Why Public-Service Performance Depends on More Than Rules and Compliance

15.09.2026 08:27:26 | Management Insights, Lukas Michel | 0 Comments | Public Services

--- and why management requires a redesign.

Public services are built on a serious promise.

To provide reliable services.
To serve citizens and communities.
To maintain quality, safety, continuity, and trust.
To keep essential systems working even when conditions are difficult.

That promise matters enormously.

And it is one reason public services so often rely on rules, procedures, and standards. In principle, that makes sense. Public institutions cannot operate casually.

But one of the most important insights in the public-services chapter of *Patterns of Mastery* is that rules and compliance, by themselves, do not create high-quality service. The manuscript describes the typical public-services organization as a traditionally organized, managed, operated, and led organization working in a rules-based context at the exploiters maturity level, with a programmed-machine form and an exploitation business model that delivers only limited or minimal outcomes.

That is the central tension.

Public services are meant to serve people.

But too often they are built to serve procedure first.

Why public services often feel harder than they should

The manuscript is direct about the dominant pattern.

Most public-services organizations operate through a web of rules and procedures intended for command and control. Incentives or punitive actions are often used to motivate people and exploit individual skills. These organizations are bureaucratic, standardized, and still only moderately successful, with mediocre performance treated as normal.

This is a revealing pattern.

Public services do not necessarily fail in dramatic ways every day.

More often, they become slow, ponderous, and burdensome.

Services still get delivered.
Citizens still get processed.
Front-line employees still help where they can.
But quality and speed remain lower than they should be.

That is why the public-services challenge is not simply a matter of “better policy” or “more effort.”

It is a matter of management design.

The dominant pattern: bureaucracy as the operating system

The chapter gives the public-services pattern unusual clarity.

Public organizations in the cluster function as programmed machines. Their hallmarks are bureaucracy and standardization intended to drive efficiency. Yet the manuscript states bluntly that many appear to be “wrongly programmed”: they fail to standardize the right tasks, lack efficiency and quality, and consume excessive resources — all paid for by taxes or fees.

This is a powerful observation.

The issue is not that public services have procedures.

The issue is that the operating system often multiplies procedure

without actually improving service.

So the organization becomes:

hard to move,
slow to respond,
expensive to run,
and difficult for both citizens and employees to navigate.

That is not a minor operational flaw.

It is a structural pattern.

Why rules become anti-change

The manuscript makes a sharp point about the context.

Public-services organizations typically operate in a comparatively stable environment where demographic change and growth

happen over years. Yet when turbulence or rapid change does appear, the operating system is not designed for it. The text describes typical governmental operating systems as defined by command, strict procedures, annual targets, slow responsiveness, poor efficiency, bureaucracy, title power, and strict standards. It concludes that this design is essentially anti-change.

That is the deeper problem.

Rules designed for stability become a liability when responsiveness is needed.

What looks like order in calm periods becomes helplessness under pressure.

And because public services often face exactly the kinds of disruptions that require flexibility — demographic shifts, crises, digital transitions, resource constraints, changing citizen expectations — the mismatch becomes more costly over time.

The human paradox in public services

One of the most important findings in the chapter is that the

human foundation is not absent.

In fact, the manuscript says workers tend to share a common purpose and have healthy relationships at top-tier levels. People at the citizen or customer interface continue delivering services despite weak leadership and burdensome systems. It also notes that people could and would want to do more.

That is a critical insight.

The problem is not that public-service workers do not care.

The problem is that the system does not allow enough of their capability to become useful.

Middle-tier awareness, trust, and choice limit their ability to respond quickly and efficiently to citizen needs. Weak or inexperienced leadership distorts focus and reduces the effectiveness of front-line workers.

This creates a familiar public-service reality:

good people inside heavy systems.

Why front-line people carry the organization

The manuscript states this point very plainly: people at the customer interface level deliver services regardless of interferences caused by weak leadership and burdensome systems.

This is the hidden resilience of public services.

Citizens are often served not because the system is well designed, but because front-line people keep compensating for it.

They explain what the process obscures.
They solve what systems complicate.
They absorb citizen frustration.
They keep quality alive where procedure alone would not.

That is admirable.

But it is not a sustainable design principle.

Because when organizations depend too heavily on the goodwill

and endurance of front-line workers, they end up normalizing exactly the wrong thing:

systemic weakness.

Why monopoly conditions make the pattern harder to challenge

The manuscript adds another important factor.

Most public-services organizations have little or no competition and are essentially monopolies. As a result, middle-tier or mediocre performance becomes accepted as normal.

This matters because competitive pressure often forces redesign in other sectors.

Public services often lack that forcing mechanism.

If citizens cannot really choose another provider,
if service still arrives eventually,
if weak performance is explained as complexity,
then the organization can live with patterns that would be unacceptable elsewhere.

That is why better public service requires deliberate leadership.

The system rarely changes itself.

The real issue is not self-responsibility alone

The chapter offers an especially useful caution here.

It argues that public services can improve quality and responsiveness by moving away from the rules-based context toward one where people are allowed to do the work while managers stay away. But it also warns that inexperienced leaders and consultants often introduce self-responsibility without the supportive systems and leadership styles required to make it work. Successful adoption of self-responsibility requires a holistic approach that balances people with systems and leadership.

That is a very important distinction.

The answer is not simply to declare empowerment.

The answer is to redesign the operating conditions so responsible action is actually possible.

That means:
clearer systems,
better leadership fit,
better dialogue with employees,
and more intelligent coordination.

Without that, self-responsibility becomes just another slogan layered on top of bureaucracy.

The crisis of control

The manuscript locates public services in the delegation stage with the resulting crisis of control. This is the point where organizations need to improve both the speed and quality of service delivery, but traditional management techniques and weak leadership keep them slow and ponderous. The text recommends a dynamic operating system plus people-centric dialogue to help overcome this barrier.

This is a decisive point.

Many public organizations believe the answer to inconsistency is more control.

But often the problem is the opposite:

too much control of the wrong kind,
and too little capability where it matters most.

That is why public-service transformation is not mainly a matter of digital tools or administrative modernization.

It is a matter of better management logic.

What leaders should look for in

public services

Leaders in public services should ask harder questions than whether procedures are being followed.

Those questions matter.

But the deeper questions are these:

Where are rules and procedures interfering with fast, high-quality service?
Where are front-line workers compensating for weak systems?
Where do people share strong purpose and relationships, but remain unable to respond effectively because awareness, trust, and choice are only middle-tier?
Where are managers using control when dialogue and better design are needed?
Where has mediocre performance become accepted as normal simply because there is little competition?
Where is the organization still anti-change in a world that now requires responsiveness?

These are the real leadership questions of public service.

The development path: spring cleaning and dynamic management

The manuscript’s action agenda is unusually clear.

Public-services organizations need to conduct a spring-cleaning program, fix systems so they align with the management context, fix the leadership style to meet the needs of people and context, and develop a scorecard that meets better standards. They also need to prepare the transition to the next stage by building dynamic systems with coordination capabilities.

That is not an argument against public discipline.

It is an argument for public-service redesign.

Public institutions still need standards.
They still need accountability.
They still need consistency.

But they also need operating systems that support

responsiveness, quality, and human contribution — rather than burying them in procedure.

That is how public service becomes more than administrative compliance.

The first step: create your own Organization Twin

The most practical first step is not another process layer.

It is to create your own Organization Twin.

Through a Structured Reflection — a standardized online questionnaire that takes about 15 minutes — you create a first evidence-based representation of how your organization currently works.

This produces two practical views:

The Capability Profile, which makes visible the broader organizational pattern: strategy, business model, organizational form, management context, growth stage, operating capabilities, and competitive barriers.

The Leadership Scorecard, which reveals how systems, leadership, culture, and success interact, and whether the organization supports understanding, thinking, delivery, engagement, and meaningful boundaries.
Together, they help leaders see whether public-service performance is being strengthened by the organization — or quietly constrained by bureaucracy, weak leadership, and anti-change systems.

Not as a judgment.
Not as a ranking.
Not as criticism of individuals.

But as preparation for a Guided Clarity Session.

Better public service begins when procedure stops being the goal

Public institutions are not meant to exist for their own procedures.

They exist to provide service.

That is why public-service performance depends on more than rules and compliance.

It depends on whether management, leadership, systems, and culture are actually designed to help people serve citizens quickly, responsibly, and well.

And in many public organizations, that redesign is still waiting to begin.

- Version zum Drucken
- Per E-Mail versenden
- Newsletter abonnieren

- Twittern

No comments yet.