Responsible administrator by terry

Sociology



Cooper divides the conflicts of responsibility into three broad categories. The classification of conflicts is not conventional. The author bases the categories on previous experiences in the earlier chapters of the book as well as the unique cognitive style in his approach. He recognizes the conflicts of authority, conflicts of interest and conflicts of the role as the three chief classes of dilemma in public administration. The writer gives an in-depth description of conflicts and gives illustrations with case studies. Conflict of authority comes about as a result of responsibilities imposed upon an administrator by two or more sources of authority. These sources of authority could include the law, elected officials, organizational superiors or the public. A public administrator feels torn between when one source of authority demands a course of action completely incompatible with the demands of another source of power. For instance, an administrator's boss could require him to perform duty A while an elected official demands the same administrator to perform duty B. The administrator finds himself in a tight spot and confusion, not sure of what to do. He must, therefore, be guided by his moral authority to do what is right for the organization he represents.

Role conflict is exhibited when an administrator has to perform his duty as a manager as well as another position held in society. This could include his position as a religious leader, a parent or a business person. An example is a dilemma involved in a catholic faithful working as an administrator in an organization that promotes the use of a condom. Conflicts of interest occur when the public administrator's interests are at odds with his obligations as a professional and public official. The effect is that officials use these situations for their personal gains or for the gains of their friends and family.

The dilemma of this nature represents clashes between self-interests and public roles (Denhardt, 2011).

A case study, the Major, the Captain and Corporal Montague depicts a perfect example of conflict of authority. A Lieutenant is faced with a dilemma of whether to believe his bosses' recommendation for Corporal Montague for a position he has left vacant as he climbs up the ladder. It later turns out that both the Captain and the Major were having an affair with Corporal Montague. Corporal Montague's performance becomes dismal and the Lieutenant's feelings of Montague's incompetence prove right. The tight spot whether to believe his experiences or the conditions of his boss caused the Lieutenant to take a wrong move and recommends the promotion of Miss Montague,

From the case study, it is evident that public administrators should follow their personal principles and observations to make decisions. A public official will never go wrong by taking the right step, even if the decision is against his boss' will. As a leader, I will employ this in all my leadership requirements and ensure ethics are maintained in all my dealings.