

**Leading the Future of the Public Sector: The Third Transatlantic Dialogue  
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA**

**May 31 – June 2, 2007**

**Workshop 2 Leadership Diversity**

**Agency Leadership and Active Representation in a Diverse State  
Organization**

**Joan M. Gibran  
and  
Ann Marie Rizzo**

**Ann-Marie Rizzo  
Tennessee State University  
Nashville  
Tennessee**

**ABSTRACT**

Despite a fairly extensive literature in representative bureaucracy, we still have not clearly identified many of the organizational processes and influences that move passive representatives from mere perceptions of discretion to active representation. The purpose of this study is to identify some of the effects and sources of administrative discretion, and some of the factors which motivate administrators to exercise their discretion and enact representative behaviors. The following research questions form the basis of this paper: What organizational characteristics influence perceptions of discretion? What is the relationship between organizational characteristics, role expectations and individual perceptions of discretion? Are these relationships significant in the process of translating passive into active representation? The data for this study were gathered from a survey of 2,329 State of Tennessee employees. The findings suggest that the effects of organization structure and processes on perceptions of discretion are mediated by organizational leadership. These mediating influences appear to be particularly important under conditions of uncertainty. The generalizability of this study is limited to state employment in Tennessee. Future studies should be extended to employees in other states and focus on smaller sets of the significant relationships identified in this study.

## **Introduction**

Public administrators play an important function in those institutions and processes which flow from the Constitution and which assert the importance of responsiveness to democratically elected representatives by acting on the inherent responsibility to protect the integrity of democratic processes.<sup>1</sup> With respect to bureaucracy, the assumption is that administrators should exercise their discretion in service of the public interest. That is, in the interests of those whom they represent.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the theory of representative bureaucracy does not undermine the importance of accountability, responsiveness and responsibility in administrative behavior. Rather, it is consistent with Rohr's concept of a legitimate public administration grounded in the Constitution and exercising its discretion to favor policies promoting the public interest.<sup>3</sup> This theory attempts to reconcile unavoidable legislative delegation of decision making authority with the principles of administrative responsiveness to elected representatives. At the same time, it also addresses the need for responsiveness to the public by permitting the exercise of administrative values.<sup>4</sup>

From the abundance of literature on organizational leadership, it has by now become conventional wisdom that leadership in diverse government organizations sets the tone for administrative behavior and agency performance. Agency leaders influence administrative behavior by defining the broad parameters of policy and rules and by helping to create the organizational climate within which administrators form perceptions of their discretionary powers. In a diverse organization, passive representation translates to active representation when administrators exercise their perceived discretionary powers in the purposeful pursuit of those they represent in their agency's client community. If we accept that one of the performance goals of public agencies is to serve the interests of their client communities, including minorities, then we can also accept that agency leadership has a transformational role in linking passive representation to active representation.

Research in representative bureaucracy has provided us with a fairly extensive list of variables that link passive to active representation. These linkages include administrators' demographic characteristics, their acceptance of a representative or advocacy role on behalf of minorities, their organizational characteristics, and perceptions of discretion. Research has found these variables to be significantly related to agency outcomes favoring minorities. However, a clearer picture has yet to emerge of what are the actual mechanisms by which passive representation translates into active representation. We do not have a very clear understanding of the effects and sources of administrative discretion as a variable that moves administrators to active pursuit of minority interests.

This paper will explore the role of agency leadership in diverse organizations and how leadership interacts with other variables in the organizational context to affect perceptions of discretion and to strengthen the linkages between passive and active representation.

## **Theoretical Background**

Mosher defined "passive" or "sociological representation" as referring to the source of origin of individuals and the degree to which they share origins and interests with the population at large. He conceptualized active representation as not just shared origins and interests, but the *purposeful* pursuit of the interests which administrators share with those in the populations that they represent.<sup>5</sup> Hanna Pitkin distinguished the concepts of active and passive representation by

pointing out that a passive representative is one who is “standing for” those he represents in a symbolic capacity. The active representative, on the other hand, is one who is “acting for” others in ways that corresponds to what they represent as a group holding similar characteristics and attitudes.<sup>6</sup>

Krislov was among the first to find that the most significant variables in explaining the linkage between passive and active representation were sex, race and ethnicity.<sup>7</sup> Seldon and others produced evidence demonstrating that differences in the backgrounds of different demographic groups produce common socialization experiences within those groups which help to shape common attitudes, values and beliefs.<sup>8</sup> These values, held in common with their demographic peers, move administrators to seek greater access for their group to policy processes and to promote policies which they believe are more responsive to their community interests.

Extant research suggests that the variables identified above are necessary, but not sufficient conditions for linking workplace diversity of passive to active representation. Other conditions must also be fulfilled in order to move administrators toward actions which represent group interests. Thompson pointed out that the organizational environment, the issue area under consideration, and the physical proximity of minority individuals to each other are also important linkages.<sup>9</sup> Others found that if sufficient numbers of a minority group exist within an organization and they hold similar views to those held by the external community, it is more likely that they will assume a representative role.<sup>10</sup> Minority administrators must also be able to exert influence on the direction of organizational activities; and policies adopted by the organization must be implemented by minorities.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, administrators must not only be willing, but must also be able to exercise discretion in policy formulation in the areas where they assume a representative or advocacy role.<sup>12</sup>

In the absence of clearly communicated, unambiguous goals, comprehensive and explicit rules, the administrator exercises his personal discretion and pursues his own understanding and vision of appropriate organizational objectives.<sup>13</sup> Agency leaders and political elites influence administrative behavior by defining the broad parameters of policy, rules and regulations. At the same time, agency clients hold expectations of service and responsiveness.

What agencies do and the effects they have on their participants do make a difference for representative bureaucracy, because government agency performance is mediated by leadership and management strategies. By setting organizational conditions in representative bureaucracies, leaders set the context for organizational experiences and what messages will be sent to administrators regarding expectations for their actions and performance. They also set the organizational context that affects administrators’ willingness to pursue active representation. Ultimately, leaders also influence organizational output by the means they provide to their agencies for meeting organizational goals.<sup>14</sup>

Organizational structure creates the objective characteristics that frame bureaucratic responses to demands from the external environment. Structure arbitrates the nature of internal relationships and interactions and significantly effects administrative behavior.<sup>15</sup> Structural conditions also create different work cultures and patterns of interaction and exert powerful effects on administrative behavior.<sup>16</sup>

Organizational processes are designed to control and coordinate individual behavior in ways that lead to predictable organizational outcomes. Organizational processes include control,

work and communication practices which guide organizational behavior in the attainment of organizational goals.<sup>17</sup>

For the purposes of this research, passive representation is understood according to Mosher's use of the term. It is the shared demographic characteristics between administrators and the population their agencies serve.<sup>18</sup> Active representation is conceptualized according to Pitkin's description as the purposeful acting on behalf of groups in the population with whom the administrator shares demographic similarities. However, this definition is expanded to include Hinderer's concept of the active pursuit of the interests of groups with whom administrators do not share demographic characteristics, but who they believe are deserving of special attention.<sup>19</sup>

This research addresses the following questions:

1. What are the organizational characteristics that lead to individual perceptions of a high or low discretion context within their organization?
2. What is the nature of the relationships between organizational characteristics, administrative role expectations, and administrative perceptions of the discretion?
3. Are these variables and their associations sufficiently significant to identify them as mediating variables in the process of translating passive into active representation?

### **Findings**

The research questions were addressed in a MANCOVA model designed to test the three sets of research hypotheses. After the three sets of multivariate tests were conducted, the dependent variables from these three equations were then tested as independent variables in a final test for their effects on all the advocacy output dependent variables. Appendix I contains a description of the research method and study model for this project, its operationalization and research hypotheses.

The MANCOVA multivariate tests related to the first research question revealed significant effects on administrator's perceptions of their discretion related to structural dimensions, such as job specialization, differentiation and size. Thus, the effects of structural differentiation and administrative span of control are found to be significant in contributing to administrators' perceptions of their discretion.

When administrators encounter situations where the division of labor and differentiation between job functions creates information bottlenecks which would impede decision making, they still feel constrained to make decisions. These circumstances significantly affect their perceptions of discretion and, given other conditions, can help to create an organizational context which supports advocacy.

This study found that administrators tend to perceive this kind of situation as granting them authority to fill the gaps left by the rules in order to get the job done. This tendency to assume discretion appears to be significantly reinforced when the agency has a stated service mission, a culture of collaborative decision making, and leaders who are actively engaged with their organizational members and supportive of their efforts to help clients. Thus structural variables can affect perceptions of discretion to interpret and fill in where rules are vague or inadequate, and leadership encourages advocacy. These variables, combined with perceptions of an advocacy mission emerge as significant in linking diversity to outcomes which benefit minorities.

These dimensions of organizational structure affect administrators' perceptions, mostly through their effects on access to adequate information for decision making. To the extent that these structural dimensions impede the flow of information, they also create opportunities for administrators to exercise individual discretion in order to get their jobs done. Thus, organizational structure can help to create a discretion context that supports advocacy behavior in individuals who are inclined towards representative behavior.

The information from personal interviews corroborated these findings. Those administrators interviewed pointed to the fact that their agency's work was divided up into several administrative and program segments. Administering their agency's programs is often complicated by multiple funding sources, the intergovernmental and inter-agency nature of the programs they implement. In all instances, these administrators reported that one of the greatest consequences of these complexities was difficulties with communication and information flows. Most interviewees believed that this affected their ability to make fully informed decisions and forced them to exercise discretion in order to "make things work."

This multivariate test results research indicate that under certain conditions, an individual's span of control significantly effects his perceptions of discretion. Where the individual's span of control forces delegation of decision making and the agency has a culture of collaborative problem solving and effective monitoring procedures, perceptions of the discretionary context are more positive. Most of the administrators interviewed reported that their agency encouraged joint problem solving and consultation. This, along with documentation and accountability procedures and good working relationships with their subordinates, made them feel comfortable about delegating decision making. This was especially the case when they delegate decision making to competent professionals. These administrators believe that delegation does not impair their control over the resulting decisions. Rather, they reported that delegation to competent individuals in a collaborative environment enhances the quality of decisions and their willingness to support minority interests.

The multivariate test associated with the second research question results indicate that administrators' perception of their discretion to pursue minority interests is significantly affected by the messages they receive from their agency leadership and from the public regarding expectations for their behavior. Thus, role expectations are another set of significant intervening variables in the linkage between passive and active representation. The test results indicate that when administrators perceive that they are expected to produce results that benefit minorities, and when they believe that this expectation includes a grant of discretion to interpret rules that are vague or inadequate, they behave in ways that are consistent with these expectations. The expectations of external stakeholders, such as the recipient community, that administrators should produce output which benefit them also emerged as significant in shaping administrators' perceptions of discretion, and in moving them towards representative behavior.

Administrators' belief that they are expected to use their professional judgment to provide the greatest possible benefits for their clients is also significant for their perceptions of discretion. Their belief that they are expected to interpret rules in order to help their clients also showed significance for administrators' perception of their discretion to pursue active representation.

One of the insights to emerge from the personal interviews is that in forming their perception of what their agency expects of them, employees look to their leaders and pay careful attention to their agency's mission statement. They often refer to the mission statement and

other messages from their leaders in determining what their priorities should be. When organizational and program complexity and organizational differentiation impede the flow of information and create uncertainty about the meaning and intent of rules, administrators reported that they exercise discretion in pursuit of client's interest, based on what they believe to be the mission of their agency. The interviewees in this study reported that when they perceived that their mission statement places emphasis on serving the needy, it encourages their willingness to direct their discretionary action towards applying rules and policies in order to gain those results.

Administrators' perceptions of an explicit advocacy mandate were reinforced when they believe that their leadership supports an advocacy mission with material and other resources. Based on the personal interviews, it was also clear that employees distinguished between what they saw as symbolic versus substantive mission statements and goals. They judged their leaders' genuineness of intent by what they actually do to support stated agency goals. Administrators reported more positive advocacy attitudes when they believe that their leaders genuinely supported active representation.

Both the quantitative and qualitative information from this study indicated that monitoring and documentation procedures can serve to encourage the exercise of discretion and active representation. When organizational structure and processes create uncertainty because of problems with communication and information flows, monitoring and control processes can create a sense of empowerment. Administrators see rules as both confining and permitting discretion. Administrators reported a preference for clear and comprehensive rules. At the same time, they reported being more active in protecting minority interests and in taking independent action when there is uncertainty or the rules are not adequate.

These findings do not fit Finer's image of self-serving bureaucrats whose behavior needs to be constrained by the tightest possible controls. Rather, they conform more to Freidrich's image of a professional bureaucrat with a strong sense of responsibility to the agency leaders and political overseers to guard against the unsanctioned use of discretion. At the same time, these administrators also believe that they must be responsive to their public and strive to adopt policy in the best interest of that public.

When rules fall short of decision making needs and there is uncertainty because of problems with communication and information flows, monitoring procedures provide administrators with a means of documenting their exercise of discretion and preempting future questions of deviation from agency expectations or of unethical conduct. When administrators perceive that there is transparency and accountability in decision making they reported a greater willingness to take actions to help their clients and which they believe to be consistent with agency objectives.

The results of tests on the third research question indicate that the effects of the significant structural and process variables and role expectations on actual representative behavior are mediated by administrators' perceptions of discretion. The exercise of discretion which produces representative behavior is mediated by a complex interaction between the decisional context created by these variables and the influence of agency leadership. First, agency outputs that favor of minorities are significantly affected when rules are not comprehensive enough and administrators perceive that they have the discretion to interpret rules in order to help agency clients. In circumstances where they also believe that their leaders support active representation, they are more likely to exercise the discretion which allows them to produce results which benefit minorities.

This conclusion is supported by other multivariate test results which indicate that representative agency output is significantly affected by administrators' decision making in conditions of uncertainty about information or the application of rules. These findings were supported by qualitative information which indicated that uncertainty enhances administrators' tendencies towards collaborative problem solving and creative thinking in the agencies studied. When these administrators believe that their agency leadership encourages collaboration, they also tended to believe that joint decision making produces better and more justifiable decisions. Again, most of the administrators interviewed reported that this belief, along with the belief that their leaders encourage active representation and the existence of documentation procedures, encourages them to make decisions which they believe will benefit minorities.

Another interesting insight to emerge from the qualitative research is that in agencies where there are high levels of interaction and mutual problem solving activities between leadership and subordinates, administrators reported a stronger sense of mission and were more confident about pursuing active representation.

### **Implications for Agency Leadership**

This study indicates that structural arrangements supported by appropriate communication, decision making, and monitoring processes that are reinforced by strong and consistent messages from leadership can enhance perceptions of discretion and encourage active representation. These support processes help to overcome some of the complications which complexity and uncertainty add to organizational decision making processes. Leadership in diverse agencies can enhance active representation by actively engaging with their organizational members and by promoting a culture of mission oriented activity and open communication. These behaviors can enhance decision making and promote active representation by encouraging administrators in goal oriented consultation and collaboration. When leaders back this kind of decision making process by moral and material support for the achievement of agency goals, they create a sense of empowerment for administrators.

The administrators in this study reported that this kind of environment helps them to feel that the agency values their contributions and opinions and that they can actually influence organizational outcomes and thereby help their clients. Collaboration, mutual problem solving and information flows can be enhanced by structuring communications and workflow hand-off processes so that they produce tangible rewards for parties on both sides of the exchange. This could provide mutually beneficial power bases that can encourage advocacy behavior in administrators. This is true for inter-unit as well as inter-agency relations.

Agency leadership and management can also encourage active representation by ensuring that monitoring and compliance procedures are designed to support responsible and responsive administrative advocacy. These procedures can provide administrators with tools for documenting and justifying their discretionary behavior by producing evidence of successful outcomes for the agency and its clients. Such procedures can help to create a sense of security because they provide a "paper trail" which satisfies administrators' needs to demonstrate decision making rationality and justify their actions in terms of agency objectives. These reporting mechanisms contribute to an organizational context which supports responsible discretionary behavior and active representation.

Administrators' beliefs about the role expectations others hold for them are significant in forming their perceptions of discretion to help agency clients. The messages that agencies send

to their administrators were found to be significant in shaping their beliefs about what behavior is expected of them. The administrators in this study reacted both to what they believe their agencies and the public expects of them. This is not a new finding. But, with respect to representative bureaucracy, this finding introduces the notion that clear and consistent communications of agency missions, goals, and expectations for administrative behavior are especially important in linking passive to active representation in complex organizations fraught with uncertainty.

Administrators pay attention to mission and goal statements and they distinguish between substantive and symbolic mission and goal statements. Mission statements made by disengaged agency leadership that are not supported with resources and appropriate processes are viewed as being only symbolic. They seem to generate frustration and disenchantment among administrators, with diminishing effects on their advocacy behavior. However, when mission statements are supported by enthusiastic leadership and backed with the necessary resources and appropriate procedures, they create a sense of empowerment and help to motivate advocacy behavior in administrators.

Administrators' beliefs that they were expected to execute their responsibilities in a professional manner appear to reinforce their approach to advocacy. As stated above, the agency's mission and goal statements provide a powerful source of messages about expectations for administrative behavior. When administrators in this study combine their beliefs about their agencies and what their public expects of them, such as professional behavior and support of the needy, with the role expectations derived from their agency's mission statements, the result appears to be advocacy that involves a judicious balancing act between the key values of public administration.

In agencies where administrators believed that their agencies expect them to produce results which support their clients' interests, personal and professional values provide strong guidance for their exercise of discretion. This is true especially when rules and policies are vague or inadequate to guide decision making. This study demonstrated that in order to meet role expectations, administrators construct a course of action that is shaped by their leaders' messages, and their professional and administrative values of responsiveness, responsibility, accountability, equity, and ethics.

Another significant factor in the relationship between passive and active representation is organizational uncertainty. When administrators are faced with uncertainty they tend to assume discretionary powers. The decisions they make under these circumstances appear to have significant effects on agency outcomes which benefit minorities. Therefore, restricting minute rules and procedures can limit opportunities for advocacy. One implication of this is that agencies with social service missions should craft their rules and procedures to allow a reasonable amount of flexibility for administrative action. For example, in circumstances literal rule compliance could result in regulatory unreasonableness and a failure to fulfill the agency's mission. Rules could introduce flexibility by allowing administrators to implement acceptable alternative procedures, such as waivers and deadline extensions.

Leaders and managers therefore have the responsibility of creating an environment within representative bureaucracies that is conducive to the exercise of discretion. This research shows that agency leadership plays a crucial role in promoting active representation in diverse agencies. It also points to the fact that in order for leaders to encourage representative outcomes, they must

ensure that structural and procedural arrangements facilitate the responsible exercise of administrative discretion.

Research by Kelley indicated that at the street level, less traditional bureaucratic structures and processes, such as decentralization of decision making and formalization have the potential for enhancing participant's willingness to exercise discretion and improve service delivery.<sup>20</sup> Andrews indicated that the willingness to exercise discretion is enhanced when organizational functions are divided in such a way that facilitates constructive interaction processes between implementing units.<sup>21</sup> The results of this study support these findings and indicate that these effects can positively affect active representation of minority interests.

### **Limitations of Study and Suggestions for Future Research**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine correlations between variables rather than to establish causation. As a consequence of this design, the results are only explanatory and cannot be generalized to indicate the existence of causal relationships between the significant independent variables identified and their dependent variables. They merely indicate that significant correlations were found and suggest phenomena that merit further study in order to be able to generalize results to a larger population, or to establish causal relationships. Despite these caveats this study provides us with some clearer insights into the linkages between diversity and active representation. This study also provides us with some interesting questions for future research.

One limitation of this study was the large number of multidimensional relationships it attempted to capture at once. Multidimensionality is an inescapable but troublesome feature of social science research because social phenomena are inherently complex. But multidimensionality also has the potential to introduce countervailing components into each variable. A series of smaller studies with more narrow foci would have provided a better understanding of the phenomena than this study has produced.

Insights provided by the qualitative component of this study, however, present a compelling argument for more qualitative research to advance our understanding of the linkages between passive and active representation. A larger number of interviews would have provided a better understanding of the linkages between passive and active representation. It would have provided a more detailed understanding of how individuals interpret their organizational context, develop perceptions about their roles in that environment and enact those roles. This would have provided helpful insight into active representation particularly in a state, such as Tennessee, where the civic culture is generally regarded as passive rather than activist.

The relationship between internal and external role expectations and administrators' perceptions of discretion needs further study. There are many and conflicting sources of expectations. When administrators' perceptions of these expectations combine with the realities of organizational structure and processes, it is expected that some effects will be muted, while others will be enhanced. The interactions between the morphological organizational variables, and individual and group psychological variables merit further investigation in order to understand what it is that moves an individual from a mere perception of discretionary authority to the exercise of that authority.

Another subject for future study is the effects of uncertainty on administrators' perceptions of discretion and discretionary power. There appears to be a complex relationship

between administrators and their rules. Administrators see rules as both confining and permitting discretion. They appear to prefer clear and comprehensive rules. At the same time, they appear to be more active in protecting minority interests and in taking independent action when there is uncertainty or the rules are not adequate. These administrators also believe that they must be responsive to their public and strive to adopt policy in the best interest of that public. A better understanding of these relationships would also help to clarify the extent to which the professional orientations and different types of personal service ethics influence behaviors in these contexts. This would help to further clarify the linkages between passive and active representation.

### **Conclusion**

By using an individual level of measurement and by identifying some of the sources from which perceptions of discretion arise, this study has gone beyond the current literature which identifies discretion as an intervening variable between passive and active representation. This research identified several factors which help to transform perceptions of discretion into actual discretion or active representation. This was done by identifying some of the interactions between the organizational size, functional differentiation and role expectations. These perceptions of discretion, when combined with their perceptions of rule adequacy and their authority to interpret rules were, in turn, shown to be significant for actual agency output or active representation.

This study supports many of the insights in current literature on leadership and agency performance. It identifies interesting and complex and dynamic interrelationships between organizational structure, processes and the organizational culture that leadership creates. These relationships are significant in moving administrators from passive to active representation. Leadership influence and behavior significantly affect administrators' perception of their discretion and authority to interpret and implement rules in ways that benefits their agency's clients, particularly minorities. In turn, administrators' perceptions of the scope of their discretion and of expectations for their behavior significantly influence their behavior and agency outcomes on behalf of both minority and non-minority clients.

This undertaking has also identified significant elements in the interaction between role expectations and organizational processes which encourage active representation. Under certain conditions, organizational processes, such as communication, interaction, and monitoring processes, contribute to administrators' perceptions of what their roles should be and what discretionary authority is inherent for realizing those role expectations. The work context created by administrative leadership emerges as a critical environmental factor in mediating the complex interrelationships between individual values, their organizational structure, processes, and administrative behavior. The conclusions of this study are by no means definitive, but they support existing research and serve to highlight some new and interesting linkages and issues for future research. Further study of these linkages and issues has the potential for greatly enhancing our understanding of the linkages between representative bureaucracy and active representation.

## References

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Burke, John P., and Robert E. Cleary, "Reconciling Public Administration and Democracy: The Role of the Responsible Administrator," *Public Administration Review* 49, no. 2 (1989), 189-186.
- <sup>2</sup> Thomas J. Barth, "The Public Interest and Administrative Discretion," *American Review of Public Administration* 22, no. 4 (1992). Barth concluded that for the public administrator, serving public interest refers to "an ongoing concern with the effects of policies and programs on individuals and groups," 292.
- <sup>3</sup> Rohr, John A., *To Run a Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State*, (Laurence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1986).
- <sup>4</sup> Saltzstein, "Bureaucratic Responsiveness," 67; and West, William F. "Structuring Administrative Discretion: The Pursuit of Rationality and Responsiveness." *American Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 2 (1984), 340-360, 344.
- <sup>5</sup> Mosher, Fredrick. C., *Democracy and the Public Service*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944), 13, 19.
- <sup>6</sup> Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel, *The Concept of Representation*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967), 96.
- <sup>7</sup> Krislov, Samuel, *Representative Bureaucracy*, (Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall, 1974). Examples of these studies are, Nachmais, David, and David H. Rosenbloom, "Measuring Bureaucratic Representation and Integration," *Public Administration Review*, 33, no. 6 (November-December 1973), 590-597, and Meier, Kenneth John. "Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis," *The American Political Science Review* 69, no. 2 (June 1975), 526-542.
- <sup>8</sup> Seldon, Sally C., *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness in a Government Agency*, (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharp, 1997), See also Seldon, Sally Coleman, Jeffrey L. Brudney, and J. Edward Kellough, "Bureaucracy as a Representative Institution: Toward a Reconciliation of Bureaucratic Government and Democratic Theory," *American Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 3 (1998), 717-744; and Brudney, Jeffrey L., F. Ted Hebert, and Deil S. Wright, "From Organizational Values to Organizational Roles," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10, no. 3 (2000), 491-512.
- <sup>9</sup> Thompson, Frank J., "Minority Groups in Public Bureaucracies: Are Passive and Active Representation Linked?" *Administration and Society* 8 (1976), 215-217.
- <sup>10</sup> Meier, Kenneth J., Robert D. Wrinkle, and J. L. Polinard, "Representative Bureaucracy and Distributional Equity: Addressing the Hard Question," *The Journal of Politics* 61, no. 4 (1999), 1025-1039; and Hindera, John J., and Cheryl D. Young. "Representative Bureaucracy: The Theoretical Implications of Statistical Interaction," *Political Research Quarterly* 51, no. 3 (1998), 655-671. Hindera's study suggested that although race tends to correlate strongly with policy congruence when minorities are sufficient in numbers it is also possible that non-minorities can adopt sympathetic policy views towards minorities and assume an active policy stance with respect to minority issues. For example, Hindera and Young found that white administrators also assumed a representative stance on behalf of blacks when black administrators were in the majority within the organization.
- <sup>11</sup> Meier, Kenneth J., and Robert E. England, "Black Representation and Educational Policy: Are They Related?" *The American Political Science Review* 78, no. 2 (1984), 392-403.
- <sup>12</sup> Meier, Kenneth J., and John Bohte, "Structure and Discretion: The Missing Links in Representative Bureaucracy," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11, no. 4 (2001), 455-470.

---

<sup>13</sup> Mladenka III, Kenneth R., "Implementing Urban Services," in *Public Policy Implementation*, ed George C. Edwards, 171-193, (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1984), 171-193.

<sup>14</sup> Andrews, Rhys, George A. Boyne, Kenneth J. Meier, Jr. O'Toole, Laurence J., and Richard M. Walker, "Representative Bureaucracy, Organizational Strategy, and Public Service Performance: An Empirical Analysis of English Local Government," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15, no. 4 (2005), 489-504, 492; Herman, Jeanne B., Randall B. Dunham, and Charles L. Hulin, "Organizational Structure, Demographic Characteristics, and Employee Responses," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 13 (1972), 206-233, 230; Kahn, Robert L., Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal, *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. (NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1964); Riccucci, Norma R., and Marcia K. Meyers, "Linking Passive and Active Representation: The Case of Frontline Workers in Welfare Agencies," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14, no. 4 (2004), 585 -597, 595; and Theilemann, G. S. and J. Stewart, John, "A Demand-Side Perspective on the Importance of Representative Bureaucracy: AIDS, Ethnicity, Gender and Sexual Orientation," *Public Administration Review* 56 no. 2 (1996), 168-173, 172.

<sup>15</sup> Bacharach, Samuel B., and Michael Aiken, "Structural and Process Constraints on Influence in Organizations: A Level-Specific Analysis," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21 (1976), 623-439, 624; Barnard, Chester, *The Functions of the Executive*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Belnap Press, 1938); Bidwell, Charles E., "Some Effects of Administrative Behavior: A Study in Role Theory," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1957), 164; Mintzberg, Henry, *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1979); Thompson, James E., *Organizations in Action*, (New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1967); Moe, Terry M., "The New Economics of Organization," *American Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 4 (1984), 739-777, 744; and Whitford, Andrew B., "Bureaucratic Discretion, Agency Structure and Democratic Responsiveness: The Case of the United States Attorneys." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12 no. 1 (2002), 3-27, 5.

<sup>16</sup> Harrison, Trice M., and Janice M. Beyer, *The Culture of Work Organizations*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993), 176; Scott, William G., "Organization Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal," *The Journal of the Academy of Management* 4, no. 1 (1961), 7-26, 9.

<sup>17</sup> Barnard, Chester, *The Functions of the Executive*, 89-9; and Simon, Herbert, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision Making in Administrative Organizations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (NY: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1976) , 106-110.

<sup>18</sup> Mosher, *Democracy and the Public Service*, 111-112.

<sup>19</sup> Pitkin, H. F. *The Concept of Representation*. 96.; and Hinderer, J. J., and C. D. Young. "Representative Bureaucracy: The Theoretical Implications of Statistical Interaction." *Political Research Quarterly*, 51 no. 3 (1998): 666.

<sup>20</sup> Kelly, Marisa, "Theories of Justice and Street-Level Discretion," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 4, no. 2 (1994), 119-140, 138.

<sup>21</sup> Whitford, Andrew B, "Bureaucratic Discretion, Agency Structure, and Democratic Responsiveness," 23.

## Appendix

### Study Design

This study utilizes a sequential mixed methods approach in its attempts to determine what factors significantly influence administrators' perceptions of discretion. This approach is appropriate for research grounded in post-positivist theory which gives priority to quantitative data because this allows the integration of qualitative information to aid the interpretation of findings after the quantitative results are available.<sup>i</sup>

The quantitative data for this research came from a cross-sectional study that surveyed state employees from nine state agencies and from secondary data collected from the State of Tennessee Department of Personnel. These agencies are listed in the appendix. Following the analysis of quantitative data collected by the survey, personal interviews were conducted to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how the variables of interest affected participant's perceptions of their administrative climate, their perceptions of discretion and their willingness to pursue active representation.

The research questions in this study were addressed in a three-step MANCOVA design model. After the three sets of multivariate tests were conducted, the dependent variables from these three equations were then tested as independent variables in a final test for their effects on all the advocacy output dependent variables.

A matrix design survey questionnaire was sent electronically to a proportionate random sample of 2,329 state employees who were dispersed throughout the state of Tennessee. The survey contained 62 questions, designed to capture sixteen multi-dimensional variables. A cross-sectional design was deemed most appropriate for this kind of study because it is well suited for the collection of data at a specific point on a large number of variables from a large sample of persons who are geographically dispersed. Since the primary purpose of this study is to examine correlations between variables rather than to establish causation, a cross-sectional study is also deemed appropriate in accordance with O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner's recommendation on the use of this technique for establishing correlations.<sup>ii</sup>

The conclusion that the state organizations in this study are slightly more diverse than the Tennessee population is justified on the basis of the demographics of the sampling group. An analysis of the data indicates that women are over represented in the agencies surveyed in this study. The overrepresentation of women was most noticeable in the service agencies with distributive and redistributive functions, such as the Departments of Children's Services, the Department of Human Services, and the Department of Health. The nine agencies in this study were more diverse with respect to the number of black administrators and other minorities they employed (33 percent) than the general Tennessee population (19 percent).

Measuring agency output across different organizations is problematic because of the differences in the units of service between different agencies. To resolve this problem, some researchers used a measure of agency output which relied on administrator's report of their behavior, preferences and attitudes.<sup>iii</sup> This research effort utilizes a similar approach in measuring advocacy output. Likert type measures were derived from questions regarding advocacy of general minority interests; attitudes towards involving minority communities in policy decisions making; and whether more services should be offered to women, African Americans, Hispanics, other ethnic groups, and disabled individuals.

The research model used in this study attempted to link passive representation to active representation through a series of intervening variables. In the first step of this linking process, it

is assumed that organizational structures and processes form the context within which individuals construct their beliefs about expectations for their behavior. It is also assumed that individual experiences within the organizational context and their beliefs about role expectations contribute to the formation of their perceptions of discretionary authority. The model then assumes that the interaction of these variables such as perceptions of discretion, professional, and personal value factors influence actual discretionary behavior. Finally, these influences and behaviors are assumed to interact with demographic variables, such as income and education levels, to produce advocacy output that advances particular community interests. This research undertaking sought to determine whether these assumed relationships have any significant effects on active representation.

### **Selected Tennessee State Agencies**

<i>Acronym</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>
DCS	Department of Children's Services
DMRS	Department of Mental Retardation Services
MHDD	Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities
DOH	Department of Health
DHS	Department of Human Services
P&P	Department of Probation and Parole
DOR	Department of Revenue
DOS	Department of Safety
LWFD	Department of Labor and Workforce Development

## MANCOVA Results

		<b>Hypothesis 1.1</b>			
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.558	164.50	.000	.442
Access to adequate information		.959	2.89	.002	.014
Delegation forced by span of control		.958	2.90	.000	.017
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion affected by standardization		2.78	.000	.197
Expert knowledge	Discretion affected by standardization		3.22	.022	.015
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		3.22	.022	.015
Adequate information	Discretion affected by standardization		2.3.91	.009	.019
Reliance on others	Discretion affected by standardization		4.93	.001	.031
Span of control	Discretion affected by standardization		3.10	.015	.019
Income	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		4.21	.041	.007
		<b>Hypothesis 1.3</b>			
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.527	190.22	.000	.473
Use professional judgment to help clients		.942	3.23	.000	.020
Help minorities without disregard for rules		.875	7.25	.000	.043
Interpret rules to help clients		.923	4.32	.000	.043
Public expects needs to be met before strict rule compliance		.912	5.01	.000	.030
Interpret rules to help*needs before rules		.845	2.63	.000	.055
Sex		.987	2.77	.041	.013
Income		.982	3.99	.008	.018
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion affected by standardization		183.84	.000	.223

<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects (continued)</i>		F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept ( <i>continued</i> )	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	208.55	.000	.246
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	310.99	.000	.327
Use professional judgment to help clients	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	4.83	.001	.029
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	4.84	.001	.029
Help minorities without disregard for rules	Discretion affected by standardization	2.97	.019	.018
	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	14.97	.000	.086
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	8.67	.000	.052
Perceived discretion to interpret the in order to help the needy	Discretion affected by standardization	3.51	.008	.021
	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	3.72	.005	.023
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	6.52	.000	.039
Public expects service before strict rule compliance	Discretion affected by standardization	5.16	.000	.031
	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	6.10	.000	.037
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	6.69	.000	.040
Interpret rules to help*service before rules	Discretion affected by standardization	2.57	.001	.053
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	3.92	.000	.082
Income	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients	4.28	.039	.007

		<b>Hypothesis 1.4</b>			
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.461	261.50	.000	.539
Income		.974	6.10	.000	.026
Sex		.984	3.61	.013	.016
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion affected by standardization		321.28	.000	.323
	Perceived discretion to serve minority interests		340.93	.000	.336
	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		455.64	.000	.403
Length of service in state government	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		2.45	.045	.014
Income	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		12.50	.000	.014
Sex	Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all agency clients		4.54	.034	.007
		<b>Hypothesis 2.1</b>			
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.593	139.40	.000	.407
Adequacy of rules for decision making		.808	11.30	.000	.069
Expectations for standardized application of rules		.909	4.913	.000	.031
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Adequacy of rules for decision making	Discretion believed to be necessary		29.8	.000	.163
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		12.00	.000	.073
Expectations for standardized application of rules	Discretion believed to be necessary		9.63	.000	.059
Expectations for standardized application of rules	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		6.26	.000	.039

**Hypothesis 2.2**

<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.551	176.27	.000	.449
Income		.957	9.84	.000	.043
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion believed to be necessary		59.17	.000	.083
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		177.21	.000	.214
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		458.22	.000	.413
Interpret rules to help the needy	Discretion believed to be necessary		2.66	.032	.016
Resolve conflict in favor of clients	Discretion believed to be necessary		4.33	.002	.026
Political views can influence rule interpretation	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		2.48	.043	.015
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		2.73	.028	.016
Income	Discretion believed to be necessary		23.38	.000	.035
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		13.52	.000	.020
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		4.82	.029	.007

**Hypothesis 2.3**

<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.530	188.01	.000	.470
Income		.953	10.43	.000	.047
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion believed to be necessary		73.45	.000	.103
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		179.56	.000	.220
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		487.56	.000	.433
Professional norms require interpreting rules to help needy	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		2.48	.043	.015
Income	Discretion believed to be necessary		23.41	.000	.433
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		15.98	.000	.024
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		5.85	.016	.009

**Hypothesis 2.4**

<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.540	191.11	.000	.460
Income		.955	10.56	.000	.045
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Discretion believed to be necessary		71.22	.000	.095
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		161.01	.000	.193
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		515.23	.000	.433
Income	Discretion believed to be necessary		22.44	.000	.032
	Actual discretion in interpreting rules		16.68	.000	.011
	Discretion in conditions of uncertainty		7.45	.007	.011
Education	Discretion believed to be necessary		5.72	.017	.008

**Hypothesis 3.1**

<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.628	42.65	.000	.372
Professional orientation		.967	2.44	.010	.033
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Actual advocacy for community counterparts		172.15	.000	.208
	Actual advocacy for policies that benefit minorities		117.18	.000	.152
	Support of minority participation		91.25	.000	.152
	Support more services for all agency clients		66.86	.000	.092
	Support of more services for women		120.57	.000	.155
	Support of more services for African Americans		122.00	.000	.158
	Support of more services for Hispanics		96.13	.000	.128
	Support of more services for other racial/ethnic groups		131.03	.000	.166
	Support of more services for disabled individuals		126.13	.000	.161
Education	Actual advocacy for community counterparts		2.42	.035	.018
	Support of more services for disabled individuals		2.25	.048	.017

<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects (continued)</i>		F	p.	$\eta^2$	
Income	Actual advocacy for community counterparts	2.94	.012	.022	
	Support of more services for African Americans	3.65	.003	.027	
	Support of more services for Hispanics	2.67	.021	.020	
	Support of more services for other racial/ethnic groups	2.63	.023	.020	
Professional affiliation	Support of minority participation	7.29	.007	.011	
	Support of more services for other racial/ethnic groups	4.93	.027	.007	
<b>Hypothesis 3.1.a</b>					
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.714	131.44	.000	.286
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Actual advocacy for community counterparts		159.28	.000	.208
	Actual advocacy for policies benefiting minorities		117.28	.000	.152
Income	Actual advocacy for community counterparts		2.94	.012	.022
Education	Actual advocacy for community counterparts		2.42	.035	.018
<b>Hypothesis 3.2</b>					
<i>Multivariate Tests</i>		Wilks' $\Lambda$	F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept		.882	9.57	.000	.118
Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all clients		.883	2.26	.000	.031
Decision making in conditions of uncertainty		.889	2.13	.000	.029
Education		.963	2.75	.004	.037
Organization level		.970	2.18	.022	.030
<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Intercept	Advocacy for community counterparts		36.35	.000	.053
	Active advocacy for minorities		17.123	.000	.026
	Advocacy for minority participation in decision making		19.23	.000	.029
	Advocacy for all agency clients		23.75	.000	.035
	Advocacy for women		11.58	.001	.017

<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects (continued)</i>		F	p.	$\eta^2$
Intercept ( <i>continued</i> )	Advocacy for African-Americans	24.03	.000	.036
	Advocacy for Hispanics	11.27	.001	.017
	Advocacy for other racial/ethnic groups	28.29	.000	.042
	Advocacy for disabled individuals	41.86	.000	.060
Perception that discretion is affected by job standardization	Advocacy for other racial/ethnic groups	3.65	.006	.022
Perceived discretion to serve minority interests	Advocacy for minority participation in decision making	2.48	.043	.015
	Advocacy for all agency clients	2.65	.032	.016
Perceived discretion to interpret rules to help all clients	Advocacy for community counterparts	2.95	.020	.018
	Active Advocacy for minorities	5.02	.001	.030
	Advocacy for minority participation in decision making	2.93	.020	.018
	Advocacy for all agency clients	3.56	.007	.021
Actual discretion in interpreting rules	Advocacy for minority participation in decision making	3.01	.018	.018
Discretion in conditions of uncertainty	Active Advocacy for minorities	3.10	.016	.018
	Advocacy for minority participation in decision making	5.12	.000	.030
	Advocacy for all agency clients	4.22	.002	.025
	Advocacy for women	3.40	.009	.020
	Advocacy for Hispanics	2.76	.026	.017
	Advocacy for other racial/ethnic groups	4.18	.002	.025
Sex	Advocacy for all agency clients	4.81	.029	.007
Income	Advocacy for Hispanics	4.64	.032	.007
Education level	Advocacy for community counterparts	6.02	.014	.009

<i>Test of Between-Subjects Effects (continued)</i>		F	p.	$\eta^2$
Education level <i>(continued)</i>	Advocacy for disabled individuals	8.85	.003	.013
Organization level	Advocacy for women	4.89	.027	.007
	Advocacy for other racial/ethnic groups	4.44	.036	.007

---