conceptualization of the ICC creative process to be theoretically and methodologically defensible in descriptive terms, it may be necessary to go beyond BPR itself—and beyond the smart practice approach as an internal critique of it. It would be necessary to think of a theoretical framework which could be relevant not only for the study of public management, but also for the study of public administration and public policy. To this aim, the research could be framed, for example, within existing theories on coordination in the public sector: collaboration could be conceptualized as a way to achieve coordination at the low politics or policy implementation level. In fact, Bardach is aware of the theoretical potential of this topic and he points to possible further developments. Using an argument of coordination theory, he asserts that if ICC is to help improve agency performance, problems need to be conceptualized in a more integrated and holistic way than traditional bureaucracy has been able to do so far. He points out that the main difficulty will stem from key defining features of traditional bureaucracy itself: functional and professional specialization, on one hand, and structural separation and differentiation down the line of hierarchy on the other. However, it would be interesting to add that these features are rooted in specific accountability systems on which the relation between bureaucracy and democracy are based. Current public sector reforms that try to confront those difficulties could be another starting research point.

Notes

1. Bardach uses the concept of public value defined by Mark Moore (1996), *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press, p. 10.
2. This research was mainly funded by the Innovations in American Government Program of the Ford Foundation and the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

Joan Subirats*
Raquel Gallego
Department of Political Science, Autonomous University of Barcelona,
Campus de la UAB,
08193 Bellaterra, Spain
E-mail address: joan.subirats@uab.es
raquel.gallego@uab.es
May 8, 2001

* Corresponding reviewer

Missing Organizational Linkage: Tools for Cross-Level Research
Paul Goodman; Thousand Oaks Sage, 2000, 193 pages

In his new book, *Missing Organizational Linkage: Tools for Cross-Level Research*, Paul Goodman introduces organizational linkage analysis. The book asks an important question—

how can we understand the effects that actions at one level of an organization have on other (often higher) levels of the organization—and proposes a set of tools for answering the question. Organizational linkage adopts ideas from a range of sources, including systems thinking, to create a set of tools that enable the researcher to analyze the effects of action at one level of an organization on other levels of the organization. Goodman shows how the analysis can help us understand the effects of organizational errors, organizational change, and organizational learning.

The analysis bears fruit in the chapters on organizational change and organizational learning in which Goodman shows how we can understand these issues differently when we use the tools he has offered. In Chapter 7, for instance, he shows how organizational linkage analysis can help us understand how positive change at the unit level can lead to negative outcomes at the organizational level. Goodman's emphasis on predictive value suggests that understanding organizational linkage analysis could prevent these negative outcomes. Certainly, understanding the dynamics that organizational linkage analysis helps to expose might make managers think twice before engaging in actions that perpetuate them.

Linkage analysis is relevant to understanding public management. A brief discussion of the study of change illustrates how Goodman's perspective contributes to the ongoing discussion on this topic. Two questions tend to dominate the discussion: 1) has it (e.g., TQM, New Public Management) happened, and 2) has it produced measurable results. Neither of these questions encourages researchers to look inside the black box and understand what is happening to the idea (e.g., TQM, New Public Management) as it is implemented in a specific context. In Latour's terms, the questions assume a diffusion model in which ideas don't change but simply move from one context to another and are adopted or not rather than a translation model in which ideas cannot be transported without being altered (1996). Goodman's contribution helps us to analyze the dynamics of translation. He looks inside the black box and provides us with an arsenal of concepts to use in assessing what happens as ideas are translated into actions and actions are translated into outcomes.

The cover suggests that the book will be useful for researchers as well as practitioners. I agree with this claim, but think there is potential for misunderstanding what it is useful for. The book presents sets of concepts for analyzing organizational linkages and analyses of linkages in specific organizational contexts. The discussions of the concepts are useful and the analyses are insightful. One could imagine, therefore, that it is possible to produce insightful analyses of specific organizational contexts by applying the concepts discussed in the book. This is not what Goodman advertises nor is it what his analyses exemplify. He does use and illustrate the concepts he introduces in his analyses, but there is considerable art in understanding how to apply the concepts and the analyses generally involve substantial additional knowledge of organizational principles. As a result it is not clear that one learns how to do the analyses that Goodman illustrates, but it is clear that one learns from the analyses that Goodman provides in the book. Most importantly, one learns to think about organizational linkages.

A discussion of when cross-level effects are important would be a valuable addition to this book. The author points out that cross-level effects are often assumed to take place and that they are rarely tested theoretically or empirically. This is certainly true, and it is useful to have a set of tools that will help us explore these questions. It is also important to know when

we should be asking these questions. When is it sufficient to have an effect in one level that does not create effects at other levels? If services in a unit within a hospital or a classroom within a school, for instance, are provided more efficiently with greater customer satisfaction but there is no discernable impact on other units or on the hospital or the school as a whole, shall we discount the improvement?

Here the private sector focus of the book is relevant. If the metric is organizational or corporate profit, then innovations at the unit level are rightly judged against their contribution to that bottom line. If one unit is more efficient, but the organization is unable to use that efficiency to increase profits, then the effort made may not be worthwhile. But if the metric is service to the public, then innovations that do not ripple throughout the organization or agency are still quite worthwhile. This said, it is interesting to think about whether an innovation does have larger effects—if not, why not and how it could. Moreover, thinking about whether the innovation has negative effects is as important in this context as in the private sector. Goodman raises all of these issues and provides tools to help us think about them.

Martha S. Feldman*
Professor of Political Science and Public Policy,
Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy,
454 Lorch Hall,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-1220
E-mail address: msfeldma@umich.edu
May 8, 2001

* Corresponding reviewer

Reference

Latour, B. (1996). *Aramis or the love of technology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.