

**Public Integrity** >

Volume 20, 2018 - Issue 5

Full access

4,131 | 3 | 9
Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

ARTICLES

Ethics in American Public Administration: A Response to a Changing Reality

Imane Hijal-Moghrabi & Meghna Sabharwal

Pages 459-477 | Published online: 16 Feb 2018

 Download citation <https://doi-org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/10.1080/10999922.2017.1419053>

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

PDF



Abstract

This article tracks the evolution of ethics in American public administration from the inception of the field in the late nineteenth century to the present, and employs the ethical lens to address some of the current pressing problems (e.g., immigration, climate change, and e-surveillance). The study acknowledges the fact that ethics has not evolved in a vacuum. Ever since the Progressive Era, various forces—social, political, legal, as well as technological—have greatly shaped the evolution of ethics, with every era injecting its opportunities and challenges, as well as its dictating values. This article highlights the continuity of ethics in public administration, by arguing that administrative ethics has not been static as it evolved over the years; it has evolved not by omission but by addition, in reflecting the changing reality of every age.

Q Keywords: [administrative ethics](#) [American public administration](#) [ethical challenges](#) [ethical development](#)[< Previous article](#)[View issue table of contents](#)[Next article >](#)

This article tracks the evolution of ethics in American public administration from the inception of the field in the late nineteenth century to the present, and employs the ethical lens to address some of the current pressing

administration has not evolved in a vacuum. Ever since the Progressive Era, various forces—social, political, legal, as well as technological—have greatly shaped the evolution of ethics, with every era injecting its opportunities and challenges, as well as its dictating values.

In defining ethics as the rigorous reflection and articulation of morality, this article promises insights into how to approach normative and moral questions in public organizations. The newness of this study lies not in the threads used, because much has been written on ethics in the relevant literature, but in addressing some of the ethical concerns and challenges that have not been given due attention in PA scholarship. This study is important to various audiences. Students of public administration will find in it a concise summary of how ethics in public administration has evolved over the years. Practitioners will gain insights into how to approach ethical issues in the twenty-first century.

This article is organized into three main sections and a conclusion. The first section provides a historical overview of the evolution of ethics in public administration from the Progressive Era to the present, highlighting the dictating ethical values of every era. The second section sheds light on some of the ethical challenges that public organizations face today. The third section provides a guide for public managers on how to manage ethics today. The conclusion reflects on the evolution and continuity of ethics in public administration.

THE EVOLUTION OF ETHICS IN AMERICAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The evolution of ethics in Public Administration can be subdivided into six main eras: (1) the Progressive Era; (2) the New Deal and Post-Second World War Era; (3) the Civil Rights Era; (4) The Post-Watergate Era; (5) the Reinventing Government Era; and (6) the Current Era of the New Governance.

The Progressive Era (Late Nineteenth–Early Twentieth Century)

The Pre-Progressive Era—also known as the Jacksonian Era—created the need for fighting corruption and for finding ways and means to improve government performance. To this end, the Progressive reforms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries aimed at transforming public administration into a professionalized, businesslike endeavor. These efforts were translated by the passage and implementation of the Pendleton Act of 1883, which laid down the foundations of a depoliticized, merit-based civil service; by Woodrow Wilson's claim to separate administration from politics by making government "less unbusinesslike" (Wilson, 1887), and by the adoption of scientific management principles (Taylor, 1912/2007).

Accordingly, in the Progressive Era, the main concern of scholars and practitioners was how to improve organizational performance by running government more like a business. Widely adopted performance strategies were then based on scientific management principles of fixed standards and instrumental rationalization of work processes (Taylor, 1912/2007) as well as on managerial principles and skills (Gulick & Urwick, 1937), thus leaving little room for politics, error in judgment, and other ethical concerns. As such, public administrators endlessly sought to improve organizational performance by pursuing the holy trinity of efficiency, effectiveness, and

economy. It was assumed that doing what one was told by organizational superiors in the most efficient way possible amounted to ethical administration. Thus, questions of ethics were not separated from performance, as they were guided by the Wilsonian legacy of neutral competency—of getting the job done (Menzel, 1997, p. 224).

However, this does not imply that the Progressives did not give ethical judgment a due regard (Goodnow, 1900/2007; Taylor, 1912/2007; Wilson, 1887). In fact, the movement of the late 1890s and early 1920s was morally charged and, therefore, first and foremost, about ethical judgment. For Wilson, the emphasis on running government as a business was by its very nature a moral statement as it meant to decrease the influence of politics and machine corruption on administration. Moral judgment is very often (although sometimes) implicitly behind the organizational or management approach in various stages of the history of public administration.

The New Deal and the post-WWII Era (1930s–1950s)

In the New Deal Era, efforts to rationalize government that had started in the Progressive Era were institutionalized by the passage of the Administrative Reorganization Act of 1939, which sought to control the federal administration by centralizing all executive powers in the hand of the Presidency. Scientific and managerial principles continued to be applied widely. However, with the expansion of the government machinery to find solutions to societal problems that emanated from the Great Depression, federal action emerged as the blueprint for efficiency, which would emphasize rules rather than men, and competence rather than favoritism. Unlike the Wilsonian professional who was expected to act “with vigor” (Wilson, 1887), in Weberian bureaucracy, rules governed behavior and regulations guided all actions. Routine meant applying the rule to the case. The bureaucratic personality type was that of an ethically neutral, rationalistic expert, incapable of emotion and devoid of will, who was supposed to act “without sympathy or enthusiasm” (Thompson, 1975). Thus, ethical administration was tantamount to following orders of legitimate organizational superiors in the most efficient way possible.

The rise of the welfare state after the Great Depression and WWII had its serious implications for the theory and practice of public administration. The Wilsonian politics-administration dichotomy, which reigned supreme as the dogma of the field in the preceding decades, lost its viability by the end of WWII. It was found impossible to rationalize government processes simply by applying business principles. Government, after all, cannot be run like a business (Appleby, 1959/2007; Dahl, 1947; Waldo, 1948/2007). This new reality required more use of administrative judgment in decision-making. Accordingly, scholars started to acknowledge the problems of morality that press hard upon individual public administrators, emphasizing the rudimentary awareness of those administrators of their public responsibilities (Appleby, 1959/2007; Bailey, 1964).

Intellectual debates in mid-century contributed to the ethical development in public administration. Two remarkable debates are the Finer-Friedrich debate of the early 1940s (Finer, 1941; Friedrich, 1940) and the Simon-Waldo debate of the late 1940s. The Finer-Friedrich debate summarized the ethical discourse on what promotes administrative responsibility and moral behavior. The Simon-Waldo debate was mainly over the fact-value distinction and the role and purpose of the practice and study of public administration. In short, Waldo (1948/2007) disputed Herbert Simon (1947)'s belief in efficiency as the central concept in the field of administrative science on the ground that efficiency is not a value-neutral concept. In his *Administrative State*, Waldo argues that

administrative study is concerned “with thinking and valuing,” where “valuing implies morality” (Waldo, 1948/2007, p. 171). Furthermore, Waldo regarded the belief in efficiency as a value-neutral concept as “a major obstacle to the development of democratic administration” (Waldo, 1948/2007, p. 171). It is worth noting that Waldo is a key figure in public administration’s continuing quest for an intellectual identity and the precursor of the New Public Administration movement in the late 1960s.

Despite the shift in public administration scholarship, efforts to rationalize public administration did not stop. The rise of the welfare state and the unprecedented growth in government spending necessitated the introduction of new strategies to control costs and improve performance. This propagated the use of generic management methods, such as strategic planning, systems-based approaches, and the application of metrics to administration and budgeting. However, most of these rationalization efforts were short-lived.

The Civil Rights Era (1960s–Early 1970s)

In the 1960s, the American society dramatically changed and became increasingly more complicated. The federal government expanded, accordingly, in size and expenditures. While liberals may view this expansion as a necessity to meet the demands of the changing society, conservatives would regard this growth as unnecessary. The aftermath of the Civil Rights Movement brought democratic principles to the scene which conflict with, and even contradict, the rationalization of public administration. Accordingly, the principle of standardization of service provision that served the society so well in the past had difficulty responding to “a diverse citizenry and its differential needs and preferences,” thus contradicting the democratic principles of fairness and social equity, and begging the question “when should we treat people differently to be fair and when must we treat them the same?” (Cooper, 2004, p. 403). While the principle of standardization sought to assure that all people are provided with the same services on equal basis, the principle of social equity requires that the services be tailored to meet the needs of the different segments of society. An example would be providing handicapped with special services including parking spaces and other accommodations.

As such, changes that took place in the societal and legal environment of public organizations rendered the concept of the ethically neutral bureaucrat, who was supposed to provide standardized services to all the constituents of society, obsolete. Bureaucracy came under fire for being too large, inefficient, rigid, and unresponsive to changes in its environment. Both Public Administration and business scholars started to denounce bureaucracy (Downs, 1967) and foretell its impending death (Bennis, 1965, 1966, 1967a, 1967b/2007; Bennis & Slater, 1968; G. Frederickson, (1971/2007)). Hence, de-bureaucratization was proposed in the 1960s and the 1970s, mainly by the advocates of New Public Administration (NPA), not as a way to rationalize government, but as a means to make government “more equitable and more responsive” (Cooper, 2004; G. Frederickson, 1971/2007; H.G. Frederickson, 1990, 1993, 1997; Menzel, 2003) to the increasing and diverse demands of society.

It was the NPA that brought ethics into the scene to become the heart of public administration (H.G. Frederickson, 1993, 1997). NPA scholars drove home the importance of social equity and the inescapable fact of administrative discretion, which broke open the old assumption about simple obedience to orders imposed from above in the bureaucracy. It was a result of this NPA perspective that the field of administrative ethics emerged in the 1970s and

with it the need for teaching morality in public administration schools (Rohr, 1978; Wakefield, 1976). With NPA, stewardship has become the spirit of the day, as NPA scholars attempted to establish a moral base for public administration by injecting new values of equity, civic virtue, and benevolence into the field (H.G. Frederickson, 1993, 1997).

The Post-Watergate Era (Mid-1970s–1980s)

The Watergate scandal opened a new chapter in American public administration, bringing public service ethics to the forefront. Both elite and popular consensus agreed that something had to be done to restore trust in government. Several efforts were taken to foster ethical conduct in the public service. In 1978, the Ethics in Government Act was signed into law by President Carter in an attempt to commit federal employees to moral standards of behavior that are required and expected of public officials.

In 1984, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) adopted an ethics code designed to promote the public service as an honorable profession. A few years later, the teaching of ethics found a niche in public administration/affairs schools, with the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) incorporating new language into its curriculum standards, urging public administration programs to “enhance the student’s values, knowledge, and skills to act ethically and effectively” (cited in Menzel, 1997, p. 225).

This initiative came in response to the recognition by several scholars of the importance of teaching ethics in schools of public administration to prepare students and practitioners of public administration to assume their role in government (Rohr, 1978; Wakefield, 1976). This recognition is based on the assertion that public officials are not neutral individuals who are supposed to carry out unquestioningly the orders of their superiors and blindly to apply the policies of the organizations they serve; they are rather moral subjects, who are supposed to exercise independent moral judgment (Rohr, 1978; Thompson, 1985).

The 1980s marked the beginning of a new rationalization wave that accompanied the sweeping changes in the political and economic arena. Efforts associated with this wave aimed at reducing the size of government, improving productivity, cutting costs, and promoting efficiency and service provision. Privatization, outsourcing, and contracting out government services became the new currency.

Several strategies for improving performance were adopted between the 1970s and the late 1980s, varying between quality improvement, privatization, outsourcing, and total quality management. Nevertheless, none of these strategies were proven effective in improving government performance, and government continued to be criticized for being too big, too bloated, inefficient, and unproductive (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

The Reinventing Government Era (1990s–2000)

Efforts to rationalize government continued vigorously in the 1990s. Improving governance has become the motto for every government ever since 1992. The new paradigms of *Reinventing Government* (Gore, 1993) and New Public Management (Light, 1997; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Ott & Goodman, 1998; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000) sought to introduce private sector values, techniques, and practices into the public sector in an attempt to improve public

service performance and to restore public trust in government. As such, the businesslike model emphasizes efficiency, productivity, high performance, customer service, improved capacity, and accountability for results, as a remedy to the ills of government (Barzelay, 1992; Gore, 1993; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

Efforts to rationalize government under NPM brought back performance and efficiency to the forefront, while at the same time sought to promote transparency and to improve trust in government. However, efficiency under the NPM model goes beyond our understanding of efficiency in traditional public administration. Traditionally, efficiency, as the relationship between production inputs and outputs, was mainly used to eliminate waste and improve central control over the administrative machinery, efficiency under NPM relates to cost effectiveness and maximization of outputs over inputs, which can be achieved by changing how public services are delivered (Hood, 1991; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Under the new businesslike model, “performance” and “results” gained currency in public organizations. Improving performance has become the primary remedy to the “performance deficit” that government was believed to suffer from (Behn, 2003; Kamensky, 1996; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010). To this end, objective measures of organizational and individual performance have been introduced into federal, state, and local governments to track and measure the extent to which public organizations are achieving their desired objectives (Brudney, Hebert, & Wright, 1999; Kearney & Berman, 1999).

In short, the new market model perceives public organizations as business corporations run by entrepreneurs, whereby officials are supposed to respond to performance targets set by managers (Hood, 1991). This model promised to enhance transparency, promote accountability, and increase flexibility by reducing planning, regulations, and procedures.

With its emphasis on transparency and accountability, NPM is thought to give ethics in public organizations a due regard (Christensen & Laegreid, 2001; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000). Opponents of NPM (G. Frederickson & Ghere, 2013; H. G. Frederickson, 1993, 1996, 1999; Gilman, 1999). However, the entrepreneurial model (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992) raised a number of ethical concerns that might undermine the public ethos by sacrificing the democratic norms of equity and by making the incidences of unethical behavior more likely to occur (G. Frederickson & Ghere, 2013; Kolthoff, Huberts, & Van den Heuvel, 2006). Proponents, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of “evidence-based ethical performance regimes” as “part of NPM discourse” (Lawton, 2008, p. 53). These regimes focus on codes of conducts for public officials as well as contractors, protocols for procurement, ethical training, and transparency in decision making (Lawton, 2008). Hood (1991, p. 15) argues that broadly speaking, NPM “assumes a culture of public service honesty as given. Its recipes, to some degree, removed devices instituted to ensure honesty and neutrality in the public service in the past (fixed salaries rules of procedures, permanence of tenure, etc.)”

The Current Era: The New Governance

In the past two decades, a new form of governance has emerged simultaneously to NPM, representing a paradigm shift “from hierarchy to hierarchy” (O’Leary, 2015)—from traditional bureaucracies to network arrangements—in policymaking and service delivery (H.G. Frederickson, 2004; Kettl, 1993; O’Toole, 1997a, 1997b; Rhodes, 1994, 1996, 1997; Salamon, 2002; Sørensen, 2002). Hence, most of public services that were solely provided by government are

now provided by network arrangements that cut across public, private, and nonprofit sectors, in which nongovernmental and quasi-governmental entities became equally responsible for policy outcomes and service delivery (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Rhodes, 1994, 1996, 1997). In this sense, the new governance denotes a change not only in the meaning and the traditional boundaries of government, but also in the manner by which society is being governed (Stoker, 1998).

Public Administration scholars variously refer to this “newly emerging paradigm in public administration” (H.G. Frederickson, 2004, p. 5) as the “new governance” (Osborne, 2006), “governing without government” (Peters & Pierre, 1998; Rhodes, 1994, 1996, 1997), “the hollow state” (Milward & Provan, 2003; Peters, 1994; Rhodes, 1994), “third-party government” (Salamon, 2002), “collaborative public management” (Agranoff, 2006; Agranoff & McGuire, 2001, 2003; McGuire, 2006; McGuire, & Agranoff, 2001), and “self-organizing and interdependent networks” (O’Toole, 1997a, 1997b), which are alternatives rather than a hybrid of markets and traditional hierarchies (Osborne, 2006; O’Toole, 1997a; Rhodes, 1996). Under these arrangements, government still relies on outside agencies, but now under the form of stronger partners rather than contractors (Considine & Lewis, 2003).

This new paradigm has emerged as “an innovative response” (Keast, Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004) to meet the pressing and growing demands of society. As such, network arrangements were developed as arenas for collaboration, where private, public, nonprofit, voluntary organizations, as well as the citizenry come together and coordinate efforts and resources to find solutions to societal problems that “cannot be achieved—or achieved easily—by a single organization” (McGuire, 2006, p. 33). The ultimate objectives of these networks are to improve government performance in terms of both policy outcomes and service delivery, to restore trust in government, and to make government more responsive to the needs of its constituents.

Some scholars fear that network arrangements, because of their self-governing nature, may deviate from the public service ethos (Rhodes, 1994, 1996, 1997). Other scholars, however, see the emergence of a new public service ethos, resulting from the strategic interaction between public, private, and nonprofit sectors that synthetically blends together elements of both the traditional PA ethos and the entrepreneurial ethos of NPM (Osborne, 2006; Stoker, 2006).

The concept of the New Public Service (NPS) was advanced by Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), who viewed NPS as “a movement built on work in democratic citizenship, community and civil society, and organizational humanism and discourse theory” (p. 549). Central to the NPS is the primary role played by the public servant in helping citizens articulate and meet their shared interests rather than attempting to control or steer society (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p. 549).

The new public service ethos is rooted in both public sector virtues of honesty, integrity, impartiality, and community service, and in private sector entrepreneurial values of competition, performance, customer satisfaction, consumer choice, and flexibility (Stoker, 1998). In this sense, substituting horizontal network structures for traditional hierarchies should not be understood as a departure from the traditional virtues of integrity, liberty, fairness, and equity that form the bedrock of democratic governance.

Aldridge and Stoker (2002) identify five elements that characterize the new public service ethos: Performance culture, commitment to accountability, a capacity to support universal access,, responsible employment practices, and contribution to the community well-being. Rhodes (1997) refers to adaptability and flexibility as key virtues of the new governance. Alter and Hage (1993) emphasize adaptive efficiency to indicate the interorganizational adaptation associated with “quality, flexibility, and innovativeness” (p. 39). Likewise, Bardach (1998, p. 232) points out to a “culture of a joint-problem solving” that reflects “an ethos that values equality, adaptability, discretion, and results.” This ethos also aims to overcome hierarchy, stability, obedience, procedures.

Similarly, trust among stakeholders is an ethical value that is of paramount importance to the proper functioning of collaborative arrangements (Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijin, 2010). In this sense, collaboration is more about enhancing trust than about reaching an agreement. Trust facilitates learning, information sharing, and the development of social capital. Accountability is another moral value in the new governance. However, it goes beyond the vertical accountability in traditional hierarchies. In network governance, accountability has a strategic orientation. It is more about managing expectations than about answerability (Acar, Guo, & Yang, 2008).

Table 1 summarizes the evolution of ethics in American public administration since the inception of the field. As depicted in Table 1, each era brought along with it new values to be adhered to in addition to the already existing values. However, the values that were maintained across the different eras (whether moral or not) were not static themselves. For instance, efficiency is a value cherished by all eras; however in each era, it has a different connotation. In the Progressive era, efficiency had a moral implication, as it was thought of as a means to reduce waste and eliminate corruption. In the New Deal era, efficiency acquired a managerial aspect: it was pursued as a means to control the federal bureaucracy. Under NPA in the 1960s and 1970s, social equity was advocated as a normative value and a new pillar in public administration (G. Frederickson, 1971/2007; H.G. Frederickson, 1990, 1993). Social and economic conditions necessitated more than technical and allocative efficiency. Distributive efficiency was a need to ensure that resources were allocated in a way to provide services that meet the needs of a diverse population. With the NPM, allocative and technical efficiency were brought back to the forefront, but this time as a means to maximize outputs and improve performance. Under the New Governance, efficiency acquired a broader connotation. It now relates to interorganizational adaptation associated with “quality, flexibility, and innovativeness” (Bardach, 1998, p. 39).

TABLE 1 The Evolution of Ethics in Public Administration

CSV

Display Table



ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

The world has entered a new millennium that can be best characterized as the age of globalization and rapid changes. This new reality has transformed and integrated societies, economies, and governments into a “global

society,” and brought along with it new challenges that require public managers as well as employees to frequently use their ethical judgement. This article highlights three of these ethical challenges: (1) the increased use of electronic surveillance, (2) illegal immigration, and (3) climate change. The first issue addresses the employer-employee relationship. The second addresses community, by highlighting the relationship between administration and those it serves. The third addresses sustainability, by emphasizing the relationship between administration and humanity as a whole. Figure 1 illustrates the three dimensions of ethics that these challenges necessitate.

FIGURE 1 Dimensions of ethical challenges.

Display full size

Perhaps, the most remarkable change that societies around the globe have been witnessing in the past few decades is the widespread use of information and computer technologies (ICTs) that revolutionized our ways of interaction and communication. This technological revolution—or what Luciano Floridi (2014) calls the “Fourth Revolution”—has ushered an unparalleled era in history—an era of boundless change, mobility, and possibilities for both individuals and organizations (Hijal-Moghrabi & Sabharwal, 2017). The use of ICTs has dramatically changed the way by which governments and their employees work, and presented both opportunities and ethical challenges to public organizations.

Related to the widespread use of ICTs in the workplace is the idea of electronic surveillance. As defined by West and Bowman, surveillance at work refers to the “use of electronic technology to instantaneously and continuously collect, store, and report the behavior of employees” (West & Bowman, 2016, p. 629). Surveillance technologies comprise computer log-in and activity reports, entry card swipes, video recording of staff comings and goings, and printer and photocopy details. They also include fingerprints, facial recognition, and iris scans, as well as smart cards that are used to control access to facilities (West & Bowman, 2016, p. 630).

Proponents of electronic surveillance perceive this type of surveillance as a means to gather information about employees’ work capacity and performance. They further argue that organizations have a valid reason to monitor and track employees in the workplace in an attempt to curtail theft, protect secrets, control costs, reduce absenteeism, maintain workplace safety, ensure security, and avoid information leaks (Mujtaba, 2003; Sarpong & Rees, 2014; West & Bowman, 2016).

Opponents, on the other hand, argue that monitoring and surveillance make employees in the work place more visible, traceable, and vulnerable, and may further upset the employer-employee relationship by giving more power to employers at the expense of the employee (Vorvoreanu & Botan, 2000). Opponents also argue that tracking employees’ data and activities may pose legal and ethical concerns for employees. They see monitoring as an invasion to privacy, conceiving of privacy as a basic moral right and as an important social issue (Alder, Schminke, Noel, & Kuenzi, 2008, Martin & Freeman, 2003).

The challenge is how to balance conflicting values of efficiency gain, fairness, privacy, and cost-effectiveness—how

to enhance transparency without violating privacy, and provide legal protections to assure fair treatment to employees within public organizations. This is particularly true in at-will state agencies where employees can be terminated for any reason, no matter how trivial it is (West & Bowman, 2016).

By the same token, electronic surveillance raises ethical concerns about the use and dissemination of employees' information, also referred to as information ethics. Because "data are leaky, and they escape in unexpected ways, be it through errors, hacks, or whistle-blowing" (Boyd & Crawford, 2012, p. 1666), protecting employees' information is of paramount concern. Any routine mishap of information may result in unintended consequences and misguided decisions that would negatively affect not only the employer-employee relationship, but also the organization as a whole (Rosenberg, 2010).

Illegal Immigration

Illegal immigration is one of the more divisive issues facing American society today. The authority to regulate immigration is initially the jurisdiction of the federal government. However, after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the federal government required state and local governments to assist with the enforcement of federal immigration law. While many states and localities show the willingness to cooperate, many cities and local governments refused to assist, by adopting instead what is known as sanctuary or noncooperation policies (Bilke, 2009).

Through executive orders, departmental policies, local resolutions, or city ordinances, these sanctuary cities, generally, forbid local law enforcement officers to inquire about immigration status or report illegal immigrants to federal authorities, except in the case of serious offenses (Bilke, 2009, p. 65). Many of these cities went to the extent to provide illegal aliens within their jurisdictions with local membership (including a municipal identification card) and the right to participate in local communities (Villazor, 2010).

Proponents of sanctuary cities and open border policies argue that sanctuary laws or ordinances seek to maintain community bonds and family unity, as well as they aim to protect all members within their respective communities. Opponents, on the other hand, fear that sanctuary cities become a safe haven for undocumented immigrants who are also criminals, who may flock to these cities because they trust that they will be neither reported to federal authorities nor deported for entering the country illegally. What makes things worse is that many juvenile defendants are released without notifying federal law enforcement. For instance, in 2008, as many as 185 youths who were engaged in serious drug-related crimes were shielded under the San Francisco's sanctuary city policy (Villazor, 2010).

Sanctuary laws and ordinances not only put sanctuary local governments in confrontation with the federal government and with their respective states to a lesser extent, but they also raise ethical and moral concerns. These cities tend to protect illegal immigrants and provide them with local benefits and privileges at the expense of the rights and life of local citizens/taxpayers. In the famous case of the Bologna family, the City of San Francisco failed to protect its citizens from an undocumented immigrant who was also a criminal. In this incident, which took place in 2008, an illegal immigrant, Edwin Ramos, who is allegedly a member of the dangerous Mare Salvatrucha, or "MS-13" gang, shot to death Anthony Bologna and two of his three sons (Villazor, 2010).

The ethics in question, here, is that of community ethics, which emphasizes the trustworthy relationship between local governments and the community they are supposed to serve. Local government employees, in general, and law enforcement officers, in particular, represent the interests of their constituents and, hence, have an ethical obligation not only to serve but also to protect and care about their local citizens.

Climate Change

Climate change is one of the most critical problems facing not only the United States, but the world in general as well. Climate change is a great threat to people and the ecological systems on which they depend (Dunlap & Brulle, 2015). For the past three years, opponents of climate change policies, as championed by fossil fuel companies, businesses, and free-market fundamentalists, have been successful in preventing government action on climate change by framing the debate in a way that emphasized the economy (high cost, loss of jobs, decrease in GDP, etc.) while ignoring the moral issues that emanate from it. The debate around climate change would be radically transformed if it were perceived and framed as a moral problem.

In this sense, high-emitting nations (including the United States) have a moral obligation to nations and people most vulnerable to climate change impact—that is, they have an obligation not to cause harm to health and ecosystems (Jorgenson, Schor, Knight, & Huang, 2016). Hence, the U.S. federal, state, and local governments, as well as businesses and corporations that emit high levels of greenhouse gases (GHG) are required to reduce these to a safer volume within the global emissions context.

Public administrators at all levels of government, more specifically at the local level, have an ethical responsibility, not only toward their immediate community, but also toward the global community as a whole. When carrying out environmental policies, they should weigh their actions and decisions taking into account the possible harm that may result from these actions or decisions. Likewise, public managers and employees, at the local level have a further duty to raise awareness and help educate civil society and businesses about the urgent need to decrease GHG emissions.

On June 1, 2017, President Trump took the decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. While some elected officials applauded this decision, others (including governors and mayors of large cities) vowed to pursue climate policies without the federal government. (Popovich & Schlossberg, 2017). Although these local actions may put these local governments in confrontation with the federal government and their respective states if they are supportive of federal environmental policies, they could be perceived as ethical/moral. The moral question here highlights the relationship between governments and humanity as a whole, not only the immediate community. The ethics in question is that of sustainability, which highlights moral obligations to future generations with respect to the environment.

In short, the new reality brought about by globalization and rapid change implies that the traditional role of public managers, despite its importance, is not enough to meet the challenges the new age calls for. Public managers do not act or behave in isolation of their environment, whether internal/organizational or local and global environment. Public managers, today, should think locally, but act globally. When carrying out policies or making

decisions, they should take into account the possible impact and consequences of their actions and decisions on both the micro and the macro level. This, ultimately, necessitates that public administrators develop new sets of knowledge, skills, and culture; assume new responsibilities; and uphold ethical/moral values that the new age necessitates.

MANAGING ETHICS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC MANAGERS

In today's turbulent world, ethical issues exist in a complex environment with conflicting ideas and unclear rules. Ethics and issues of "right" and "wrong" have been concerns of society for as long as societies have existed. Public administrators are faced with difficult choices every day, concerning ethical decisions. Ethical considerations are paramount to public administrators since they exercise great discretion in influencing and implementing policy decisions that either benefit or harm impacted parties. As such, ethically mature organizations embrace ethics as a routine obligation of the organization. Promoting and sustaining ethical cultures in which ethical attitudes, ethical behaviors, and ethical conducts are the norm is the responsibility of every public manager, whether in a traditional hierarchy or in the heterarchy of the New Governance.

In the past few decades, there has been an increased interest in ethics management as a means to promote more ethical organizations (Lawton, 1998; Maesschalck, 2004; Menzel, 2012; Petrick & Quinn, 1997). This need has emerged partly in response to the NPM reforms that emphasize competition and entrepreneurship, and partly in response to changes in societal values. Citizens, today, want more say in the provision of public services and a horizontal, rather than vertical, form of accountability (Maesschalck, 2004).

Ethics management, whether in terms of compliance or integrity, is the responsibility of every manager. Ethics management distinguishes between two approaches to promote ethics in organizational settings: compliance and integrity—also referred to as the "low road" and the "high road" approaches (Rohr, 1978). This distinction originates from the Finer-Friedrich debate in the 1940s, with compliance emphasizing external control as a means to promote employee ethical behavior, and with integrity underscoring internal control as reflected in moral judgment and moral character. These two approaches do not—and should not be regarded—as a dichotomy. Both should be taken into consideration in managing ethics in public organizations (Cooper, 2012). Compliance can be achieved either through ethics training, also referred to as compliance and value-oriented ethics programs (Weaver & Treviño, 1999; West, Berman, West, & Berman, 2004), or through the adoption of a code of ethics, identifying legal and illegal actions, ethical and unethical conducts, and appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. Integrity, on the other hand, can be enhanced through integrity training, which is often conceived of as a promising tool to promote employees' integrity in public as well as private organizations.

Scandals and high profile cases of corruption often disgust citizens toward the public sector. Adhering to ethical codes and providing training on a regular basis is necessary (Bowman & Knox, 2008). If organizations are expected to act ethically, ethical values have to be part and parcel of the organizational culture (Cayer & Sabharwal, 2016).

After all, promoting greater integrity in the public service restores trust in government which, in turn, enhances administrative capacity (Denhardt, 2002) and, ultimately, improves organizational performance.

CONCLUSION

This study tracks the evolution of ethics in American public administration since the inception of the field in the Progressive Era to the current era of the new governance. This evolution shows that public administrative ethics, as Cooper (2001) contends, has demonstrated its sustainability and centrality to the field of public administration. This article argues that administrative ethics has not been static. It has been shaped by several environmental factors that guided its governing values. However, it has evolved not by omission but by addition. Looking at the ethics of the present, today, we can discern different, even conflicting, ethical values that have been cherished by traditional public administration and NPM, coexisting side by side. This denotes the continuity of ethics in public administration.

In short, different types of ethics have existed and continue to exist alongside each other for at least some period. For example, the so-called Weberian/traditional ethics was not over when NPM arrived, and traditional hierarchy has not been completely replaced by new governance heterarchy. All this leads us to conclude that administrative ethics is not a passing fad. Dwight Waldo observed several decades ago that public administration will continue to play an important role, whether directly or indirectly. It will continue to reflect the state of the art, even if that art changes. Administrative ethics, being the heart of public administration, will continue to reflect the changing reality of that art.

REFERENCES

1. Acar, M., Guo, C., & Yang, K. (2008). Accountability when hierarchical authority is absent: Views from public private partnership practitioners. *American Review of Public Administration*, 38(1), 3–23. doi:10.1177/0275074007299481. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
2. Agranoff, R. (2006). Inside collaborative networks: Ten lessons for public managers. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 56–65. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00666.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
3. Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2001). Big questions in public network management research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(3), 295–326. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003504. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
4. Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*.

Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt2tt2nq. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

5. Alder, G. S., Schminke, M., Noel, T. W., & Kuenzi, M. (2008). Employee reactions to internet monitoring: The moderating role of ethical orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80*(3), 481–498. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9432-2. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
6. Aldridge, R., & Stoker, G. (2002). *Advancing a new public service ethos*. London, UK: New Local Government Network. Retrieved from <http://www.nlgn.org.uk/pdfs/upload/Advancing%20a%20New%20Public%20Service%20Ethos.pdf> [Google Scholar]
7. Alter, C., & Hage, J. (1993). *Organizations working together*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Google Scholar]
8. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571. doi:10.1093/jopart/mum032. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
9. Appleby, P. H. (1959/2007). Government is different. In J. M. Shafritz & A. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 119–123). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Google Scholar]
10. Bailey, S. K. (1964). Ethics and the public service. *Public Administration Review, 24*(4), 234–243. doi:10.2307/973314. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
11. Bardach, E. (1998). *Getting agencies to work together: The practice and theory of managerial craftsmanship*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/72126609/getting-agencies-to-work-together-the-practice-and> [Google Scholar]
12. Barzelay, M. (1992). *Breaking through bureaucracy: A new vision for managing in government*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press. [Google Scholar]
13. Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review, 63*(5), 586–606. doi:10.1111/1540-6210.00322. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
14. Bennis, W. (1965). Beyond bureaucracy. *Society, 2*(5), 31–35. doi:10.1007/bf02806136. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
15. Bennis, W. (1966). Changing organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 2*(3), 247–263.

doi:10.1177/002188636600200301. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

16. Bennis, W. (1967a). The coming death of bureaucracy. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 9(7), 380. Retrieved from http://journals.lww.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/joem/citation/1967/07000/the_coming_death_of_bureaucracy.34.aspx [Google Scholar]
17. Bennis, W. (1967b/2007). Organizations of the future. In J. M. Shafritz & A. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 220–230). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Google Scholar]
18. Bennis, W., & Slater, P. (1968). *The temporary society*. New York NY: Harper & Row. [Google Scholar]
19. Bilke, C. (2009). Divided we stand, united we fall: A public policy analysis of sanctuary cities' role in the illegal immigration debate. *Indiana Law Review*, 42, 165. Retrieved from <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/inlawrev/article/download/3986/3944>. [Google Scholar]
20. Bowman, J., & Knox, C. (2008). Ethics in government: No matter how long and dark the night. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 627–639. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
21. Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679. doi:10.1080/1369118x.2012.678878. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
22. Brudney, J., Hebert, T., & Wright, D. (1999). Reinventing government in the American states: Measuring and explaining administrative reform. *Public Administration Review*, 59(1), 19–30. doi:10.2307/977476. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
23. Cayer, J., & Sabharwal, S. (2016). *Public personnel administration* (6th ed.). San Diego, CA: Birkdale. [Google Scholar]
24. Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2001). New public management: The effects of contractualism and devolution on political control. *Public Management Review*, 3(1), 73–94. doi:10.1080/14719030122006. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
25. Considine, M., & Lewis, J. M. (2003). Bureaucracy, network, or enterprise? Comparing models of governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherland, and New Zealand. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 131–140. doi:10.1111/1540-6210.00274. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

26. Cooper, T. L. (2001). The emergence of administrative ethics as a field of study in the United States. In T. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Handbook of administrative ethics* (pp. 1–36). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. Retrieved from <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/books/9781482290042>. [Google Scholar]
27. Cooper, T. L. (2004). Big questions in administrative ethics: A need for focused, collaborative effort. *Public Administration Review*, 64(4), 395–407. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
28. Cooper, T. L. (2012). *The responsible administrator: An approach to ethics for the administrative role*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons. [Google Scholar]
29. Dahl, R. A. (1947). The science of public administration: Three problems. *Public Administration Review*, 7(1), 1–11. doi:10.2307/972349 [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
30. Denhardt, R. B. (2002). Trust as capacity: The role of integrity and responsiveness. *Public Organization Review*, 2(1), 65–76. doi:10.1023/A:1016027504549. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
31. Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549–559. doi:10.1111/0033-3352.00117. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
32. Downs, A. (1967). *Inside bureaucracy*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
33. Dunlap, R. E., & Brulle, R. J. (Eds.). (2015). *Climate change and society: Sociological perspectives*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199356102.001.0001. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
34. Finer, H. (1941). Administrative responsibility in democratic government. *Public Administration Review*, 1(4), 335–350. doi:10.2307/972907. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
35. Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar]
36. Frederickson, H. G. (1971/2007). Toward a new public administration. In J. M. Shafritz & A. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 296–307). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Google Scholar]
37. Frederickson, H. G. (Ed.). (1990). Public administration and social equity. *Public Administration Review*, 50(2), 228–237. doi:10.2307/976870. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
38. Frederickson, H. G. (Ed.). (1993). *Ethics and public administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

doi:10.4324/9781315704524. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

39. Frederickson, H. G. (1996). Comparing the reinventing government movement with the new public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 56(3), 263–270. doi:10.2307/976450. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
40. Frederickson, H. G. (1997). *The spirit of public administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. [Google Scholar]
41. Frederickson, H. G. (1999). Ethics and the new managerialism. *Public Administration & Management: An Interactive Journal*, 4(2), 299–324. Retrieved from <https://spaef.org/article/1103/Ethics-and-the-New-Managerialism> [Google Scholar]
42. Frederickson, H. G., & Ghore, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Ethics in public management*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. doi:10.4324/9781315704517. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
43. Frederickson, H. G. (2004). Whatever happened to public administration? Governance, governance, everywhere (Working Paper QU/GOV/3/2004). Belfast, Ireland: Institute of Governance, Public Policy and Social Research, Queen's University. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.537.8624&rep=rep1&type=pdf> [Google Scholar]
44. Friedrich, C. J. (1940). Public policy and the nature of administrative responsibility. In C. Friedrich (Ed.), *Public policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Google Scholar]
45. Gilman, S. C. (1999). Public sector ethics and government reinvention: Realigning systems to meet organizational change. *Public Integrity*, 1(2), 175–192. [Google Scholar]
46. Goodnow, C. (1900/2007). Politics and administration. In J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 28–30). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Google Scholar]
47. Gore, A. (1993). *From red tape to results: Creating a government that works better and costs less. Report of the National Performance Review*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED384294.pdf> [Google Scholar]
48. Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1937). *Papers on the science of administration*. New York, NY: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University. doi:10.4324/9780203509241. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
49. Hijal-Moghrabi, I., & Sabharwal, M. (2017). The role of the information society in promoting a better and a more

democratic governance. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 7(4). doi:10.5296/jpag.v7i4.12018. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

50. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
51. Jorgenson, A. K., Schor, J. B., Knight, K. W., & Huang, X. (2016). Domestic inequality and carbon emissions in comparative perspective. *Sociological Forum*, 31(s1), 770–786. doi:10.1111/socf.12272. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
52. Kamensky, J. (1996). Role of the “reinventing government” movement in federal management reform. *Public Administration Review*, 56(3), 247–255. doi:10.2307/976448. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
53. Kearney, R., & Berman, E. (1999). *Public sector performance: management, motivation, and measurement*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/89759233/public-sector-performance-management-motivation> [Google Scholar]
54. Keast, R., Mandell, M., Brown, K., & Woolcock, G. (2004). Network structures: Working differently and changing expectations. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 363–371. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00380.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
55. Kettl, D. (1993). *Sharing power: Public governance and private markets*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/7916611/sharing-power-public-governance-and-private-markets> [Google Scholar]
56. Klijn, E., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (2010). Trust in governance networks its impacts on outcomes. *Administration & Society*, 4(2), 193–221. doi:10.1177/0095399710362716. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
57. Kolthoff, E., Huberts, L., & Van den Heuvel, H. (2006). The ethics of new public management: Is integrity at stake? *Public Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 399–439. Retrieved from <https://spaef.org/article/747/The-Ethics-of-New-Public-Management:-Is-Integrity-at-Stake> [Google Scholar]
58. Lawton, A. (1998). *Ethical management for the public services*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press. <https://www.questia.com/library/120073193/ethical-management-for-the-public-services> [Google Scholar]
59. Lawton, A. (2008). The language of ethics: Understanding public service ethics through discourse. *Public Integrity*,

11(1), 45–62. doi:10.2753/pin1099-9922110103. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]

60. Light, P. C. (1997). *The tides of reform: Making government work, 1945-1995*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. [Google Scholar]
61. Maesschalck, J. (2004). Approaches to ethics management in the public sector: A proposed extension of the compliance-integrity continuum. *Public Integrity*, 7(1), 20–41. doi:10.1080/10999922.2004.11051267. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
62. Martin, K., & Freeman, E. (2003). Some problems with employee monitoring. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(4), 535–361. doi:10.1023/A:1023014112461. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
63. McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 33–43. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00664.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
64. McGuire, M., & Agranoff, R. (2001). American federalism and the search for models of management. *Public Administration Review*, 61(6), 671–681. doi:10.1111/0033-3352.00138. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
65. Menzel, D. C. (1997). Teaching ethics and values in public administration: Are we making a difference? *Public Administration Review*, 30(3), 224–230. doi:10.2307/976653. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
66. Menzel, D. C. (2003). Public administration as a profession: Where do body and soul reside? *Public Integrity*, 5(3), 239–249. doi:10.1080/15580989.2003.11770949. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
67. Menzel, D. C. (2012). *Ethics management for public administrators: Leading and building organizations of integrity*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. doi:10.4324/9781315704500. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
68. Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. (2003). Managing the hollow state collaboration and contracting. *Public Management Review*, 5(1), 1–18. doi:10.1080/1461667022000028834. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
69. Moynihan, D., & Pandey, S. (2010). The big question for performance management: Why do managers use performance information? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(4), 849–866. doi:10.1093/jopart/muq004. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
70. Mujtaba, B. G. (2003). Ethical implications of employee monitoring: What leaders should consider. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3), 22–47. Retrieved from

<https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-1178660591/ethical-implications-of-employee-monitoring-what>
[Google Scholar]

71. O'Leary, R. (2015). From silos to networks. In M. Guy & M. Rubin (Eds.), *Public administration evolving: From foundations to the future* (pp. 85–100). New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315718958-13. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
72. Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/97586920/reinventing-government-how-the-entrepreneurial-spirit> [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
73. Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new Public governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377–387. doi:10.1080/14719030600853022. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
74. O'Toole Jr., L. J. (1997a). Treating networks seriously: Practical and research-based agendas in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 57(1), 45–52. doi:10.2307/976691. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
75. O'Toole Jr., L. J. (1997b). The implications for democracy in a networked bureaucratic world. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(3), 443–459. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024358. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
76. Ott, J. S., & Goodman, D. (1998). Government reform or alternatives to bureaucracy? Thickening, tides and the future of governing. *Public Administration Review*, 58(6), 540–545. doi:10.2307/977581. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
77. Peters, B. G. (1994). Managing the hollow state. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17(3–4), 739–756. doi:10.1080/01900699408524915. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
78. Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (1998). Governance without government? Rethinking public administration. *Journal of public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(2), 223–243. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024379. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
79. Petrick, J. A., & Quinn, J. F. (1997). *Management ethics: Integrity at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Google Scholar]
80. Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford

University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/2179787/public-management-reform-a-comparative-analysis> [Google Scholar]

81. Popovich, N., & Schlossberg, T. (2017, June 2). How cities and states reacted to Trump's decision to exit the Paris climate deal. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/02/climate/trump-paris-mayors.html> [Google Scholar]
82. Rhodes, R. (1994). The hollowing out of the state: The changing nature of the public service in Britain. *Political Quarterly*, 65(2), 138–151. doi:10.1111/j.1467-923x.1994.tb00441.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
83. Rhodes, R. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
84. Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press. [Google Scholar]
85. Rohr, J. A. (1978). *Ethics for bureaucrats: An essay on law and values*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker. [Google Scholar]
86. Rosenberg, K. (2010). Location surveillance by GPS: Balancing an employer's business interest with employee privacy. *Washington Journal of Law, Technology & Arts*, 6, 143–154. Retrieved from <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/dspace-law/bitstream/handle/1773.1/479/6wjta143Rosenberg.pdf> [Google Scholar]
87. Salamon, L. M. (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar]
88. Sarpong, S., & Rees, D. (2014). Assessing the effects of "big brother" in a workplace: The case of WAST. *European Management Journal*, 32(2), 216–222. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2013.06.008. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
89. Simon, H. (1947). *Administrative behavior*. New York, NY: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]
90. Sørensen, E. (2002). Democratic theory and network governance. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 24(4), 693–720. doi:10.1080/10841806.2002.11029383. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
91. Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28.

[Crossref], [Google Scholar]

92. Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management a new narrative for networked governance? *American Review of public Administration*, 36(1), 41–57. doi:10.1177/0275074005282583. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
93. Taylor, F. (1912/2007). Scientific management. In J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 36–38). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Google Scholar]
94. Thompson, D. F. (1985). The possibility of administrative ethics. *Public Administration Review*, 45(5), 555–561. doi:10.2307/3109930. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
95. Thompson, V. A. (1975). *Without sympathy or enthusiasm*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/72278551/without-sympathy-or-enthusiasm-the-problem-of-administrative> [Google Scholar]
96. Villazor, R. C. (2010). "Sanctuary cities" and local citizenship. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 37, 573. Retrieved from <http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2338&context=ulj> [Google Scholar]
97. Vorvoreanu, M., & Botan, C. H. (2000, June). *Examining electronic surveillance in the workplace: A review of theoretical perspectives and research findings* (CERIAS Tech Report 2000-14). Paper Presented at the Conference of the International Communication Association: "Fifty Years of Research in Communication, Culture, and Cognition," Acapulco, Mexico.. Retrieved from https://www.cerias.purdue.edu/assets/pdf/bibtex_archive/2000-14.pdf [Google Scholar]
98. Wakefield, S. (1976). Ethics and the public service: A case for individual responsibility. *Public Administration Review*, 36(6), 661–666. doi:10.2307/975060. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
99. Waldo, D. (1948/2007). The administrative state. In J. M. Shafritz & A. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (6th ed., pp. 138–142). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
00. Weaver, G. R., & Treviño, L. K. (1999). Compliance and values oriented ethics programs: Influences on employees' attitudes and behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 9(2), 315–335. doi:10.5840/10.2307/3857477. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
01. West, J. P., & Bowman, J. S. (2016). Electronic surveillance at work: An ethical analysis. *Administration & Society*, 48(5), 628–651. doi:10.1177/0095399714556502. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

02. West, J. P., Berman, E. M., West, J. P., & Berman, E. M. (2004). Ethics training in U.S. cities: Content, pedagogy, and impact. *Public Integrity*, 6(3), 189–206. doi:10.1080/10999922.2004.11051253. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
03. Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197–222. doi:10.2307/2143644. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
3

Information for

Authors
Corporate partners
Editors
Librarians
Societies

Open access

Overview
Open journals
Open Select
Dove Medical Press
F1000Research

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints
Advertising solutions
Accelerated publication
Corporate access solutions

Help and information

Help and contact
Newsroom
All journals
Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email



Sign me up



Copyright © 2021 Informa UK Limited [Privacy policy](#) [Cookies](#) [Terms & conditions](#) [Accessibility](#)

Registered in England & Wales No. 3099067
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG



Taylor & Francis Group
an informa business