



Table of Contents

- 1.....PMRA News
- 6.....The Future of Public Administration Research: A Symposium
Norma M. Riccucci
- 7.....Whither Governance
H. George Frederickson
- 11.....What Is the Future Direction of Public Administration Research?
Mary E. Guy
- 17.....The Future Direction of Public Administration Research
Beryl A. Radin
- 20.....The Future of Public Administration Research: Is Reinvention Still Relevant?
Frank J. Thompson

PMRA News

Name That Newsletter

This is the first issue of the PMRA newsletter. The careful reader will have noticed that the masthead does not have a title. Incoming president Kenneth Meier has announced a contest to name the newsletter and is appointing a PMRA committee to receive suggestions from the members. The member who recommends the newsletter title chosen by the committee will receive a one year free PMRA membership and a free registration at the USC Public Management Research Conference. The members of the Newsletter Title Committee will be announced later.

All suggestions for newsletter titles should be e-mailed to David Matkin, the newsletter editor, at matkin@ku.edu. He will pass them on to the committee. Members may make more than one suggestion. The deadline for suggesting the title for the newsletter is December 31, 2003.

Committee Report on the Organization of Future Research Conferences

In the spring of 2003, Brint Milward, president of the Public Management Research Association, appointed the Committee on the Organization of Future Research Conferences. Lawrence J. O'Toole, Jr. served as chair and the committee included H. George Frederickson, William Gormley, Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. On July 14, 2003, the committee issued its report, reprinted here as follows.

The National Public Management Research Conference (NPMRC) has been convened every other year since the initial gathering at the Maxwell School, Syracuse University, in 1991. The first meeting was a high-quality research conference with a critical mass of many leading public management scholars in the United States. Researchers from around the country and a variety of academic units participated (schools of public affairs, public policy, and business; departments of political science, public administration, etc.). The pattern has continued. Subsequent conferences have been held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison (1993); the University of Kansas (1995); the University of Georgia (1997); Texas A&M University (1999); Indiana University, Bloomington (2001); and Georgetown University (2003). Attendance has slowly increased but remains modest by the standards of most regularly convened meetings in the

U.S. The conferences have included occasional participation by non-U.S. researchers, most of these Europeans. The series of meetings has been notable for the quality of research presented and discussed, the stimulation of new collaboration, and a solid record of publishing products in both book and journal formats.

At the first several meetings, the conference organization was relatively low key and informal, and invitations were issued to a fairly small and select set of individuals. These design elements have kept the meetings limited in scope and free of administrative burden. The decision to locate each gathering on a university campus has minimized costs and has been viewed as a plus by most participants. At the same time, the structure and format of the gatherings have varied; the degree of access by top junior scholars has been uneven; the involvement of non-U.S. scholars has been quite low; and the lack of transparency regarding such issues as governance structure, paper and panel selection, selection of meeting location, and plans for publication have often been seen as weaknesses.

In 2001, the Public Management Research Association (PMRA) was established, and the NPMRC became the research conference of the Association. From 2001 until 2003 the basics of the PMRA operations were established, a membership was formed, a secretariat was founded, and the Association began an official connection with and sponsorship of the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. What began as an experiment with a relatively informal arrangement for biennial gatherings evolved into a research conference of a new scholarly association, whose membership could be expected to grow. Accordingly, the PMRA president asked an ad hoc committee to propose arrangements to govern the selection of research conference sites, as well as rules to guide execution of the tasks associated with the conferences. To a large extent, this latter matter focuses on a distribution of responsibilities between the PMRA and the local or host organizers of the conference. This report summarizes the proposals of the committee, as follows:

1. The National Public Management Research Conference should be renamed the Public Management Research Conference of the PMRA. This change reflects a choice to encourage high-quality international participation in both the Association and the Conference. Any particular conference will be known as the [Name of University] Public Management Research Conference of the PMRA.
2. It is expected that for the time being, at least, the Conference will continue to be convened very other year in the odd years, mostly or always in North America.
3. Early in each odd-numbered year the PMRA president will appoint a site selection committee to choose the location and host for the Research Conference to be convened two years hence. The process should be organized so that the selection of the next site can be announced at each Research Conference. The site selection committee will invite proposals by contacting the PMRA membership by e-mail to encourage submissions. The announcement inviting proposals should also be distributed via the listservs of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, as well as the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management. The site selection committee will select a venue while taking into account such considerations as location, ease of travel, institutional support for and contributions toward the Conference, capacity at prospective host institutions, quality and quantity of space available for the Conference, availability of preferred conference dates (the Conference should be scheduled for a period in the autumn

to minimize conflicts with other research meetings in related fields), costs and convenience to attendees, and any distinctive elements (for instance, thematic elements) that proposers may choose to include in their submission. Attached is a sample set of questions that has been used recently to elicit the appropriate information from interested institutions. Some version of this document could be used in the future. [Here we would include the attachment we have used this year.] All institutions submitting proposals will be informed by the PMRA president, prior to the convening of the preceding Research Conference, of the outcome of the selection process. A general announcement about the location of the next conference will be made by the president at each Conference. Announcement will subsequently be made via e-mail to the PMRA membership list, which is maintained by the secretariat. Upon site selection, the conference will be known as the [Name of University] Public Management Research Conference of the PMRA.

4. The PMRA president will then appoint a conference committee chaired by a representative from the host institution. The committee will usually include additional representation from the host institution and will always include some representatives who are not from the host institution. When feasible, consideration should be given to including on the committee a PMRA member from outside the U.S.
5. Nine months before the Conference the conference committee will issue a call for papers and additional participation (panels, conveners, and perhaps discussants). The Conference announcement will be generally announced to all PMRA members, published in *J-PART*, and mentioned prominently on the PMRA website. The conference committee will select the papers and participants and organize them into panels, roundtables, and so forth. The committee will inform all who submitted paper proposals for the program, or other ideas about participation, of the disposition of their proposals. In selecting papers and determining the overall size of the program, the committee will consider the demand for program space but will also be mindful both of the importance of maintaining a program of high quality and of the value and attractiveness of a relatively modest-scaled program. The choices of papers and panels will be completed no later than six months in advance of the Conference. Once completed, the Conference program will be listed on the PMRA website until the Conference is held. The papers presented at the Conference will be archived at the PMRA website.
6. Upon complying with registration requirements and deadlines, any PMRA member may attend the Conference.
7. The host institution will form a local committee, chaired by the Conference committee chair. The local committee, consisting of research faculty at the host institution, will make hotel/conference center arrangements for lodging, food, meeting rooms, and other similar items. The local committee also sets the conference registration fee and manages all funds and accounts associated with the conference.
8. Non-panel aspects of the Conference, such as selection of one or two guest speakers, plenary sessions, organization and scheduling of receptions, and booking of entertainment, are organized by the host institution's local committee, at its discretion.

9. The host institution's local committee manages the Conference and also arranges for post-conference publication aspects of the research presented (one or more edited books, plan to work with specified journal editors, etc.), in all cases using commonly accepted refereeing processes.
10. The local and conference committees will consult with each other as appropriate and keep each other informed of key decisions and issues as they arise.

The Board of Directors of the Public Management Research Association met September 26, 2003, and adopted points 1 through 10 of the committee report as association policy.

New Association Officers

At the Georgetown University Public Management Research Conference, Brint Milward completed his term as the first president of the Public Management Research Association. At the same time Barry Bozeman, Marcia Myers, Laurence O'Toole, Jr., Rosemary O'Leary, and Yan Tang completed their terms as founding members of the PMRA board of directors.

Following the PMRA Charter, a board elections committee including Kenneth Meier (chair), Donald Kettl, and Beryl Radin were appointed by President Brint Milward in the spring of 2003. The committee nominated Eugene Bardach, Patricia Ingraham, Ann Chih Lin, and Norma Riccucci to four-year terms, expiring at the Public Management Research Conference in 2007. These new board members join continuing members Carolyn Heinrich, Donald Kettl, Laurence Lynn, Beryl Radin, and Lois Wise, all of whom have served two years of four-year terms.

Under the PMRA Charter, the president appoints and chairs an officers committee, which this year included Kenneth Meier, Laurence Lynn, and H. George Frederickson. The officers committee nominated and the board of directors subsequently elected Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr. to be the incoming PMRA vice president.

At the Georgetown University conference Kenneth Meier, who served from 2001 to 2003 as vice president, became president; Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr. became vice president—to become president in 2005; and H. George Frederickson was elected to serve a second two-year term as PMRA treasurer.

USC Chosen to Host:

2005 Public Management Research Conference

The winning bid to host the 2005 Public Management Research Conference was from the School of Policy, Planning, and Development (SPPD) of the University of Southern California. The Conference will be held from September 29-October 1, 2005, at the Davidson Conference Center on the USC campus. Guests will be staying in the Radisson Hotel, directly across from the SPPD. This will be the first West Coast meeting of the PMRC. The site selection committee included Laurence O'Toole (chair), H. George Frederickson, William Gormley, Carolyn Heinrich, and Laurence Lynn.

Change in the PMRA Secretariat

There have been two changes in the PMRA secretariat. First, because PMRA membership includes a subscription to the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory (JPART)*, Oxford University Press, which publishes *JPART*, has agreed to serve

as the annual membership/subscription renewal agent for the association. This will streamline the membership/subscription process and allow the PMRA secretariat to focus on other matters. Second, the Bush School of Texas A&M University has served admirably for the past two years as the PMRA secretariat. Because of the administrative burdens associated with the development of a new school, it has been agreed that the PMRA secretariat be moved temporarily to the University of Kansas, which will serve as the interim secretariat. Early in his term as president, Kenneth Meier will issue a request for proposals from the institutions of members to bid on housing the continuing PMRA secretariat. The PMRA officers express appreciation to the staff of the Bush School for their good work as the founding secretariat.

Meier Sets the PMRA Agenda

President Kenneth Meier has indicated that the primary objectives he would like PMRA to accomplish over the next two years would include the following: The first order of business will be improving the management of association affairs and bringing stability to its operations. To this end a committee will be appointed to develop a request for proposals to serve as the continuing PMRA secretariat, to receive bids, and, based on those bids, recommend to the board of directors the new secretariat. Second, further work is necessary on the balance between the relative exclusivity of past Public Management Research Conferences and the need for a broad-based conference to accommodate the participation of PMRA members. Third, because the field of public management research is increasingly international, specific attention should be paid to the possible international and comparative dimensions of PMRA and of the Public Management Research Conferences.

The Future of Public Administration Research: A Symposium

Norma M. Riccucci
Rutgers University, Newark
riccucci@andromeda.rutgers.edu

The 99th annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA) was held in August 2003 in Philadelphia. As program chair of the conference's Public Administration Division, I had some discretion in assembling panels for the national conference. One thought was to assemble some of the most prominent scholars in the field to discuss their views of the key trends in, and future directions of, public administration research. The comments of this illustrious group, H. George Frederickson, Mary Ellen Guy, Beryl Radin, and Frank Thompson, follow (David H. Rosenbloom, also a participant on this APSA panel, was unable to prepare comments for this newsletter). The e-mail addresses of the participants in the symposium are listed with their names and you are invited to correspond with them regarding their perspectives on public administration research.

In addition, PMRA members are invited to write general responses for inclusion in the next newsletter. If you wish to make such a response sent it to the Newsletter Editor, David Matkin at matkin@ku.edu.

Whither Governance

H. George Frederickson

University of Kansas and
The University of Oxford
george.frederickson@politics.ox.ac.uk

Governance has, in the past decade, come to be the favored organizing concept for public administration or public management. In the field's leading literature the word *governance* is used increasingly as a surrogate for the phrases *public administration* or *public management* (Kettl 2002; Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill 2001). "The linguistic morphing of public administration into the study of governance acknowledged the new realities of the administrative state and is argued by some to herald a new more theoretical orientation for the discipline" (Frederickson and Smith 2003, p. 209; see also Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill 2001; Peters and Pierre 1998). Following the theme of this roundtable, I will ask and attempt to answer this question: Is governance a serviceable concept by which to organize the research enterprise in our field?

Governance has a remarkable range of meanings. Governance is used as a surrogate word for the phrase "the new public management" with its emphasis on competition, markets, customers, performance measurement, and steering rather than rowing (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). In Europe, Australia, and New Zealand governance is understood to be approximately "good governance," which means deregulation, downsizing, contracting-out, transparency, privatization, and other characteristics of the devolution from state-centric steering to public-private networks (Rhodes 2000; Peters and Pierre 1998). Governance often also means "global governance" and all the modern forms of international interdependence associated with contemporary limits on the autonomy and sovereignty of the nation-state (Hirst 1990). In the private sector, governance means approximately corporate board oversight of management with a special emphasis on financial disclosure and transparency. Governance is used as a way to describe interjurisdictional cooperation and policy networks (Peters and Pierre 1998; O'Toole 1997). All these definitions would, according to March and Olsen (1995), be understood to be an exchange

approach to governance, an approach based on the assumption of rational actors making bargains and crafting winning coalitions in competitive environments. The final definition of governance is the institutional perspective, a direct challenge to the exchange perspective (March and Olsen 1995). In the institutional perspective, governance happens in formal bounded frameworks of rules, roles, and identities in which preferences are inconsistent, changing, and at least partly endogenous. Actors in such settings are guided by the logic of appropriateness rather than assumptions of goal-directed rationality (March and Olsen 1995, p. 32).

The capacious range of approaches to governance in public administration indicates the possible usefulness of the word as a way to better connect the field to the modern realities of fuzzy and porous jurisdictional borders, state decentralization, increasing involvement of the private sector in public affairs, and a less state-centric bureaucracy. But the possible usefulness of the word/concept governance as applied to public administration is significantly diminished by the absence of agreement among scholars as to its meaning. There is one big exception.

The most serious and complete consideration of governance in public management is found in the work of Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill (2001; see also Heinrich and Lynn 2000; and Lynn and Hill 2003). They use a big definition of governance, to wit: "regimes of laws, rules, judicial decisions, and administrative practices that constrain, prescribe, and enable the provision of publicly supported goods and services" (2001, p. 7). In their governance model, Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill express this definition in terms of public outputs or outcomes as a function of: (1) environmental factors; (2) the characteristics of clients; (3) treatments, which is to say descriptions of the missions, objectives, criteria for service, and technologies; (4) structures or forms of organization, centralization, administrative rules and incentives, budgets, and institutional culture; and (5) managerial roles and actions. This is a state-centric institutional model that, while highly contextual and contingent, is, nevertheless, essentially governmental.

In their most recent work, a large-scale synthesis of 800 articles from 70 leading journals over a 12 year period, Hill and Lynn, using a variation of the model described above, concentrated on the

results of data-based studies using positivist social science.

In the order of their presentation, Hill and Lynn found that: (1) there is notably more research explaining frontline work than research on higher levels of governance; (2) the majority of studies adopt a top-down perspective on governance with little emphasis on outcomes, results, or stakeholders' assessments—studies of street-level bureaucracy and bureaucrat-client interactions are the exception; (3) structures of authority are used to explain, they are not explained; (4) governance matters or, put another way, there is a demonstrable hierarchy of influence from politics clear down to the stakeholders and at each step of the way structure, process, and management matter; (5) in governance studies results are most often described as institutional outputs and not social outcomes; (6) organizational structures and levels of management discretion influence organizational effectiveness; and (7) effectiveness and cost savings associated with third-party governance are influenced by incentives and contract review standards and processes. None of these findings are a surprise and they all generally fit contemporary advanced understandings of public management. Nevertheless, it is important that such a large-scale synthesis of the empirical literature corroborate the thrust of general theory in the field (Frederickson and Smith 2003).

Hill and Lynn's most important finding is that hierarchy and, as they put it, hierarchical governance, is alive and well and the primary means by which we govern. It appears that the networked, associational, horizontal, and conjoined forms of governance are less important than governance scholars might think. "[T]he American political scheme remains hierarchical and jurisdictional" and jurisdictional hierarchy is the predicate to networked governance (p. 34). And they identify this likely reason why: "the seemingly 'paradigmatic' shift away from hierarchical government toward horizontal governing (hence increasing the preference for 'governance' as an organizing concept) is less fundamental than it is tactical: the addition of new tools or administrative technologies that facilitate public governance within hierarchical systems" (p. 33). While not entirely deflating the governance balloon, the Hill and Lynn findings certainly let some of the air out.

At this point it is useful to consider the general critique of governance, not only in public administration but in international relations and urban studies, a form of governance usually described as regime theory. Much of the governance literature is "a rehash of old academic debates under a new and jazzier name—a sort of intellectual mutton dressed up as lamb—so that pushy new professors. . . can have the same old arguments as their elders but can flatter themselves that they are breaking new ground by using new jargon" (Strange 1982, p. 341). Fashions change, and we already may have reached the half-life of the hegemony of governance as an organizing concept for the field.

Second, the concept is imprecise, woolly, and, when applied, so broad that virtually any meaning can be attached to it.

Third, the concept of governance is value loaded, implying that certain things are understood and agreed upon when, in fact, they should not be taken for granted. Governance as public administration tends to wrap together both anti-bureaucratic and anti-governmental sentiments, preferences for markets over governments, and preferences for limited government, all points of view masked as given, understood, and agreed-upon (Kernaghan, Marson, and Borins 2000). Its democratic deficits are not the least of the value problems generally associated with some uses of the concept of governance. Standard models of democratic government involve a limited state, controlled by representative government bound by the rule of law, and a largely self-organizing civil society independent of the state but protected by the state's laws and administrative procedures. Some models of governance, however, either discount the significance of jurisdictionally based democratic traditions or fail to take them into account, most notably the Osborn and Gaebler reinventing government model (1992; see also Hirst 2000; Sorensen 2002). Other models are deeply contextual, based on constitutional, legal, organizational, and political influences and imperatives (Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill 2001). These models are state and jurisdiction centered understandings of governance in which public administration is contingent on artifacts of constitutions, rules, laws, and politics. This perspective on governance in public administration makes the subject bigger and more grand, a kind of un-public administration.

Fourth, governance is all about change, reform, getting things right. Such a perspective begins with the notion that things are broken and need to be fixed. Investments in our prevailing institutions, our cities, states, and nations and their established governments are devalued, as are the accomplishments of those institutions. Order, stability, and predictability are likewise undervalued. Governance is about dynamic change. Governance is about reform.

Fifth, governance is often centered on non-state institutions—both nonprofit and for-profit contractors, nongovernmental organizations, parastatals, and third parties generally. State and jurisdiction-centered theory and research are, from some governance perspectives, passé

This critique, along with the findings from the Lynn and Hill synthesis, indicate some disappointment with governance as the organizing concept for the field and suggests a less ambitious approach.

Powerful forces are at work in the world, forces that the traditional study of politics, government, and public administration do not explain. The state and its sub-jurisdictions are losing important elements of their sovereignty; borders have less and less meaning. Social and economic problems and challenges are seldom contained within jurisdictional boundaries, and systems of communication pay little attention to them. Business is increasingly regional or global. Business elites have multiple residences and operate extended networks that are highly multi-jurisdictional. States and jurisdictions are hollowing-out their organization and administrative capacities, exporting to contractors much of the work of public administration.

Governance, even with its weakness, is the most useful available concept for describing and explaining these forces. But for governance to become anything more than passing fashion or a dismissive un-public administration, it must respond to the critique of governance. To do this governance scholars must settle on an agreed-upon definition, a definition broad enough to comprehend the forces it presumes to explain but not so broad as to claim to explain everything. Governance theorists must be ready to explain not only what governance is, but also what it is not. Governance theorists must be up-front about the biases in the concept and the implications of those biases.

To construct a practical and usable concept of governance for public administration, the field would profit by narrowing the subject to its most common usage and return to what may be the original conception of governance in the field. Harlan Cleveland first used the term governance in public administration (1972). By governance he meant horizontal patterns of nonhierarchical decision making involving both public and private organizations. Governance, then, describes vertical and horizontal interjurisdictional and interorganizational cooperation. Governance also describes the extension of the state or jurisdiction by contracts or grants to third parties. And governance describes forms of public but nonjurisdictional or nongovernmental policy making and implementation. This approach to government has the advantage of describing approximately what most research scholars usually mean when they use the term governance. It also has the advantage of trimming from governance the rhetorical and advocacy perspectives sometimes associated with the use of the term among proponents of the so-called new public management. Their approach to governance may or may not be of value, but it is not essentially a research approach.

Governance is, then, that form of public administration that puts the executive at or across the boundaries of the organization, in regularized patterns of interaction with other executives likewise working at the borders of their organizations. Governance, as a distinct form of public administration, therefore, has to do with the extension of the state or jurisdiction either beyond its boundaries, through third parties, or by nongovernmental institutions. This less grand and ambitious approach to governance in public administration research will make that research more orderly and replicable.

References

- Cleveland, Harlan, 1972. *The Future Executive: A Guide for Tomorrow's Managers*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Frederickson, H. George, 1999. "The Repositioning of American Public Administration." *PS: Political Science*. pp. 701-711
- Frederickson, H. George and Kevin Smith, 2003. *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Heinrich, Carolyn J. and Laurence E. Lynn Jr., eds.

2000. *Governance and Performance: New Perspectives*. Washington, DC.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hill, Carolyn J and Laurence E. Lynn. 2003. "Hierarchical Governance." unpublished paper.
- Hirst, Paul, 2000. "Authority, Steering, and Democracy" In Jon Pierre, ed. *Democracy and Governance*, pp. 13-35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kernaghan, Kenneth, Brian Marson and Sanford Borins, 2000. *The New Public Organization*. Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada.
- Kettl, Donald, 1993. *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Markets*. Washington, DC.: Brookings Institution.
- Lynn, Laurence E. Jr., Carolyn Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill, 2001. *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen, 1995. *Democratic Governance*. New York: The Free Press.
- O'Toole, Laurence J. Jr., 1993. "Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research Based Agendas in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 57: 45-52.
- Peters, B. Guy, 2001. *The Future of Governance*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre, 1998. "Governance Without Government? Rethinking Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8: 227-243.
- Pierre, Jon, ed, 2000. *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, And Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salaman, Lester, ed. 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Strange, Susan, 1982. "Cave! Hic Dragones: A Critique of Regime Analysis." *International Organizations* 36: 2: 337-354.

What Is the Future Direction of Public Administration Research?

Mary E. Guy
Florida State University
mguy@mailier.fsu.edu

My remarks will focus on six topics that I hope will become future research directions. These are issues that emerge in several of our subfields and range from macro to micro levels of analysis. Included in these directions are a number of perspectives, ranging from methodology, to HR functions, to intellectual history. I also mention three overall governance issues: speaking truth to power, marketing government, and responsiveness to the "new normal" that followed 9/11.

The first of six "directions" is not as much substance as it is process. It is a methodology question. How do we investigate? Gone are the days when we could acquire a huge dataset, mine it for correlations and R²s, publish the results in elaborate tables, then dust off our hands and walk away, believing that the research was complete. In fact the task is only half done.

Mixed methods provide a fuller picture of events; qualitative analysis helps to answer the questions put forth by quantitative findings. Interviews, focus groups, participant observation: all these help to round out the picture and to explain the data. Our efforts to be "just like the physical sciences" has finally convinced us that people do not behave as inanimate objects and our efforts are better served by embracing more holistic inquiries into behavior, institutions, and outcomes. Public administration research should be both *theoretically rigorous* and *practically useful*. One of the significant differences between public administration research and many other variants of political science research is that practitioners want to know how to do their work better and they look to us for answers. Our research should help them.

The next five "directions" provide venues for stretching the envelope of our understanding. The first that I will discuss is that of HR issues in public service organizations, and in this I include two unrelated subjects: civil service reform and

the important role of emotional intelligence and emotional labor in public service work

Public service is primarily *service* – work, yet our job classifications and position descriptions are rooted in the terminology of scientific management, where tangible skills and behaviors are itemized but all those skills, behaviors, and performances that “grease the wheels” so that the work gets done and interactions are “customer friendly” remain unstated, undefined, and uncompensated. Here I am talking about two closely related concepts: *emotional labor* and *emotional intelligence*.

Let me explain emotional labor: Many, if not most, public service jobs require interpersonal contact, usually face-to-face or voice-to-voice. Those who staff the counter at the driver’s license examining station are expected to greet the one-hundredth applicant of the day with the same sincerity as they greeted the first. Those who staff the phone lines for the Internal Revenue Service are expected to be “nicer than nice.” Caseworkers must care about strangers; administrative assistants must “read” their directors’ moods; the governor’s communications staff must handle each inquiry and complaint with grace. This work is relational in nature and is called emotional labor. It requires the office holder to play a role as if on stage, to “manufacture” a feeling appropriate to the circumstance.

First identified by sociologist Arlie Hochschild twenty years ago, emotional labor is a requirement for those in service industries, such as airline attendants, sales representatives, and customer service jobs. We are only now coming to appreciate the necessity of this skill in public service work.

By tradition, work and accompanying job descriptions focus on the tangible production of goods and services. Behavior that mediates the process and produces positive interpersonal relations, a sense of community, and resolution of conflict and tension, does not fit easily into quantifiable elements. The confluence of scientific management and engineering norms have cemented notions about what is, and is not, real work, resulting in emotional labor being what Joyce Fletcher calls “disappeared.” Defined as a natural behavior, meaning one that occurs by virtue of the fact that it is inherent to the individual, emotional labor is thought unworthy of financial compensation.

(Heavy lifting, about which the same argument for “naturalness” could be made, does qualify however.) As a consequence, support staff see their contributions diminished and poorly rewarded. “Work” is paid while “natural” labor is compensated by words of thanks.

Emotional labor is applicable to both men’s and women’s work but it is the “softer” emotions, those required in relational tasks such as caring and nurturing, that “get disappeared” most often from job descriptions, performance evaluations, and salary calculations. These are the emotions that are a mainstay of health and human service professions, public education, paraprofessional jobs, and most support positions such as administrative assistants, receptionists, clerical staff, and secretaries. Simply stated, acts that “grease the wheels” so that people cooperate, stay on task, and work well together, are essential for job completion but are rewarded more with a pat on the back than with money.

Writing about the gender-related dynamics that drive this disappearing process, Joyce Fletcher (1999) says “. . . there is a masculine logic of effectiveness operating in organizations that is accepted as so natural and right that it may seem odd to call it masculine. This logic of effectiveness suppresses or “disappears” behavior that is inconsistent with its basic premises, even when that behavior is in line with organizational goals. The result is that organizations adopt the rhetoric of change – moving, for example, to self-managed teams – but end up disappearing the very behavior that would make the change work, such as recognizing the effort involved in helping a team work together effectively”(p3).

To acknowledge the *caritas* function is to violate the norms of management “science.” It does not fit into the paradigm for how bureaucracies behave nor does it comport with the standard listing of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). Yet, as hierarchical systems of prediction and control transform into collaborative networks, task forces, and teams, these behaviors are more important now than ever before. Interpersonal links, rather than office walls, define the boundaries of our new organizational sizes and shapes. Meredith Newman and I have shaped our research into emotional labor to investigate the pay differential between women and men, and job segregation and emotional labor.

There are many other ways to look at this subject.

Closely related to emotional labor is the requisite skill to produce it, called *emotional intelligence*. This term is analogous to cognitive intelligence; it refers to the ability to manage one's own emotions and to sense those of others, using that knowledge to govern one's actions. Related competencies include self-awareness, self-control, empathy, active listening, and the skill to resolve conflicts and to cooperate with others. As with intellectual intelligence, ability levels vary with the individual.

In this post-industrial economy, both Hochschild and Goleman are cuing on skills, traits, and performance that do not fit the mold prescribed by Frederick Taylor's scientific management, Max Weber's ideal bureaucracy, or behaviorist requirements that traits and skills be measurable if they are to matter.

Emotional intelligence and emotional labor are topics that are ripe for research. They are not unique to the public sector—management scholars have recently started publishing studies about both – but we have a leg up in public settings because government job classifications and corresponding pay scales are more accessible for study and can often be found on-line.

The second aspect in HR issues pertains to civil service reform. More than one hundred years ago, the Pendleton Act was passed; now we are seeing a reversion to pre-Pendleton Act days. State employment in Georgia is now *at will* and a large portion of the Florida state workforce was converted to *at will* status a couple years ago. Texas flirted with a statewide merit system for state employees for about twenty years but terminated that in 1985 and reverted to decentralization where each agency makes its own rules.

Florida's 2001 initiative – called Service First by its proponents and Service Worst by its detractors, eliminated job tenure for 16,300 career employees. It is as radical in its purpose, if not its scope, as the 1996 Georgia reform that removed civil service safeguards for all new state workers. In some ways it is even bolder since it abolished many appeal rights of current employees. While the contemporary reform movement goes beyond these two southern cases, they represent a decisive shift among three values that have historically characterized public service: representativeness,

neutral competence, and executive leadership. We need to know how public performance is affected. Is it improved? We need to know whether the shift to partisan loyalty in place of neutral competence, and the shift to executive leadership in place of experienced career staff, truly improves public service.

The third research theme relates to *speaking truth to power* in a voice that is persuasive: It is easy to find elected officials who clamor for government accountability, but it is a challenge to find officials who will listen when presented with information that is contrary to their assumptions or partisan platforms. This especially pertains to contracted services and voucher programs. Here, again, I draw on the Florida example. The state has a legislative agency, Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), whose budget is being whittled away. This has occurred with a vengeance since the agency produced reports that contradicted the governor's views on contracted services. While no one challenges the accuracy of the data, those in power wish to kill the messenger. OPPAGA had been asked by the legislature to perform the study. The problem is that the agency's careful work produced the "wrong" answer. If performance is better, so be it. If not, the story needs to be told. The challenge is how to speak truth to power in such a way that the message is heard.

Lois Wise's (2002) conception of drivers of change, which includes the demand for greater social equity, for democratization and empowerment, and for humanization, is instructive here. She analyzes public management reform based on the relative intensity of three normative drivers. Perhaps that is what is at stake here: the normative dimension to how government is to be performed. Thus, straightforward accountability interpreted in terms of efficiency and economics falls short of contemporary ideology.

Are the values in question simply the ideology of those in power, regardless of actual program performance? It is up to public administration researchers to provide balanced research, not swayed by the preferences of partisan ideology. Another Florida example: Florida's Department of Children and Families is currently seeking legislation that will replace requirements for contract compliance monitoring with auditing after-the-fact and/or accreditation of services by national

bodies. Such legislation will remove real-time monitoring of the processes by which outcomes are achieved. As a profession we talk unceasingly about government accountability but we seem to be like ships passing in the night when we speak to partisan loyalists. How can we do a better job of producing reports that compel elected officials to respond to the message rather than kill the messenger?

The fourth future direction is *marketing*. Twenty years ago, the word marketing moved from being anathema among nonprofit agencies to grow into a legitimate administrative function. The American Red Cross stepped out in front and developed a formal “how to” manual that instructed chapters in how to market their services. Nonprofit boards of directors no longer blanch when the subject of marketing emerges. MPA programs offer courses in marketing for nonprofits. We haven’t gotten that far in government but we are getting closer, and it is an effort whose time has come.

Cities like Tallahassee operate their own cable television stations, disguised as departments of communication, which they use not just to post job announcements and public meeting notices but to provide programming that explains city services, encourages citizen involvement, and engages viewers in call-in Q&A shows. States like Indiana and Pennsylvania put their state websites on license tags, setting the stage not only for providing accessible information on the website but also for “advertising” strengths and attractions. (See www.state.PA.US and www.IN.gov)

We live in a consumer culture, one based on marketing to create images, desires, and expectations. It is time for government to go to school on what succeeds. This is a wide open area for research and attention. What marketing ventures are being used? Which ones work? Which ones fail? How are citizens’ views of government affected by marketing strategies?

The fifth research dimension should be attractive for history buffs. The role of women in the formative stages of professional public administration has been ignored in the field’s intellectual history. Cam Stivers’ comparison of settlement women to bureau men is instructive. Students of public administration learn about the PA Clearing House and 1313 E. 60th Street projects. Certainly the establishment of processes, procedures, and rules for governing are important

to know, but they represent only one side of the civic mind. Improving life-in-community and providing safety net services for people – services that are designed to improve people’s lives but for which no profit can be earned – are other aspects of *public* administration, and these activities are both initiated and conducted primarily by women. And they often serve as a springboard for further contributions to governance.

Take, for example, the life of Frances Perkins – the first woman cabinet secretary – named by President Franklin Roosevelt to head the Department of Labor. Frances Perkins started her public service career at Hull House, where she served as a fulltime volunteer for 6 months in 1906 (Newman, in press). She later gained significant positions of power in the Roosevelt administration and translated Hull House philosophy into national labor legislation. Perkins left Hull House in 1907 to become executive secretary of the Philadelphia Research and Protective Association, where she investigated mistreatment of immigrants and black women in the city. In 1910, she became executive secretary of the New York City Consumers’ League and served as an effective lobbyist in Albany for labor legislation. She continued to gain ever more responsible jobs, rising by 1928 to be one of New York Governor Al Smith’s key labor advisors. I am certain that a number of other significant women of that generation were affiliated with Hull House; similarly, many of the public administration gurus that we celebrate, quote, and commemorate came of age through their work at 1313 E. 60th St. in Chicago. In 1934, Perkins wrote that it was Jane Addams “who taught us to take all elements of the community into conference for the solution of any human problem” (p. 41).

When I researched Laverne Burchfield’s work – one of the few women to play an *acknowledged role* at 1313— I looked for linkages between Burchfield and Hull House but could not find them – though I still suspect that there were at least informal connections.

My point in this regard is that the field plays fast and loose with our intellectual history. I hope that up-and-coming scholars who enjoy historical research will look not just for the skeleton’s bones that have shaped us, but for the connective tissue that makes things work. A deeper, richer, more accurate history of the development of public

administration in this country will enrich our understanding of how we got to where we are today.

Finally, my sixth point pertains to September 11, 2001. The events of that day will be marked as a watershed in our history, and its meaning is only beginning to become clear. There is no going back; our lifestyle and economy have engendered a hatred of us too deep to comprehend and too prevalent to ignore. Societal fault lines have expanded to global fault lines. In response, what we used to take for granted as the American way of life has changed. Restrictions in public access to government buildings and increased security measures wipe away the sense of freedom that was once a matter of American pride. What this portends for matters of governance is only beginning to become obvious. The implications of the Patriot Act continue to unfold and affect individual liberties, the power of the state, the power of institutions, and the lives of citizens. The confluence of restricted liberties, suspicion of "others," fear, and repression deserve prolonged attention for the changes they compel in the American lifestyle.

One of our doctoral students, Melanie Kopp, has been canvassing public administration journals to see how much research has appeared in our literature about September 11. Out of 1,766 articles in 29 journals, she has found only 40 articles published on any aspect of 9/11 and the special issue of *Public Administration Review* contained 21 of these. *When desperation strikes, citizens turn not to the marketplace but to government.* This fact harkens back to Cam Stivers and Cheryl King, who remind us that the marketplace is about you and me; government is for us. It is the "us" that should be our focus.

The asymmetry between the governed and those who govern, along with the erosion of the capacity to manage complex social, economic, and political issues, is symptomatic of change in the nature of the State. Our challenge is to inform about the qualities necessary to provide the civic nutrition that makes communities work amidst this. How we can get our arms around this in a meaningful way is a very large question, but clearly one worth asking.

Summary

To recap, the six areas I have mentioned include

- methodology, in which I urge the field to embrace Mixed Methods rather than relying solely on quantitative data;
- HRM, about which I cite the need to evaluate civil service reforms and in which I encourage sensitivity to a *sine qua non* of service work: emotional intelligence and emotional labor;
- designing compelling measures of performance and accountability that make it possible to speak truth to power;
- marketing public services and government, *per se*;
- appreciating the difference that gender makes in the development of the field of public administration; and
- addressing the repercussions of 9/11 on government, public service, and the citizenry.

References

- Fletcher, Joyce K. 1999. *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. New York: Bantam.
- Guy, Mary E. and Newman, Meredith A. in press. "Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor." *Public Administration Review*.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Newman, Meredith. in press. "Madame Secretary Frances Perkins." In *Outstanding Women in Public Administration*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe
- Perkins, Frances. 1934. *People at Work*. New York: John Day.
- Stivers, Camilla. 2000. *Bureau Men, Settlement Women: Constructing Public Administration in the Progressive Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Wise, Lois. 2002. "Public Management Reform: Competing Drivers of Change." *Public Administration Review* 62(5): 555-567.

The Future Direction of Public Administration Research

Beryl A. Radin

University of Baltimore

bradin@ix.netcom.com

I'd like to look at the future by reviewing the past. It's been 30 years since the publication of Pressman and Wildavsky's seminal book, *Implementation*, in 1973. That volume was hailed as marking a new day in the field. For the first time they, and the other implementation writers who followed, sought to join policy and administration, substance and process. The emergence of this approach was an acknowledgement that neither approach alone provided a good sense of the dynamics of the world.

Before the creation of the implementation, field policy and public administration moved along separate tracks. Policy was largely defined by economists. They focused on substantive impacts as well as on the normative and distributional consequences of the outcomes of programs. They asked questions about who benefits and who loses but they had little sense of why these outcomes occurred or how we got to where we are. This approach made it very difficult to intervene, since there was little attention to the process by which these outcomes occurred. As you will recall, Pressman and Wildavsky focused on the high expectations of Great Society programs, expectations that were dashed in the processes of policy implementation.

In the early 1970s, the public administration field focused almost entirely on process. Few asked the "so what" question. Using our trusty POSTCORB framework we were able to describe how the process worked, but we sought to avoid the normative questions. We focused on the classic issues of PA: human resources, reorganization and organization structure, budgeting, planning, and so forth. The tendency was to emphasize the standard operating procedures that led to the status quo. And our focus on processes often ignored the differences in context and setting. We tried to look for similarities across agency settings and found

the appealing idea that one size of management reform fits all.

The implementation approach joined the two streams. When combined, they asked questions about the impact of intervention and how efforts played out. One of my favorite studies is Paul Hill's evaluation of the Title I compensatory education program at the National Institute of Education. The team he assembled looked at multiple expectations of programs, including the distribution of funds (did they get to the right place, tracing the flow from the federal level to states to local education agencies), how school districts used the money, and the impact of the programs on the test scores of children. This approach allowed one to capture the unique dimensions of this particular program and the education policy area and showed how the federal government attempted to carve out a role in a policy domain that had a limited fiscal role – at its peak it was 9 percent of total elementary and secondary education budget.

What Happened to Implementation?

The implementation analysis that began with Pressman and Wildavsky depicted a very complex process. This was best illustrated by the Rube Goldberg diagrams in the book depicting the complexity of joint action. There was a frustration in the work of Pressman and Wildavsky and an urge to avoid administrative agencies, to go to the market instead. Gene Bardach's work on implementation as a series of games actually engendered a level of cynicism from his readers. Mazmanian and Sabatier sought to be predictive and attempted to create models of implementation. Others followed suit.

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, although there was some continued attention to the implementation field, the implementation focus was marginal within the public administration and other communities. APPAM separated public management from substantive policy in its research conference. ASPA focused on efficiency and microanalysis. Both bought into the public management approach and leaned on the private sector for models and questions. However, the policy section of the APSA did keep the field alive through a newsletter exchange on the implementation field several years ago. Yet there were few public administration people involved at the time.

By the Reagan years, much of what was included in the public administration field effectively took out politics. There were a few courses offered in some universities and some articles in the journals.

As a result, we have tended to avoid a number of questions:

Who benefits, who loses?

What institutional structures surround the implementation process?

Who are the political actors and what do they want?

What predominant values are at play?

I'd like to discuss two examples from my own work in which I have sought to answer those questions; however, I frequently feel that I am going against the grain.

GPRA and Performance Management

There is very little discussion in the work on performance of which political actors are interested in performance and which are not. We have tended to ignore attention to the implicit agenda of those involved. In my work comparing performance management efforts in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand, I found that there were at least three agendas intertwined that were hard to disentangle from one another but came from very different origins. I found that they were negative, neutral, and positive approaches.

Very little attention has been given to the impact of the institutional setting on performance activity, especially federalism. It is an illusion to believe that the federal government can be held accountable for programs in which state and local governments (and others) have significant implementation discretion

Another bias has involved the tendency of writers on performance to talk about "the Congress" and "the interest groups" as if they were homogenous actors marching in lockstep. There has been little attention to the impact of the fragmentation of Congress, in which different agendas and approaches are found between committees, especially the differences between authorizing and appropriating committees..

There are other biases and missing elements. An overwhelming focus has been centered on efficiency values and avoidance of questions related to equity. We have largely ignored the difficulty of linking efficiency approaches to reality of the political system. There is some

understanding that career bureaucrats have adopted a compliance mentality and engaged in gaming in the efforts. We have tended to view their reactions as resistance to change rather than a rational response to unreasonable requests.

The performance movement is an approach to literalism where neither practitioners nor scholars have looked beyond the words used and have ignored a partisan agenda at play. We have bought into one size fits all approaches and a focus on efficiency. We are enamored of centralization and focus on the role of OMB and the Government Reform and Operations committees. We are not sensitive to differences among programs or policy issues.

We have become so enamored of this approach that we have avoided a focus on the problems with PART — the Program Assessment Rating Tool that is a part of the Bush management agenda and its effort to integrate the budget and performance assessments. The effort has been described as having four purposes: to measure and diagnose program performance; to evaluate programs in a systematic, consistent and transparent manner; to inform agency and OMB decisions for management, legislative or regulatory improvements, and budget decisions; and to focus program improvements and measure progress compared with prior year ratings. There are at least five problems with this approach.

1. *The PART effort focuses only on the President's budget and is thus limited to an executive branch perspective.* Agency officials have found themselves in the midst of a PART assessment that moves in a direction that is very different from what they know they can expect in the congressional appropriations process.

2. *The assessment of program purpose and design can be viewed as an attempt to preempt the role of the Congress.* Legislation is often constructed for a range of political reasons that may not be clear or relevant to OMB budget examiners. Some critics believe that it is not appropriate for OMB to second guess Congress in terms of assessment of program purpose and design.

3. *The PART process is described as a value-free enterprise that "simply" rates achievement of program goals.* Program goals often include several purposes and multiple values. The PART effort appears to focus only on the

achievement of efficiency goals. Little in the process highlights program effectiveness, and basically nothing assesses the achievement of equity goals within programs. In many instances, there is a subtle but significant overlay of ideology that has had an impact on the ratings.

4. *Program assessments do not acknowledge the difficulty of collecting performance data in program areas that involve block grants to states.* While PART did employ a questionnaire that was meant to capture the problems involved in block grants, the assessment process does not reflect the special problems involved in this program area. Many of the block grant programs were found to have “results not demonstrated,” and there was little acknowledgement that federal agencies have limited authority to require data from state agencies charged with implementation of these programs.

5. *In order to satisfy the PART requirements, agencies would need to collect new data; however, agencies are constrained both by the mandates of the Paperwork Reduction Act and by budget limitations.* A number of agencies would like to be able to collect data on the achievement of program outcomes. However, they are limited in doing so because of requirements that they reduce the number of data elements. This was a problem in the GPRA implementation and it continues with PART.

I conclude with a few remarks about networks. We have been so focused on micro behaviors within networks that few scholars really look at what occurs substantively around efforts. We seem to be attracted to best practices and not to the reasons networks are operative in one area and not in another. We haven’t examined the relationship between anti-government views and network advocates.

We don’t look at the differences among participants. When networks have both public and private actors, there is little that helps us understand the role that each plays. In the work that my colleagues and I did on the State Rural Development Councils, we found that questions related to conflict of interest and legitimacy of action defined the roles, and the networks stayed at the margins – rather than the center — of issues.

These comments call for the public administration community to return to the concerns that led to the development of the implementation

field 30 years ago. At that time, policy people sought to figure out why their good intentions did not always work, and in the process questioned the questions and raised the concerns of classic public administration. Now is the time for the public administration community to ask the same question: Why have our pronouncements of good management had limited success? It is time to focus on the context and the substance of the programs and policies that are being administered. When we do that we ask the questions that actually are at the core of the political science field.

The Future of Public Administration Research: Is Reinvention Still Relevant?

Frank J. Thompson

University at Albany, SUNY
Thompson@albany.edu

The particular lens I will apply to this topic derives from the dominant administrative reform movement of the 1990s—reinvention, or what some call the “new public management.” The appeal to reinvent public administration made its way on to the agenda of many governments through the work of such authors as David Osborne and Ted Gabler and such initiatives as the National Performance Review and the Winter Commission. The ideas that comprised reinvention were not, per se, new. But in packaging and popularizing them, reinvention proponents did much to shape thinking about how to structure “good” public administration. The movement generated ample, often heated, debate within the academic community, much of which appeared on the pages of the *Public Administration Review*.

Now that the 1990s are fading into history, the question naturally arises: Are the empirical and normative questions emanating from the reinvention movement still worthy of exploration? Or should we all breathe a sigh of relief and move on to study topics suggested by other conceptual frameworks and reform ideologies? Perhaps to the disappointment of several of you in the audience, I believe that we cannot afford to relegate reinvention to the conceptual dustbin at this point. To the contrary, it

seems to me that key tenets of the reinvention movement continue to suggest critically important questions that the public administration community has taken only modest steps to answer. While I would not argue that reinvention ought to be the dominant framework guiding public administration research in the first decade of the new century, I do believe that it points to a research agenda that public administration scholars can ill afford to ignore.

In adopting this position, let me clarify at the outset what I take to be the core tenets of reinvention. These derive from an article that Norma Riccucci and I wrote for the *Annual Review of Political Science* (Nelson W. Polsby, ed., Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, 1998). Based on a careful analysis of reinvention writing, we concluded that four general principles above all characterized the movement. First, reinvention espouses the internal deregulation of government agencies—reducing the rules or “red tape” that supposedly hamstringing public administrators. In this view the central problem of public administration is not that administrators possess too much formal discretion but rather too little. At its core, reinvention venerates the concepts of “let managers manage” and the pursuit of administrative “entrepreneurship.” Second, reformers emphasize that administration ought to be performance based, or mission driven. Administrators ought to be held accountable for achieving certain carefully measured results and rewarded for doing so. Third, reinvention calls for decentralization and front-line empowerment. This admonition tends to assume two guises. One emphasizes the importance of freeing line agencies from control by oversight organizations such as civil service departments. Another stresses the need to pay particular attention to the role of front-line employees in any effort to improve performance. Fourth, reinvention reformers emphasize market ideology and rhetoric. They urge public administrators to identify their “customers” and to keep them satisfied. They tout the virtues of forcing public agencies to compete with private contractors to win the right to provide government services (“competitive sourcing”). Although not always intentionally, they give impetus to the view that beneficiaries of government programs should be given more choice of service providers (e.g., via vouchers) and that policy makers should help citizens become more effective consumers of public goods through the promulgation of report cards and other tools designed to create

smarter markets.

When they are placed in the context of emerging trends in politics and governance, these tenets highlight an important set of research foci for the public administration community. In the limited time available on this panel, I will discuss a subset of these topics that seems particularly pivotal.

Rules and Administrative Discretion

Public administration scholars should focus attention on key issues that arise from reinvention’s emphasis on freeing administrators from formal rules. In part this means building on a long tradition of useful research rooted primarily in social psychology. In this regard, the work on perceptions of red tape associated with such scholars as Barry Bozeman and Hal Rainey should continue.

But the most promising avenues for progress in this area may well spring from efforts to examine more objectively the degree to which statutes and codes of administrative regulation “let managers manage” and the implications of rule specificity and density for performance and accountability. In this sense, I side with such scholars as David Rosenbloom who have persistently emphasized the importance of paying attention to law in our efforts to fathom public administration.

Consider, for instance, the issue of statutory specificity. Over 20 years ago, two students of policy implementation, Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sabatier, presented a model that assigned considerable importance to statutory precision as a precondition for effective program implementation. Texts on implementation frequently endorse this proposition. In fact, however, scholars have not systematically tested the validity of this hypothesis with a significant sample of programs. More recently, two political scientists, John Huber and Charles Shipan, have in a Herculean effort coded and analyzed statutory constraints on administrators in the United States and Europe (see their *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*, Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Unlike Mazmanian and Sabatier, they focus on the circumstances (e.g., divided government) under which legislative bodies tend to write precise laws to constrain administrators. In the principal-agent tradition of much of contemporary political science, they are preoccupied with issues of administrative con-

trol rather than performance. But their work, along with that of Sabatier and Mazmanian, appropriately spotlights the relevance of statutory analysis for public administration research. Reinvention has primarily focused on freeing public administrators from rules embedded in management systems that target procurement, personnel, and the like. This focus should continue, but it also should be broadened to include consideration of the degree to which statutes generally free or restrict administrative agencies and the implications of various patterns for performance and accountability.

In pursuing this agenda, the public administration community should also be alert to research opportunities provided by outliers, i.e., extreme cases of internal deregulation. In this regard, the radical transformation of civil service systems in Florida and Georgia over the last decade should be the target of systematic analysis. Both states took giant steps to throw out the statutory and administrative rules that had come to define their “merit” systems. Will these bold initiatives to establish “at-will” employment practices and to “let managers manage” make it harder or easier for these states to recruit, motivate, and retain talented public servants? To what extent, if at all, will these initiatives also become a vehicle for the return of old-fashioned political patronage? The two states (along with Texas, which has persistently had a deregulated personnel system) provide important laboratories to probe these and related questions. (The successful efforts of the Bush Administration in Washington to prune rules protecting the rights of employees in the Department of Homeland Security represent a less radical version of reinvention but also deserve careful analysis.)

Performance-Based Accountability: Building on a Base

The empirical and normative issues embedded in reinvention’s push to make public administration more performance driven should also command attention. At least rhetorically, the Bush administration and the leaders of many state and local governments continue to promote this principle. Public administration scholars have made impressive headway in studying issues of performance management. Robert Behn and Beryl Radin have, for instance, elucidated the subject as has a panoply of authors in Dall Forsythe’s edited volume, *Quicker, Better, Cheaper* (Albany, New York:

Rockefeller Institute of Government, 2001).

The task of the public administration community for this decade is in many respects an exercise in normal science—continued, steady effort to build on this knowledge base. Additional study can, for instance, better specify the range of conditions under which various kinds of performance management systems emerge and sustain themselves. So, too, researchers should examine the policies and politics that shape the commitment and capacity of federal agencies (e.g., the Census Bureau) to provide the data needed to track program performance. Inquiry can also usefully probe the political uses (especially symbolic) of performance management by top elected officials. From a normative perspective, those skeptical of the performance paradigm need to sharpen their specification of alternatives to it. In many cases, steps other than those embedded in the performance-management approach may well do much more to enhance program effectiveness and efficiency. But critics of performance management have not to this point articulated, attractively labeled, and promoted an alternative (perhaps hybrid) normative model.

Market Principles, Patronage, and Citizenship

The market ideology of the reinvention movement points to a particularly important set of research questions. Achieving intellectual legitimacy from its ties to economic theory, rhetorical commitment to market mechanisms in public administration has grown under the Bush administration and in many state governments (especially those where the Republican Party has gained hegemony over the last decade). Two research foci strike me as particularly central in the wake of these developments.

The first revolves around “competitive sourcing”—the view, popularized by the story of garbage collection in Phoenix, that public agencies ought to compete with private entities to demonstrate that they can provide some government service more efficiently and effectively. In this regard the Bush administration has proposed that some 850,000 federal jobs, about half of the federal civilian workforce excluding the postal service, be subjected to competitive sourcing. Many other officials at all levels of government simply assume that private firms will outperform public agencies and

dogmatically pursue privatization. Researchers have devoted considerable attention to the implications of privatization for performance and accountability. This stream of inquiry should continue. It will also be important to assess the processes of competitive sourcing, especially as they evolve under the Bush administration in Washington. The degree to which the decision rules embedded in these processes stack the deck for public agencies or private vendors in the competition to perform a service should be scrutinized.

Of even greater importance, however, the public administration community should assay the extent to which privatization constitutes a new partisan patronage. The old spoils model of patronage politics, where government employees owed their jobs to a particular political party, frequently featured a requirement that these workers ante up a portion of their salaries to the party. To what degree does this dynamic now apply to private contractors? Anecdotal accounts suggest the importance of privatization as a vehicle for obtaining campaign funds. In New Jersey state and local politics, for instance, the conventional wisdom has it that private firms must “pay to play”—that they must make campaign contributions to those in power if they wish to obtain government contracts. Others claim that Governor Jeb Bush’s commitment to privatization in Florida partly emanates from a concern to keep his campaign coffers flush. Are these and related assertions empirically correct? I have uncovered no studies that address this proposition in any systematic way. It deserves note that the research target here is not hard-to-study “corruption” in the legal sense of that phrase (e.g., secret kick-backs to politicians from contractors). Instead, investigation of this phenomenon requires careful assessment of the relationship between contract awards and contributions to political parties and candidates.

A second important focus for research arising from reinvention’s commitment to market ideology centers on the possible trade-off between enhancing the skills of the populace as consumers rather than as citizens. Critics of reinvention have questioned its emphasis on customers and choice arguing that, among other things, this thrust undermines the values of community and citizen development.

This controversy intersects with a tension that Albert Hirschman masterfully depicted over

three decades ago in his book, *Exit, Voice, And Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970). Consistent with the logic of reinvention, Hirschman acknowledged that enhancing the public’s capacity to exit a poorly performing agency could motivate the agency to improve its service. But he also assigned considerable importance to voice—the frequency and skill with which citizens express their views, mobilize coalitions, shape public opinion, and generally seek to influence those who hold public authority. Like the latter-day critics of reinvention, Hirschman worried that enhancing opportunities for exit in a society could cause its mechanisms of voice to atrophy. Put somewhat differently, efforts to enhance the capacity of the populace as consumers might well erode the capacity of the populace as citizens of the polis.

To what degree and in what ways do current efforts to expand choice, or exit opportunities, for citizens attenuate their willingness and capacity to express political voice? An array of methodological and other factors confound attempts to answer this question definitively. Clearly, however, current initiatives to enlarge choice in one of the most important public arenas—elementary and secondary education—offer a golden opportunity to plumb this issue. In this regard, I commend a recent book by Mark Schneider and associates called *Choosing Schools* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). The volume rests on an analysis of how parents responded in four school districts where they had varying degrees of choice concerning where to send their children to school. The study partly gauges how different classes of parents performed as consumers, such as the degree to which they possessed knowledge about pertinent characteristics of different schools. But the book also probes the question of whether enhanced choice increases or diminishes citizen involvement with the schools. In this regard, Schneider and his coauthors found a positive relationship between opportunities for choice and various indicators of such involvement (which they call social capital). These findings suggest that there may not be a sharp trade-off between reinvention’s emphasis on the exit option and more traditional concerns with building citizen capacity to exercise political voice. In fact, the two initiatives may at times reinforce one another.

Evidence from one study in one policy domain can hardly be viewed as conclusive. Indeed,

the measures that Schneider and his associates use to gauge citizen involvement have many limitations as indicators of political voice. Despite these limitations, however, the authors do deserve credit for seeking to move the debate about civic versus consumer capacity beyond the realm of general assertion to careful hypothesis testing. Further empirical investigation of this kind in the context of public schools and other domains could do much to elevate discussion of this important issue.

In sum, the public administration community cannot over the next few years safely ignore the core tenets that congealed into the reinvention movement in the 1990s. In one form or another, many of these principles continue to receive endorsement—at the top levels of the Bush administration, in many statehouses, and in countless local governments. Moreover, top officials frequently seem inclined to walk the talk of reinvention through sweeping deregulation of civil service systems, major commitments to “competitive sourcing,” expanded opportunities for citizen choice, and in other ways. Hence, public administration scholars should continue to target the empirical and normative questions that emanate from the reinvention movement.

In doing so, these researchers will not only elucidate the perennial public administration issues of performance and accountability, they will also cast light on the more general fabric of American politics and democracy at the dawn of the new century.

References

- Forsythe, Dall, ed. 2001. *Quicker, Better, Cheaper*. Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- Hirschmann, Albert. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Huber, John and Shipan, Charles. 2002. *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Riccucci, Norma and Thompson, Frank. 1998. In Nelson Polsby, ed. *Annual Review of Political Science*. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Schneider, Mark, and associates. 2000. *Choosing Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

PMRA Secretariat
Public Administration Department
University of Kansas
1541 Lilac Lane, #318
Lawrence, KS 66045