governance. This indicates a move from hierarchical and well-institutionalized forms of government toward less formalized, bottom-up forms of governance in which state authority makes way for an appreciation of mutual interdependence with different stakeholders (Edelenbos, 2005). This is also related to fragmented network society where complex mutual dependencies exist between government and other actors interested in policy matters (Castells, 1996).

Due to the involvement of private companies and / or citizens, strengthening of demand driven policymaking is one of the most important features of co-production. (Teisman et al., 2004). Teisman et al. (2004) have written that governmental organizations are often not able to deal with interactive policy processes. Among other things this is due to their locked culture with an emphasis on an internal fight for positions and a lack of sufficient resources. Most citizens have not enough knowledge of governmental structures and they don not take this into account while expressing their perceptions of problems and possible solutions. Interactive policymaking demands an open process culture, which is difficult to combine with the closed organizational culture. Furthermore, interactive processes could also have an institutional impact (Teisman et al., 2004; Edelenbos, 2005). In addition, Edelenbos (2005) makes a distinction between institutions on procedural and role level, although they closely interact. However, in governmental organizations (studied at local level) there is poor institutional embeddedness of interactive processes. Edelenbos (2005) has showed that governmental organizations at local level offer resistance and show institutional rigidity. He has explained that in spite of their directing role, administrators stayed at distance behind their acquainted institutions. According to civil servants the interactive process mainly was a political whim. They developed an attitude of toleration and wherever possible they have tried to bend it in the direction of standard procedures. At procedural level, according to Edelenbos (2005) a distinction can be made between existing procedures and new procedures for the interactive process.

These differ greatly and are isolated from each other. In his study Edelenbos (2005) has shown that towards the end of the process the existing procedures have a decisive influence on the outcome of the interactive process.

Teisman et al. (2004) acknowledge the importance of vigilance for the process of co-production, because traditional governmental processes will not suffice anymore. Other actors have their own perception of how to organize these processes. In De Bruijn, Ten Heuvelhoff and In ‘t Veld (2002) a more extensive outline about the management and design of processes can be found; besides De Bruijn, Teisman, Edelenbos, Veeneman (2004) is a more in depth study of the management of polyphonic processes. Among other features Teisman et al. (2004) distinguishes sufficient freedom for whimsicality and unpredictability as essential for co-production processes. Conversely common administrative and managerial behavior is directed at creating order and predictability. Also the multilayered character of co-production should be acknowledged. As Teisman et al. (2004) have noticed, co-production is usually established by a central group. However, the actors of this group experience difficulties with the (actors of) other levels in their own organization, which persists with their procedures and routines. Furthermore co-production demands direct interaction between the involved stakeholders and in all cases public-public cooperation (Teisman et al. 2004). According to Teisman et al. (2004) co-production can be seen as dilemma–management.

From the above considered features at least two different purposes for co-production processes can be derived. We can distinguish between citizen participation as a goal and citizen participation instrument for organizational change. However, these goals seem to be entwined and interconnected. Furthermore, also a tension can be seen between these purposes. Citizen participation as a goal can be developed at project level, but the aim of a more open organization is less concrete and probable more difficult to accomplish. This last goal requires a more process-oriented approach instead of a project approach. It is a task of the program management to develop and maintain a connection between these short-term project results and the long-term process of organizational change.

From a lot of different perspectives has been written about processes of organizational change and possible barriers and explanations for failures. Boonstra (2004) for instance has distinguished a strategic management, a structural, a power and political, a cultural

and a psychological perspective. “These perspectives seek obstacles for change in the existing organizations and the behavior of people in this organization.”

Argyris has written about organizational defensive routines, which he defines as: *any policy or action that inhibits individuals, groups, intergroups, and organizations from experiencing embarrassment or threat and, at the same time, prevents the actors from identifying and reducing the causes of the embarrassment or threat. Organizational defensive routines are anti-learning and overprotective*.” (Argyris, 1993, 15)

According to Argyris for the creation of change it is necessary to alterate interconnected individual routines and protective organizational norms. This perspective on organizational change seems to correspond with those described by Flood (1999) and Stacey (2003) who emphasize the importance to study ‘the whole’ and to be aware of the non-linearity of complex systems and processes.

Bennebroek Gravenhorst and In ‘t Veld (2004) have given four possible obstructions in the process of organizational change. The first reason they give is that people tend focus on single issues in their attempts to understand or realize change. Another reason, according to them is the domination of the perspective of the higher-level managers on the process of change. This gives a rather one-sided perspective on the necessity for change and of the process of change. The third obstruction they have mentioned is that in the process of change too much focus is on content and too little on process. At last, they have noticed that in organizational change in general a top-down approach is applied, which lots of barriers as a consequence.

Based on Flood (Problem Solving Problem, 1995) Cao et al. (2003) have made a distinction in to four categories of organizational change, namely changes in organizational process; organizational functions, coordination and control; organizational culture; and changes in power distribution and the way organizational issues are influenced. However, these types of organizational change are interconnected and interacting: “*Organizational change can be seen as a dynamic process.”* (Cao et al., 2003, 105)

Interaction with citizens can be seen at all governmental levels, but is mainly applied at the local level and is also known as participatory or interactive policy making (Edelenbos, 2000; Edelenbos & Monnikhof, 2001). The central government organizations

seem to be aware of the importance of co-production for other actors, however, they do not realize the necessity to adapt their own way of acting and procedures (Teisman et al., 2004). Central government organizations tend to demand other governmental levels to change, while at the same time they assume that they self can focus on. They tend to adhere to their own organisational habits, and in fact this is one of problems that need to be addressed by co-production.

However, nowadays at central level signals can be seen of an increasing awareness of adapting the ways of working and procedures. In the current government's coalition agreement relatively much attention is given to increasing the influence of citizens (Coalition agreement Cabinet Balkenende II, 2003), although it is striking that in the way it is put forward this seems to be attached with a strengthening of representative democracy:

"The effective form of governance we envisage needs to feature less bureaucracy and regulatory control and more concrete policy objectives; there must be vigorous action to tackle persistent problems and a restored sense of social responsibility throughout the community. Action must be taken to create a closer relationship between voters and elected representatives by strengthening the representative nature of democracy, increasing the direct influence of the public and reforming the system of government."

(CDA, VVD, D'66, mei 2003)

In practice attempts to citizen participation and co-producing with citizens at central governmental level can be seen in the programs Modernising Government (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations) and Policy with Citizens (Ministry of VROM).

This last program is the case that will be discussed in this paper. As noted co-production at central government level is not very common, which highlights the effort of the Mininstry of VROM to commit to co-production with citizens and furthermore to connect this to a combined change of the ministerial organization and her employees towards an citizen-oriented attitude. However, this process has appeared to be not that easy; all kinds of barriers have arisen.

From the above literature we can conclude co-production is not only about a relation between two or more actors, co-production has also an impact on the systems involved in this co-production process. Managers of co-production processes have to deal with

barriers at individual, process or program, and institutional level. In this paper the focus is at the meaning of the co-production for public managers and their organization(s). The paper is based on an empirical study at the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Development and Environment (VROM). First we will give a brief introduction to the Policy with Citizens program at this ministry.

3. Policy with Citizens at VROM

Due to a political motion by the MPs Feenstra, Klein Molenkamp, and Augusteijn-Esser[2] in the 2002 budget proposed in the Dutch House of Commons the Ministry of VROM had been requested to let the Dutch environmental policy to a greater extent become *of*, *for* and *by* citizens. This motion had the aim to involve citizens more in a co-producing role in making environmental policy (Edelenbos, van Buuren, 2005). This fits with the earlier described trends of interactive governance, from government to governance and network society. The then minister of VROM adopted the motion and in the budget a line was added for a multi-annual program aimed at stimulating the involvement of citizens in environmental policy making (Edelenbos & van Buuren, 2005).

This stimulation program Citizen and Environment has (at least) two main objectives, on the one hand to intensify citizen-orientation in her environmental and sustainability policy. This objective is focused on the routines and ways of working of the policy makers. And on the other hand to involve citizens in the policy-making process, co-production between ministry and citizens (VROM, 2002; Edelenbos & van Buuren, 2005). A combined program team was created to execute the program, existing of four VROM-employees of the Department of Environment and three specialists in citizen involvement from the Institute for Public and Politics. Four different project-lines were established within the program, these were in the context of: *policy innovations of the National Environmental Policy Plan 4*; *the four (interdepartmental) transitions towards sustainability*; *National Strategy for Sustainable Development*; and *to subsidize projects of societal organizations and institutions in the context of the Citizen and Environment Policy of the Subsidy Regulation for Societal Organizations and Environment*.

[2] House of Commons, 2001-2002. Motion Feenstra, Klein Molenkamp and Augusteijn-Esser. 28 000 XI:21

Researchers from the Pytheas Network conducted an ex-durante evaluation of the program in 2003, for which they explored a learning evaluation approach. They concluded that the program should focus more on the agenda of citizens and that the role of citizens in the projects should shift from advisory to co-producing (Edelenbos et al., 2003; Edelenbos & van Buuren, 2005). Besides this intensifying of the program, another advice was to broaden the program within the VROM-organization. Due to incentives like these the stimulation program Citizen and Environment changed into the Policy with Citizens program, in which also the Housing and the Spatial Planning Department of the ministry became involved[3]. In the strategy of today's government[4] improving participation by citizens is one of the core themes in modernizing government[5].

Besides a change of name, the adaptation of the program has become visible by the appointment of a renewed program team. This team consists of employees from the three involved VROM-departments. Projects that are part of the program have been conducted in all three departments at present. For intensification of the program, besides a quantity of smaller and limited projects, more attention has been paid to two extensive projects: 'Citizen's platforms' (see also Boogers et al., 2005) and 'Agenda of the general public'. Compared to the former projects in these projects the emphasis in the role of citizens has shifted from consultation and informing rather towards participation and co-production.

In this process of broadening and intensifying the program, the renewed program's management team has to deal with several barriers on individual, program and organizational level. Later on in this paper we will elaborate on the results of the first round of our study for the Policy with Citizens program management. It contains an exploration of barriers at different levels that the program management has to deal with.

4. Co-production with citizens; a case of program management

The co-production process between citizens and the ministry of VROM has been cast in a program approach. A first search in Public Administration literature shows a limited amount of publications about the management of programs and the role for public

[3] The 4th department of VROM, Rijksgebouwendienst has been left out of the program.
[4] 'Meedoen, meer werk, minder regels', Hoofdlijnenakkoord voor het Kabinet CDA, VVD, D66; mei 2003
[5] www.andereoverheid.nl / www.modernisinggovernment.nl

managers in these temporality constructions. However, in today's government 'program' and 'program management' seem to be very common terms.

For a broader understanding of governmental programs and their difficulties we fall back on Pressman and Wildavsky (1973, 1974, 1984). They distinguish the following features:

"A program consist of governmental action initiated in order to secure objectives whose attainment is problematica…Considered as a whole, a program can be conceived of as a system in which each element is dependent on the other…Program implementation thus becomes a seamless web." (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1974, xiv-xv)

According to them if in a governmental program *intense conflicts of interest, disagreement of people who have to cooperate, necessary resources are far beyond those available* and *a high level of uncertainty about even the possibility of success* could be expected, people should not be surprised of program failure. However:

"Few programs could be undertaken if all participants had to be specified in advance, all future differences resolved at the outset, and future bargains made under yesterday's conditions. Something has to be left to the unfolding events. Then as latent conflicts become manifest, the original agreements have to be renegotiated and a new and possibly more antagonistic situation emerges."

(Pressman & Wildavsky, 1974, 91-92)

According to Partington (2005) project management is used for the planning and implementation of different kind of internal and external change initiatives, particularly in large organizations. He has explained that parallel with rise of project management, the concept of program management has emerged. Lycett et al. (2004) adds to this perspective that program management emerged over time due to a lack of coordination, lack of overall control, and confusion over responsibility in the management of multiple projects.

Programs are useful to set the context for projects by grouping them, directing them and initiating them. Besides of that Pellegrinelli (2002) acknowledges that programs are able to provide a bridge between projects and the strategic goals of an organisation. Lycett et al. (2004) refutes that program management is far more than just the management of large and / or multiple projects. However, this assumption has been made often and

besides the same people assume a one size fits all approach to program management is appropriate. These assumptions have led to the emergence of a standard approach to program management with a focus on structure and control; a hierarchy of roles; a linear lifecycle; and a set of defined activities. In his criticism of this approach, Lycett (2004) argues that this 'rational' basis of program management represents only part of the equation. According to him this approach certainly needs to be supplemented with competences related to the understanding and management of relationships between program- and project management, individual project managers within a program, and individual projects and the goals and drivers of the wider organisation. Out of Lycett's (et al) work (2004, 296) can be concluded that program management should be perceived as '*contextual*', '*variable and concurrent in practice'*, and '*evolutionary in sophistication'*. Also Partington et al. (2005) indicate that competences for program management are not just an extension of those needed for project management. As a result of an extensive study of fifteen strategic programs they have developed a model of program management competence. They have found seventeen attributes which can be grouped in *relationship between self and work*, *relationship between self and others*, *relationship between self and program environment*. Each attribute can occur at four different levels of concern: *Delivery of program scope*, *Wider organizational impact of program*, *Achievement of high-level program outcomes*, and *Development of strategic capabilities*.

Teisman (2005) sees program management as a phenomenon that fits with an approach with a plurality of goals, horizontal relations and with a need to consider and manage projects in mutual coherence. Project management is seen as a mechanic approach, focused at reducing complexity. Program managers consider the projects on coherence and synergy, according to Teisman (2005) these managers seem to proceed on the edge of project- and complexity management.

According to McGuire (2002) also a distinction between programs can be made. He has distinguished programs with clear objectives and established performance indicators from those programs that consists of rather abstract terms and which must be established jointly in a network. This last approach seems to fit with the management of polyphonic processes in spatial development, as described by De Bruijn et al. (2004):

"The management of spatial development is a high demanding task, in which a large variety of competences and knowledge is needed. Frequently different managers fulfill part of the process management and are changed in between. Results come in fits and starts and none of involved parties is able to have an overall view of the whole set of processes that take place surrounding spatial investments."

(De Bruijn et al., 2004, 411; translation J-M Buijs, 2005)

They have concluded that combinations of project- and process management seem to be needed for the performance of these complex processes. Project management is needed for its focus on realization and process management is necessary for enrichment. Combinations of project and process management appear to fit in the concept of program management as previously described. Program management can be used to provide a bridge between projects and for instance processes of organizational change.

5. Results of the exploration within the Policy with Citizens program: barriers at different levels

So far, literature about co-production and program management has shown us that ministerial programs focused at co-production with citizens is certainly not that easy. Processes of co-production have appeared to rather complex and employees (civil servants and administrators/managers) and governmental organizations often show institutional rigidity. Literature on program management has demonstrated that as a concept it can provide a bridge between projects and complex processes, but also, or maybe we should say even more, it is accompanied by certain tensions.

In this paragraph we will elaborate on the results of our exploration of barriers the program Policy with Citizens has to deal with. As explicated in the introduction we have grouped these barriers into three levels: individual, program and organizational level. We are aware of that these levels have vague boundaries and are probably to a large extent interrelated. However, we may say that the program management has to deal with these barriers somehow.

Individual

A citizen-oriented approach has brought about a defensive attitude among some civil servants. A few of the employees at VROM are immediately enthusiast, however, several don't want to shift their way of working. Common reactions among those people are "We already do this", "This is not possible", "It is not our responsibility" and "It's just a political wave that will blow over". They suffer from incompetence to think past the present policy. Change is seen as something that rejects their traditional approach: "Have I always been wrong?". What is unknown is often disliked; citizen orientation is new and brings uncertainty in their work. To avoid uncertainty, most of the people rather maintain their usual and acquainted way of working. For most civil servants citizen orientation is new and they suffer from a lack of competences.

Besides of this, two people involved in former attempts to increase VROM's extern orientation have pointed out that the character of people would block this process of change. These people look up to citizen orientation as a difficult and complex process. Furthermore they would be lazy, passive and don't have the ability to think flexibly.

Several resources have indicated that actually participating in a project with citizens can be a factor in a change of their attitude. For adopting an extern-oriented approach it could also be an important factor if process conditions were part of the assessment of civil servants. Nowadays they are only evaluated on the products they have delivered and not on the development processes of these products. This development process is certainly of concern for the effectiveness of the policy. Because these civil servants are not evaluated on working extern oriented, they consider as something that takes extra time.

Person X has said the office workers at VROM are mainly trained on a project approach and they suffer from a lack of competences for process management.

Program

On this level a distinction can be made between those barriers that affect mainly the projects as part of the program and barriers in relation to the program as a long-term process of change. In the projects it is important to consider if the policy subject is appropriate for citizen participation: citizens have to feel committed to this subject and it needs to be rather concrete. Besides of this, enough possibilities for openness and

flexibility in the policy process are necessary. Another possible barrier has to do with expectation management. Upfront the civil servants should inform the citizens about the weight and value of their participation, otherwise they could become disappointed and frustrate the further process.

The civil servants involved in the program team could become narrow sighted during the course of time. Through their experience with citizen orientation related projects, they are not always able to see the difficulties for their inexperienced and unskilled colleagues at the ministry. Another barrier the program team has to face has to do with time. The program management does not take time for consolidation of the results, their focus is at the moment mainly on low fruit picking. Of course this is important, but not at the cost of awareness for a more long-term change towards external orientation. The narrowness of the programs' focus also entails a pitfall. From democratization perspective citizen involvement can be seen as an enriching instrument. On the other hand by involving only citizens in their role as citizen, the ministry leaves out several stakeholders (e.g. companies, NGO's, but also municipalities and provinces) to which policy of VROM is at least as important. This could lead to resistance in the policy process among these stakeholders, but also amid civil servants that have to deal with these other actors in their normal work. This latter group seems to have legitimate arguments for not turning over to citizen orientation.

Organization

As we mentioned before, the organization does not evaluate their employees on the development of their products. The organizational system is focused at short-term individual scoring. Several resources have pointed out the organization gives almost no positive incentives for citizen orientation and other process oriented objectives. Due to these features there is in particular attention for the short-term and the long-term is most of time out of the picture. Citizen orientation is seen as extra work by some of the civil servants. This does not seem odd, according to that the organization does not will or can release time for working extern oriented. At this time, as said by the program team, the political wind is well disposed. Before the Policy with Citizens program a lack of support from the politics and the ministries top management had been an important factor for the

(premature) end of two other extern-oriented programs at VROM. However, the question remains how substantial the political and top management support for extern-oriented processes really is? Individual contributions to this process are not rewarded and it seems difficult to obtain time for citizen oriented projects.

An exploration of these earlier programs also has shown VROM as an organization has no memory. The organization learns slightly and after a few years the wheel is invented again. Besides the program managers need to be aware of the cultural diversity in the ministry. The program has started in the Environment policy directorate of the Ministry. Compared to other directorates in the ministry, this group is known as rather progressive and persevering. Special attention for this cultural diversity is needed, now that the program has broadened from DGM to the whole organization. Cultural diversity is not only an issue between the directorates, but also to the different disciplines in the Ministry. Fine-tuning will be needed to avoid tensions between the policy, financial and the juridical departments.

Challenges

After finding out this large amount of barriers failure of the program could be easily accepted in advance. Although, as Pressman and Wildavsky have said before, in program management should something be left open for unfolding events. Literature on program management shows promising new challenges for processes of organizational change like Policy with Citizens. In the following paragraph we will relate the earlier describe literature on co-production and program management with insights from theory on public managers. We assume this may contribute to the creation of new ideas and challenges for program management in the field of public management.

6. Public managers at the edge of order and chaos: ideas for program management

"Where managers once operated with a Tayloresque, mechanistic model of their world, which was predicted on linear thinking control, and predictability, they now find themselves struggling with something more nonlinear, where limited control and a restricted ability to predict outcomes are the order of the day"

(Regine & Lewin, 2000, 6)

This tension between the two management concepts as described by Regine & Lewin also seem to be the case in the management of particular programs. As has been found in literature on program management, a distinction can be made between programs managed as projects and programs managed as program with besides attention for projects also alertness for processes. Teisman (2005) has developed and deepened out a comparable contrast between two perspectives of public management. As said before he sees program management as a phenomenon that seems to proceed on the edge of project and complexity management. Project management is seen as part of the order-creating perspective of management. From this perspective public managers are primary managers of line and projects, who create order through separating, bounding and structuring. Complexity management, a complex acknowledging perspective on management, is focused at the development and functioning of chains, networks and processes. These two perspective are coopetive related to each other, incompatible and complementary at the same time (Teisman, 2005).

According to Teisman (2005) failures (dissatisfied results) arise from invalid connections, he quotes Braganza & Myers with their explanation for the failing of innovations: "*the underlying cause is that managers have given insufficient thought to creating patterns of connectivity*" (Braganza & Myers, 1997, 196; quoted in Teisman, 2005, 134)

This coopetive relation seems to be in line with results of research about managerial behaviour. We will outline some relevant aspects of this approach below.

Since the fifties of the previous century there has regularly been done empirical research about the work of (public) managers. Well-known examples are Executive Behavior by Sune Carlson (1951, reprinted 1991), The nature of managerial behaviour (Mintzberg, 1973), the work of Rosemary Stewart and more recent Attention! (Work and Behavior of Public Managers amidst Ambiguity, 2000) by Mirko Noordegraaf.

Before this managerial behaviour approach we have seen The Great Man School, which assumes that a manager's qualities are mostly determined by innate characteristics. This school is followed by The Science of Administration approach with e.g. Gulick's POSDCORB. This was mainly aimed at the functions managers should have. Managers

were seen as rational decision makers. In 1973 Mintzberg refutes the myths that managers would be systematic planners; a successful managers doesn't have regular tasks; a manager needs a complete picture by a formal management information system; and management would be, or is becoming, an profession. Mintzberg (1975, 1991) has also given his thoughts about why we haven't succeeded in getting grasp on the work of managers. One of the reasons for that is a *Failure of description*: *"In our by management obsessed society there seems to be anxiety for getting grip on what managers really do. Not only people below, but also manager themselves have a need for erasing the mythology: "Managers who thought they had to plan, organize, coordinate, and control, could now, by realizing that it is natural to work in 'calculated chaos', turn around and swim downstream – go naturally with the job by bringing conception in line with perception."* Mintzberg acknowledges the complexity and variety of managerial work, but this should not discourage us for developing feasible theories. Another reason for not getting grasp on the work of manager he has given is a *Paradox of control:* Carlson has shown in Executive Behavior (1951, 1991) that organisations appoint managers for bringing order, but that the work of managers themselves is disorderly (Mintzberg, 1975 1991). According to Mintzberg organisations need alternately order and disorder, besides he characterizes managers as systems of 'ambiguity in, order out' which do processes of calculated chaos realize. Due to the multilevel character of most organizations, this is more complex in practice. Furthermore Mintzberg describes a *Crisis of superficiality: "More and more managers in the top are not able to understand their organisation, which could be caused by the unmanageability of the organisations or incompetence of the managers themselves. Faced with this inability to understand, the calculated chaos of the manager's job becomes its undoing, driving behaviour to become more and more superficial. A already noted they tried to hide in POSDCORB."* A last reason Mintzberg has given is a *Fallacy of (de facto) professionalism:* Mintzberg points out he has revealed the idea that management is becoming an profession, although the field of management is still dominated by de facto professionalism.

In a reflection on his own work Mintzberg (1990, 170) describes that his publications about managerial work and behaviour in the seventies shows us another face of management then the traditional one. The traditional approach is the long-dominant

professional or cerebral face and stresses calculation. It figures the world as the components of a portfolio. This cerebral face operates with the words and numbers of rationality.

The other approach is described by Mintzberg as the insightful face of management, which stresses commitment as sees the world with integrative perspective. This face is rooted in the images and feel of a manager's integrity. In practice, management has to be two-faced –there has to be a balance between these perspectives.

Balance between these two management perspectives seems to go along with the concept of program management as discussed before.

Noordegraaf (2000) acknowledges the tension between these two perspectives. To the statement that individual rationality is less important in the managerial behaviour approach he adds the relevance of the embedding of managerial behaviour within social settings that provide stability and meaning. Because of that he points out the importance of institutions in relation to managerial behaviour. He has assumed that:

"Public managers are 'competent' when they know how to play the 'game' of public management and how to apply the 'rules of the game' This enables them to change the game" (Noordegraaf, 2003, 320)

This explicates the importance of the relationship between public managers and institutions. Earlier Edelenbos has showed a institutional distinction can be made between role and procedural level, but on both levels public managers and their organizations show institutional rigidity. Teisman (2005) shows what really appears to be important in governmental organizations line management: in line management of administrative systems mainly attention is given to annual budget cycles, annual reports, weekly conversations with the prime-minister, yearly function evaluations, elections et cetera. Later on he explains that executives back away when external orientation results in adaptations of their own internal processes, which are needed for embeddedness in chains and networks. Rather, Teisman sees management is an interact, as the capacity of complex systems to act in mutual connectedness. In this interact managers have a limited view and almost no grip on developments in these systems, although citizens expect them to possess these capacities. Teisman (2005) has explained this loss of grip to a change of contexts.

7. Concluding remarks

Due to the broadness and the status of development it is not possible and also not the intention to derive definite conclusions from this study. However we would like to make some concluding remarks, which could be grounds for discussion.

On a rather abstract level we have seen public managers have lost grip due to a change of contexts. When context has changed, governmental organizations and their employees continued to work as they were used to. However, as a consequence of this change in context, governmental organizations seem to be forced to start up new interactive processes. Nevertheless from discussed literature we may state that for a successful co-production program between ministry and citizens, two links seem to be broken. On the one hand there seems to be a lack of connectivity between the program management and line management of the organization. And on the other hand there seem to be invalid connections between the organizational and the program's institutions. We assume these two missing links are entwined with each other. Reparation of these missing links offers new challenges to the concept of program management. To overcome barriers for change, and so for the Policy with Citizens program, we suppose the management of programs should become to a greater extent embedded in the middle management of governmental organizations.

For the moment these are first ideas toward concepts for organizational learning, which should be further developed in our project with the ministry of VROM.

References:

- Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action, a guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change. San Fransisco: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Argyris, C. (1995) Action science and organizational learning. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 10, nr. 6, pp. 20-26
- Bennebroek Gravenhorst, K. en In ’t Veld, R. (2004) Power and Collaboration: Methodologies for Working Together in Change. In: J.J. Boonstra (eds) (2004) Dynamics of Organizational Change and Learning. Chichester: Wiley (pp. 317-342)
- Boonstra, J.J. (eds) (2004) Dynamics of Organizational Change and Learning. Chichester: Wiley
- Boogers, M.J.G.J.A., Becker, B., & Tops, P.W. (2005). *Experiment burgerplatform VROM: lessen en leerervaringen voor burgerparticipatie en beleidsinnovatie.* Tilburg: UvT
- Braganza A., & A. Myers (1997) Business Process Redesign: A view from the inside. London: International Thomson Business Press
- Bruijn, de H; G.R. Teisman, J.Edelenbos & W. Veeneman (2004) Meervoudig ruimtegebruik en het management van meerstemmige processen. Utrecht: Lemna
- Bruijn, de J.A., E.F. ten Heuvelhof & R.J. in ’t Veld (2002) Procesmanagement, over procesontwerp en besluitvorming, 2e herziene druk, Heuvelhof en R.J. in ’t Veld. Schoonhoven: Academic Services.
- Buijs, M.J. (2004). *Action research; onderzoeksstrategie voor complexe beleidsprocessen.* Afstudeerscriptie Universiteit van Tilburg.
- Buijs, M.J. (2005) Complexiteit tussen theorie en praktijk. Paper presented at congress Lof der Verwarring, 19 mei 2005, Rotterdam
- Cao, G., S. Clarke & B. Lehaney (2004) The need for a systemic approach to change management: a case study. Systemic Practice and Action Research, vol 17, no. 2, pp. 103-126
- Carlson, S. (1991) [1951]. Exucutive behavior, Uppsala.
- Castells, M. (1996). The network society. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- CDA, VVD & D66 (2003) Coalition agreement: 'Participation, employment, deregulation’
- Edelenbos, J. 2005. Institutional implications of interactive governance: insights from Dutch Practice. Governance: an international journal of policy, administration, and institutions, vol 18, no1, pp 111-134
- Edelenbos, J. (2000) Proces in Vorm. Utrecht: Lemna
- Edelenbos, J. & R. Monnikhof (eds) (2001) Lokale interactieve beleidsvorming. Utrecht:
- Lemna
- Edelenbos, J., M.W. van Buuren, M. van As, M Duijn, A. Slob, and W. Vermeulen (2003) Milieubeleid van, voor, en door de burger. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
- Edelenbos, J. & A. van Buuren (2005). The learning evaluation: a theoretical and empirical exploration. Evaluation review (forthcoming)
- Flood, R.L. (1999). Rethinking the fifth discipline: learning within the unknowable. London: Routledge

- Levin, M. (2004). Cross-boundary learning systems: integrating universities, corporations, and governmental institutions in knowledge generating systems. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, vol. 17, nr. 3, pp. 151-159
- Lycett, M., A. Rassau & J. Danson (2004) Program management: a critical review. International Journal of Project Management vol.22, 289-299
- Ministry of VROM (2002) Performance strategy Stimulation program Citizens and Environment. Den Haag: Ministerie van VROM
- Mintzberg, H. (2000). The manager's job. Folklore and Fact. Harvard Business Review. pp. 49-61 [reprint from 1975]
- Mintzberg, H. Managerial work: forty years later, Carlson, S., Exucutive behavior, Uppsala, 1991, pp. 97-119.
- McGuire, M. (2002) Managing networks: propositions on what managers do and why they do it. Public Administration Review, vol. 62, no. 5, pp 599-609
- Noordegraaf, M. (2000) Attention! Work and Behavior of Public Managers amidst Ambiguity. Delft: Eburon
- Noordegraaf, M. (2003) Professional sense-makers: managerial competencies amidst ambiguity. The international journal of public sector management vol.13, nr. 4, pp 319-332
- Partington, D., S. Pellegrinelli & M. Young (2005) Attributes and levels of programma management competence: an interpretive study. International Journal of Project Management vol. 23, pp 87-95
- Pellegrinelli, S. (2002) Shaping context: the role and challenge for programs. International Journal of Project Management vol. 20, pp. 229-233
- Phelps, R. & S. Hase. (2002). Complexity and Action Research: exploring the theoretical and methodological connections. *Educational Action Research*, vol.10, nr. 3, pp. 507-524
- Pressman, J.L. & A.B. Wildavsky (1974 first paperback edition, 1973 first print). Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; or, Why it's amazing that federall programs work at all. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Regine, B. & R. Lewin (2000) Leading at the edge: How leaders influence complex systems. Emergence vol. 2, nr. 2, 5-23
- Teisman, G.R., J. Edelenbos, E-H. Klijn, M. Reudink (2004) State of the Art Coproductie: STIP-Studie. Den Haag: Kenniscentrum Grote Steden
- Teisman, G.R. (2005). Publiek management op de grens van chaos en orde. Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers