

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

May 31–June 2, 2007

Workshop number 5: “Leadership and the New Public Management”.

***Government Reform, Public Service Values and the
Roles of Public Sector Leadership in Serving
Society***

By

Professor Frances S. Berry

Director, Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, and
Frank Sherwood Professor of Public Administration
635 Bellamy, Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2250 USA

Email: fberry@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
phone: (850) 644-7603
fax: (850) 644-7617

Abstract: Administrative reforms, through processes and structures inspired by New Public Management are now widespread and commonly used. This paper looks at the values we want to promote through government, the styles of leadership managers use to implement those reforms, and assesses whether the NPM reforms are promoting the values we most desire in a democratic government. The conclusions suggest many NPM reforms are not consistent with broader values than efficiency and thus may be falling short of our aspirations and the values citizens want from government. Decisions on appropriate managerial leadership styles to endorse and teach are needed, as NPM reforms encourage private sector practices that probably need tempering for the public sector.

“The contemporary problem is how to organize the public sector so that it can adapt to the changing needs of society, without losing coherence of strategy or continuity of governance values. (OECD,2005, 13)

During this time of reform in all sectors, management skills were emphasized, as the various public and private sector organizations struggled to survive and to compete... There were also some able leaders, but with a predominance of these performing a somewhat traditional, hierarchical leadership role. This somewhat impoverished private sector model has tended to be duplicated in the public sector.” Brosnahan, 2000, p. 229-230.

“So there is a major challenge to create a public sector environment which can nourish leadership and create lively, innovative publicly responsive organizations.” (IBID, p. 225)

Introduction

There has been an international revolution in government management over the past thirty years. It is unprecedented in the breadth and scope of countries impacted, and it has occurred in both developed and developing countries alike. We are moving past incremental changes in government reform and considering ways to transform government into fundamentally different organizations from those in the industrial era. What does it mean to create a “transformed” government? It involves change, of course. Webster’s dictionary defines transformation as: “An act, process or instance of change in structure, appearance or character; a conversion, revolution, makeover or renovation.” Transformation is more than incremental changes; it involves a fundamental redoing of program design, application of technology, and business processes.

While every country has a unique footprint of how its administrative reforms have unfolded and which have been undertaken, there are many commonalities across countries, and there is the appearance that much diffusion and cross-country learning has been taking place. The administrative reform movements in Great Britain and the United States were linked with Thatcher and Reagan and had a distinctly ideological fervor about them, to downsize and decentralize government. Many developing countries adopted administrative reforms during times of economic crises or to meet demands by international lending agencies to help finance growing economies. And still other countries, such as Sweden adopted reforms quietly and in a non-ideological debate.

The administrative reforms adopted cover many areas of government service delivery, management and accountability, but the most widely adopted reforms are related to: civil service reforms, performance budgeting and measurement, use of information technology and e-government, strategic planning, public private partnerships, contracting out to nonprofit agencies, structural streamlining and process improvement, improving customer service in service delivery, market-based governance, increasing citizen involvement in policy and management, regulatory reform, and decentralization to lower levels of government and within agencies.

Commonly, public administrators discuss their management innovations and the managerialism of new public management as having the virtues of promoting efficiency,

productivity and running government like a business. In short, attempting to use market competition and practices to make government work better and cost less. But I argue within that public administrators should also underscore the public service values that underlie their efforts in “reinventing government”. Citizens want to be treated like citizens, owners of the government and stakeholders involved in the governance of the state collective concerns as well as being treated like customers who receive better quality service in a timely manner. And public managers should convey those public values and purposes to citizens so government IS distinguished from the private sector. Governance of the modern state goes much farther than merely running services economically. There are collective decisions about what services we want to provide ourselves, and how much we want to extract from citizens to live in their civic society. These decisions must involve both citizens and public administrators.

This paper has four purposes. First, we briefly summarize the reasons governments have undertaken administrative reforms. Second, we examine the types of reforms commonly adopted and the public or private values they emphasize. Third, we discuss the relationship between democracy and public administration, and consider some of the problems American democracy is facing today. Fourth, we make a case that administrative reforms do carry explicit values that impact the country’s civic culture, citizen involvement, and its long term governance. This brings a responsibility to the administrator’s role that goes beyond the politics/administration dichotomy, or the role of the neutral public servant. And finally, we discuss what a “transformed government” might look like.

Background and Causes of Administrative Reforms

There are many causes of the broad administrative reform movement underway internationally, and they differ by the specific government and its unique historical and cultural contexts. Yet the causes are also similar. In Latin and South America, the solutions to major national economic crises included governmental restructuring, economic liberalization policies (Weyland, 2004), and performance management policies to reform budgeting, information policy and accountability efforts. Many of these efforts were mandated by international lending organizations that developed packages of governance and economic reforms they required countries to adopt in order to get financial assistance or loan forgiveness (Karmarck, 2003) from the development banks. In the United States, perhaps more than in any other country, citizen’s distrust and dislike of government led to President Reagan calling for a smaller and less regulatory government in the early 1980s while president Clinton, in the early 1990s, launched the National Performance Review that called for “government to work better and cost less” which would help in “closing the trust deficit” with the American people (Gore, 1993, i). In Great Britain, Australia and other developed European countries, government reforms included restructuring and selling off some government-run industries, extensive performance management and improved budgeting, as well as other administrative improvements (OECD, 1997. 2005).

Kettl (2000) identified four broad economic and political forces that he considers driving forces for international management reforms. In the political arena, the end of the cold war and the movement to democratize has unleashed a critical assessment of what

government's role in society is. Part of the cold war's legacy is to make the market even more appealing and powerful than it was previously. The economic changes have been immense. The Asian recession of the 1990s and the broad globalization of consumer markets have led to major deregulatory efforts, and a central focus on economic development and job growth for most governments. Privatization and market approaches have been dominant for policy formation. Social transformations have been large for some countries as the Asian countries continue a process of industrialization and "westernization". While countries in Europe that were formally under communist control, are now transitioning into democratic governments and market economies with impacts on their family lives, standard of living, and social cultures. And finally, institutional changes beyond the individual country's administrative reforms have been occurring. In particular, the European Union is creating new institutions and patterns to build a unified Europe; international organizations of financial assistance (such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the United Nations) continue to influence management practices and policies of those countries they lend to; and within established and emerging democracies (e.g., United Kingdom, the United States, South Korea), policy and financial resources are being decentralized to allow more local control and innovation.

Several commentators (Peters, 2001; Kamarck, 2003) assert that there have been two waves of government management reform. Peters (2001, 118) argues that "several of the attempts at changing public administration during the 1960s and 1970s were perhaps even more significant than those implemented during the 1980s and 1990s. The real difference from previous periods of change is... the seemingly endless attempts...of a variety of actors to improve performance of the public sector in their countries." Peters (2001) believes that many of the reforms in the second wave are direct responses to the earlier reforms, efforts to finetune policy, re-regulate when deregulation showed flaws, and adapting newer reforms from other countries to continue "tireless tinkering". Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000 argue that the most dominant ideas underlying the most recent wave of administrative reforms is the concept of improving service quality and performance management.

Many studies, especially of American policy and administrative reform (e.g. Kingdon;) discuss the prevalence of economic or political crises as a prelude to reform efforts. In an interesting study of innovation winners for administrative and policy reforms in the US, Europe and Canada, Borins (2001, 725) refutes this common wisdom, and finds of the top four or five reasons that initiate reform, a prior crisis does not top the list, in fact, crisis played a factor in 28 percent of in the U.S. innovations over 1990-1998, and 14 percent among advanced Commonwealth countries. The most frequent condition behind an innovation was internal problems (in about 75% of the innovations). Political influence, and new opportunities appeared in at least one-third to one-half of the innovations.

Borins also studied which level of agencies' management initiated management reform, and found a surprising impact by middle management. "In the USA, approximately 50 percent of the innovations originate from middle managers or frontline staff, 25 percent from agency heads, 21 percent from politicians, 13 percent from interest groups, and 10 percent from individuals outside of government. In the sample from the economically advanced countries of the Commonwealth, the proportion from middle

managers or frontline staff (82 percent) and agency heads (39 percent) is higher, while that of politicians (11 percent), interest groups (2 percent) and individuals outside government (5 percent) is lower. In developing countries, the results are also similar” (Borins, 2001, 723).

However widely used and admired these administrative reforms are, we need to take stock of the somewhat alarming view that multiple values in public administration and democratic governance are now viewed in conflict or at least in tension under the administrative reforms. The values of neutral competence of civil service conflict with both political responsiveness and with the entrepreneurial role of public managers. Deregulating the civil service may have led to less emphasis on public-service values by political officials and even citizens. The heavy emphasis on service quality and treating citizens like customers may have impressed service delivery but also mixes metaphors about the clear distinctions and roles of citizens and customers. Public servants, too, may get mixed messages about how they should behave. Customer service principles require that customers be treated uniquely and get what they want. Policy regulations require that citizens be treated fairly and equally and must meet eligibility and other criteria to received services. These views can conflict.

While administrative reforms are often believed to help increase citizens’ trust in government, (Behn, 2002), again, reforms introduce the paradox of giving more discretion and less institutional oversight to both government managers, and those private and nonprofit sector managers who are actually delivery government services through contracts. This increased discretion and reduced oversight, can increase possibility of corruption and misuse of power which presumably, would lead to a decreased level of trust in government by citizens.

Administrative Reforms

This paper will focus on internal management reforms rather than large structural reforms including reorganizing government and selling off government industries. Often these reforms are called New Public Management and certainly include bringing best practices from the private sector into government, or contracting out government service delivery to private and non-profit organizations. But many studies have been made of countries’ administrative reform efforts, and using the list of reforms from a few of these studies (e.g., OECD, 1997; Peters, 2001; Karmarck, 2003) gives us a clear overview of what should be considered widely used administrative reforms of the past decade.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published a study in 1997 of performance management reforms in ten countries, all of which had been active in undertaking administrative reforms. A follow-up study in 2005 chronicles progress over the last ten years and assesses the thirty year record of reforms. The reforms these studies catalog include: contract management approaches, performance pay; performance budgeting; collecting and using different types of performance measures, and installing performance measurement systems; benchmarking; strategic planning (moving to mission-oriented government rather than separate programs); attention to service quality, including customer feedback through regular surveys and interviews, and service standards; process improvements; accountability systems; and reporting of performance information. Karmarck (2003) and Peters (2001) note the

heavy use of e-government and information technology for processing and making available government information to citizens; civil service reforms; privatization; using new incentives that are generally market-based and more voluntary; and citizen and lower level govt. worker empowerment and involvement; decentralization in agencies and to lower levels of government; collaboration and cooperation across agencies and sectors; promoting cross-sector organizations and initiatives (with less red-tape and fewer rules); and comprehensive reform (across broad systems in government).

This is a large range of types of reforms and each type can often have multiple approaches as well as different implementation patterns (OECD, 1997; 2005). So readers who want to learn more about the substance of these reforms are referred to these fine overviews to learn about the substantive details of what reforms were adopted by various countries internationally, and how they were implemented.

Two large scale studies of administrative reform innovation award winners have found common themes that the innovative programs promoted. Holzer and Callahan in their book *Government at Work: Best Practices and Model Programs* (assessing the winners of Exemplary State and Local Government Award Programs from 1989 to 1995 in the U.S.) found the dozens of winners reviewed promoted six common reform patterns: (1) focus on the customer; (2) build partnerships with public and private organizations and citizens; (3) manage for quality using long-term strategic planning with support from top leadership; (4) develop human resources and empower employees through team building, systematic training, recognition, and balancing employee and organizational needs; (5) adapt technologies to achieve open access to data, automation for productivity, cost-effective applications, and cross-cutting techniques that deliver on public demands; and (6) measure for performance by establishing goals and measuring results, justifying and allocating as necessary resource requirements, and developing organizational improvement strategies. (Rainey & Rhy, 2004, 41)

Borin, studying award winners from the Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management (CAPAM) International Innovations Awards Programme (in 1998 and 2000) and the Ford Foundation/Kennedy School of Government Innovations in American Government (1990 to 1998) found five common reform themes and characteristics: (1) holism (partnerships and networks); (2) the use of new information technology; (3) process improvements (including user pay mechanism, voluntary compliance and alternative dispute resolution); and (4) the involvement of organizations or individuals outside the public sector to achieve public purposes; and (5) the empowerment of communities, citizens or staff.

Country Traditions and Reforms

The long traditions of civil service in many countries are now obstacles to streamlining regulations and making government less bureaucratic. In the U.S., Ms. Kay James, head of the Office of Personnel Management said, "The civil service system [in the U.S.] was built for a 1950's workforce comprised primarily of clerks, and our system has struggled to adapt to today's highly mobile (and highly marketable) knowledge workers. The system's unitary rules, once its strength, have become a potential weakness; intended to insure fairness through uniformity, they have begun to have the opposite effect, fostering rigidity and sameness and mediocrity...to the point that few

distinctions are made between top performers and those who are merely doing their time.” (Karmarck, 2003, 28-29).

In Korea, in 1999, the government established the “Open Competitive Position System” to bring in new talent from many of Korea’s society sectors. Under this reform, agencies are told to designate 20% of their job openings as open positions that do not draw from the closed civil service system. (Karmarck, 2003, 30)

These are just two examples of how best practices of over a hundred years ago are now considered red tape and regulations that keep management moribund and are old, now failed, techniques. Every country must examine how its practices have developed, and adapt the new ideas to fit those practices selectively, without uncritically adopting new reforms wholesale that do not fit the culture and values of the country’s traditions.

To conclude this section, let me once again quote from the OECD Report on *Modernizing Government: The Way Forward* (2005, 22).

“The reform experiences of the OECD countries have highlighted that a country’s public administration system is part of its wider governance and constitutional structures. The practice of public administration both reflects and influences the values of governance.”

The Role of Public Servants in Administrative Reform: Leaders or Managers?

Since the topic of our session is Leadership and the New Public Management, it is important to consider how NPM either promotes types of managerial leadership, or is impacted by existing styles of leadership. Without empirical studies, we can not know the causal direction of these linkages, and few studies have been able to get at these issues except through case studies which suffer from the limited N.

In a study of performance-based management reform based on an international review of studies written in 2002, the U.S. General Accounting Office concluded, “The clear and sustained commitment of an agency’s top leadership to change is perhaps the single most important element of successful transformation and management improvement initiatives” (GAO-02-862:25).

For the past decade, there has been a heated debate between scholars as to whether the new public management is promoting risky, reckless individual-oriented (rather than public-oriented) behavior by managers, or whether the entrepreneurial spirit heralded by Osborne and Gabler (1992) has allowed managers to do the right thing and bypass bureaucracy to implement more efficient and effective government. Bob Behn (1998) argues that managers must be leaders as the legislatures are often vague and imprecise, and managers are the experts who can measure program outputs, and correct poor performance. He also notes that appointed or elected leaders often do not have the time, expertise or inclination to define and take leadership in program implementation.

Larry Terry (1998:197) writes that “the entrepreneurial leadership model has been the focus of intense criticism since its emergence in the 1980s as an alternative to the administrative management paradigm. Critics charge that the public entrepreneur’s anti-traditionalist orientation and obsession with self-promotion, rule-breaking, power politics, risk-taking, and radical change conflicts with democratic theory (Moe, 1994,

Terry, 1990). Some have said entrepreneurship conflicts with due process, accountability and equal treatment. Hood (1991) writes of new public management that it emphasizes economy and efficiency and this focus may come at the cost of ethical values such as honesty, fairness and such. DeLeon and Denhardt (2000, 92) note that government entrepreneurs' "single-mindedness, tenacity and willingness to bend the rules make them very difficult to control. They can become loose canons."

A third view is similar to the entrepreneurial view of managers, but takes place in the context of strategic management that includes leadership within an agency for programs and services, as well as externally to the agency with clients and stakeholders. This view is well-represented by Mark Moore whose book *Creating Public Value* lectures that managers who operate from a strategic management perspective first and foremost create public value. In this view, managers are agents who help define what would be valuable for their programs and agencies to do instead of merely developing means of carrying out mandated services. Managers engage the politics surrounding their organization to help define public value and they reengineer how their organizations operate instead of expecting stability in policy and management styles. Moore goes on to assert that managers have three different functions that they must serve to be effective: (1) judging and articulating the public value of their mission and purpose, (2) managing outward, toward politics, to invest their purposes with legitimacy and support, and (3) managing downward, toward improving the organization's capabilities for achieving the desired purposes. Moore asserts that, "It is not enough then, that managers simply maintain the continuity of their organizations, or even that the organizations become efficient in current tasks. It is also important that the enterprise be adaptable to new purposes and that it be innovative and experimental (p. 55). And Moore is clear that managers have the right, indeed, responsibility to help define those purposes that contribute value to society, and develop programs that respond to client and societal needs. In this sense, managers are not just carrying out legislative mandates.

This debate about whether entrepreneurs are improving government by innovating, cutting red-tape and providing better service to citizens or are threatening democratic accountability by breaking rules and operating independently, perhaps driven by ambition and not the public interest is at heart a debate about leadership and how we want our managerial leaders to act on our behalf with the machinery of government.

In an in-depth book review of *The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective* (1995) and *Public Management: The New Zealand Model* (1996), Anne Khademian (1998, 269) asks, "What do we want Public Managers to Be?" and she goes on to declare where is reformers part ways is in

"the *how* these features of the new public management are operationalized (the precise roles public managers should play in the policy process) that separates the American reform effort from that of the Westminster countries. Advocates of the Westminster approach (with slight variations on the theme) accept the premise that policy and operations can be clearly separated and management efforts tightly framed by elected officials. Both Aucoin and Boston and his colleagues reject the idea of managerial discretion that is entrepreneurial, mixing policy with management (270).....Essential to Boston et al's (1996) model is the 'clear separation of the responsibilities of ministers and departmental chief executives (CEs): ministers should be responsible for

selecting the inputs required to produce the desired outputs with the minimum practical interference from ministers and central agencies'(4). In other words, managers should practice the new public management, but they should do so within a tightly defined contract, negotiated with the State Services Commissioner that adheres to 'policy guidelines set by the government'(105) (271).”

So, for this conference, I pose the question, which leadership style is most defensible, legally, substantively and normatively?

Desirable Values to Promote Through Administrative/Management Reforms

Professionalism of Government: The traditional democratic government over the past one hundred years has developed a well-regulated civil service system that attempts to separate neutral professional from political patronage in deciding who will get jobs in government. This legacy of the Progressive era in the United State is shared by even older traditions in many European countries; and in China where civil service systems were developed over two thousand years ago. Some countries are reducing the rules and rigidities of their civil service systems to encourage new talent from both the private and public sectors to join government

Transparency: Corruption in government remains a major problem in many countries and works to undermine citizen trust in government. Corruption also robs the citizens of many funds and services they might have received if it did not exist, especially in those countries where international lending organizations funnel financial aid into countries, and corruption leads many top leaders to pocketing large amounts of funds into Swiss bank accounts.

Transparency is also promoted through Freedom of Information Acts where citizens can request government documents and records that are not classified for national security purposes. Transparency also helps spread government procurement and service contracts out to a larger part of the population who can access government through websites from any location, and find information from diverse ministries and levels of government from one location. For example, Singapore's e-Citizen Portal is used as a gateway for government information.

Citizen Empowerment: Public administration in its traditional values included a role for citizens, through public hearings and other access to government actions. However, the newer reforms go way beyond passive public hearings and include intensive citizen participation in policy development and implementation. Examples include citizen involvement in rule-making, citizen commissions that develop policy in environmental or social services; citizen presence³ on task forces that develop performance goals and measures for programs; and other direct involvement in determining what services should be funded and provided. Beyond involvement in policy development and management, there is also the opportunity to get information on what government is doing through e-government information and web portals. Examples that are regularly used by most national and state governments include: strategic plans; statutes, legislative bills and hearings on-line; bill payment and license renewal on-line; and through performance

information regularly updated on websites. The state of Florida's extensive website that can be accessed through MyFlorida.com is just one example of how citizens can avail themselves of pending and legislated government actions from their home or office.

Accountability: One of the central values for a democratic government is accountability, being answerable to the people who vote their leaders into office and who give direction on policy choices. Accountability is often directed at public administrators, as in they are being held responsible for the performance of government. Accountability can take many forms. In *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*, Robert Behn (2001) makes the case that at least four types of accountability are valued and demanded in democratic governments. First, financial accountability. Where was money spent? Was it spent legally and in accordance with laws and how it was supposed to be spent? Financial audits have been implemented to determine the extent to which our governments and managers meet financial accountability standards. Second, accountability for fairness. Is government operated so that its employees, contractors and citizens treated fairly? Many of our rules and procedures are established to define how fairness and equity will be ensured, often through procedural processes rather than through examining the outcomes of government services. Third, accountability for the use of power. Many of our laws on ethics, the proper use of government funds and hiring practices relate to keeping officials from abusing their power. And finally, accountability for performance. This is at the heart of the last two decades of administrative reforms. Previously, we mostly accounted for inputs, finances and legal practices. Accountability for performance focuses on what government is doing and how well government achieves those efforts. And not just on the processes and procedures that governments uses to spend money and deliver services. Accountability has also gained currency and urgency as governments try to enhance their citizens' trust in government and show that government is spending money for good results.

High Quality Services: With the transformation of the global business sector and practices since the 1980s, quality service and customer care has become a primary value in the private sector. The improved service citizens experience from business transactions has probably had a major influence on how they view stodgy government. At the very least, these private sector changes have raised expectations and fostered comparisons that have not been kind to government. Government began importing business management practices related to customer service and quality, such as TQM in the late 1980s, and quality management transformation has continued to be pursued by most governments (E.G. OECD, 2005) perhaps led by local governments which made these changes earlier than higher levels of government. Quality services is also considered an outcome for many government services (as evidenced by the practice in Florida under performance-based budgeting at the state level, that agency managers survey citizens for their programs to determine their satisfaction and rating of the program's quality.

“Modernized governments are required to be responsive to various groups of citizens. But there is a cost in terms of capacity for collective action when the public service is differentiated and fragmented. New management approaches need to go beyond contracting and reporting to give renewed attention to connecting the public interest to individual motivation and values.” (OECD, 2005, 22)

Accessibility: This is related to quality services as we see government offices are staying open later in the evenings and on weekend so that working citizens do not have to take off from work to conduct business with government. Clearly, e-government is making government accessible to many more people and 24/7 in a way that was never possible through face to face visits.

Many have raised the concern that e-government will promote more divisions in which citizens have ready access to and information from government. Those educated and with home computers will be the citizens linked to government while those who do not use computers or have easy access to them will be left out. This issue, often called the digital divide, will presumably be less of an issue in developed countries as children learn to use computers and have access to them through libraries, schools and other public places if not in their homes. Government actions to overcome this divide include: after-school programs for low-income children and after-work classes for low-income adults to improve computer literacy as well as government subsidies to be sure all elementary through high schools have adequate computer labs for instruction purposes.

Ethical Government. All of these values add up to an ethical government that works to provide the services elected officials vote to deliver as effectively and efficiently as possible with maximum participation by citizens and through an open, transparent, accountable process. Clearly an ethical government includes one that is free of corruption and cronyism. Mark Moore in *Creating Public Value* (1995) talks about part of the value that managers deliver to citizens is the process of a well-run and open government. Thus the administrative reforms, and the values associated with those reforms all contribute to the promotion or diminution of democratic governance in countries around the world. Indeed, he writes: "Citizens' aspirations, expressed through representative government, are the central concerns of public managers (52)."

Strategic, Mission-oriented

An agency that is clear about its mission, its purpose and what it is trying to accomplish is an agency that can separate out its priorities and the activities it needs to reduce or eliminate. A strategic plan that is well communicated to the agency's staff can help unite an agency, and give guidance to workers at the frontlines when they make decisions on how to best promote what the agency's mission is (Berry, 2000).

An agency's values are often embedded explicitly in its strategic plan, and more particularly through its Vision, Mission and Values (Berry, 2000). An excellent example of these values being prominently front and center is contained in the Strategic plan of the Florida Department of Revenue (FDOR) (which has been widely recognized for its management excellence, including being awarded the FL Sterling Award in 1997). In the FDOR's Long Range Program Plan FY 2006-07, these elements are found:

Vision

The Vision of the Florida Department of Revenue is:

- *We will be competitive with world-class organizations.
- *We will exemplify the best of public service.
- *We will demonstrate integrity in all of our actions.

Mission

To achieve our vision to serve Floridians, we will:

- *Innovate.
- *Promote change.

*Promote excellence.

Values

The Florida Department of revenue subscribes to the following fundamental beliefs that guide the actions of every individual member of the agency, as well as the agency collectively. In our recruitment and hiring processes, we seek individuals who display these values, and we recognize and reward employees who model these values in the daily performance of their jobs. It is as a result of the exceptional display of these values that we are able to create an environment in which the value of diversity is appreciated and the organization thrives.

Of Character—

- Integrity We conduct ourselves in accordance with our values.
- Honesty and Trust We have the courage to be honest and to trust others.
- Fairness We treat everyone without bias and based upon facts.
- Respect We appreciate, honor and value others.
- Concern for Others We emphasize with and care for others.

Of Performance

- Service We provide quality customer service.
- Excellence We achieve quality performance through our commitment to continued improvement.
- Innovation We seek ways to be innovative in our programs and services.
- Commitment We achieve our mission through enablement and determination.
- Communication We express ourselves freely and share information openly.
- Teamwork We cooperate to get things done and never willingly let a team member fail.
- Knowledge We grow through education, experience, and communication.

{ Table 1 here }

Government Reforms and What values they Promote

Often policy makers and managers talk about administrative reforms in terms of efficiency and streamlining government operations. David Osborne (1992) in the book *Reinventing Government* talked about the need for government to “steer” (or make policy and strategic decisions) while partners in the private or nonprofit sector could do the “rowing” (or actually deliver the services). But administrative reforms also can promote the types of democratic governance values we have just discussed. Here I want to run through a few of the major types of reforms and link them with each of the six public service values just discussed above.

Performance Measurement: Robert Behn in *Rethinking Democratic Accountability* notes that two types of accountability are commonly required of agencies: fiscal and accountability for performance. And in fact, these often conflict, as fiscal measures require careful documentation and assurance that all procedures have been followed and

met, while performance measures for results are output and outcome measures without a direct linkage to inputs and resources.

Performance measures are at the heart of the logic of administrative reform over the past three decades. Measures demonstrate what government is achieving for the taxes and monies it spends. Performance measures assure some level of transparency across vendors who deliver services to government through contracts. Performance measures are a necessary part of strategic planning and missions-oriented government, to demonstrate that goals and objectives (or standards for performance) have been met, or not (Berry, 2007).

Strategic Planning and Management: Mission-oriented government fits hand in glove with results-oriented government, and gives direction and focus to governmental work. Strategic plans also help communicate to the staff at lower levels of the organization what their responsibilities are and how their program activities fit into the broader agency's goals and purposes. Finally, strategic plans also communicate with citizens (including external stakeholders) and elected officials that helps ensure the agency is accountable and transparent.

Process Improvement and Re-engineering Government: Reengineering government programs (especially using process improvements assessments) has been often used as part of the integration to get more information technology into government. Process improvement may be especially prominent in the United States where it has diffused from the best-managed private sector companies, and it is part of the criteria for the Baldrige Award. Of the six democratic values we examine herein, it most positively impacts the quality of service delivery by streamlining operations, and encouraging the use of information technology to manage data and decision making.

E-Government: E-government is a reform that promotes many democratic values, including transparency; improved quality of services; citizen accessibility (due to 24/7 web availability), and accountability by displaying information, budget data, program requirements, rules and plans for future government services. In addition, it may promote the other three values of citizen involvement and participation, professionalism.

Civil Service Reforms: These have been undertaken for multiple reasons. In some cases, it is to get new talent into the government that may not meet the requirements for traditional government service. In the U.S. at the state levels, these reforms have primarily been made to promote accountability, as in promoting more responsiveness by senior managers to political appointees and elected officials. In many cases, formal professional requirements and exams are no longer required to be considered for government jobs. While this promotes flexibility in hiring, it may lead to reduced professionalism, and transparency about job qualifications. This author finds no clear assessment that civil service reforms promote any of the six values considered in this paper.

Deregulation and Using Market-based Reforms: Red tape and government are synonymous and have been since the early Chinese empires. But the belief that competition makes all agencies work better has become a prevalent theme driving reforms in both the private and public sectors since the late 1970s. Competition is probably most effective at leading to cost savings and efficiency gains, values not given primacy in this study. Deregulation may lead to better quality services, to higher professionalism and more transparent government under the right conditions.

Privatization and Contracting Out: Contracting out is another form of using the market to reduce costs and encourage innovation as just discussed. Under the right conditions, contracting out may lead to higher quality services, better professionalism (if providers have more professional staff to deliver services) and better accessibility as providers are community-based and closer to the clients. But evidence from research suggests that accountability and transparency are reduced as overworked contract managers in government may not pay as much attention to performance indicators as to financial audits.

Decentralization in Agencies and Across Levels of Government: Decentralization can mean both delegating more discretion and decision making authority down into the middle and frontline levels of government agencies, and on a more macro scale, delegating financial and policy decision making (and implementation) from the central (national) government to municipal or provincial-level governments. Decentralization of one or both types has been very common in nearly all country reform packages. Yet interestingly, decentralization (as scored in Table 1) has almost no clear impact on democratic reform values. It all depends on what the lower levels of government do with their newly found powers.

The rhetoric used by many who promote administrative reforms within government often herald the virtues of efficiency, using the market to infuse competition into government service delivery, and reducing the size and perhaps cost of government. One study (Boyne et al. (2003) that assessed the research completed on administrative reforms in various countries summarized the primary criteria used in these studies to evaluate the consequences of reforms, and these were: (1) efficiency, (2) responsiveness, and (3) equity, each divided further into subcategories.

What does a Transformed Government Look Like?

U.S. Comptroller David Walker has been advocating for recognition that transformational change in government is needed. He argues that transformed governmental organizations will be less hierarchical and more networked with other organizations in the private and public and nonprofit sectors; more process-oriented (rather than program-oriented); externally focused to help define public value and solve needs; and integrated across programs and services to achieve results. Table 2 (taken from Bruel, 2005) compares the features of incremental change to transformational change.

{ Table 2 here }

You will note that a transformed government can incorporate the very values that we discussed above that fit with a democratic and responsive government. However, it is worth considering that the six values I have covered in this paper are not very heavily promoted through the eight administrative reforms reviewed here. The administrative reforms of the past two decades promote efficiency, using the market, and reducing the size and perhaps cost of government. But they do not lead to other important values in promoting a democratic government as Table 1 demonstrates.

Conclusion

Government administrative reforms are part of the effort to complete democracy in new democracies, and to reinvigorate democracies that are well-established. Management reforms can lead to higher citizen trust in government, and satisfaction with their government agencies.

We rarely talk about what values are promoted by administrative reforms, but this may be a positive approach to help citizens understand the purpose of government reforms, and to get them more involved in government.

We also rarely connect the role of civil servants in the reform process to its values and the traditional role of the government in society. But these processes seem closely linked. While I believe the strategic management approach laid out by Mark Moore (1995) is highly defensible, it is likely that this freedom and independence in defining values, creating work processes, and interacting with citizens is more available to very senior managers in agencies, and not to the mid-level managers. How can we ensure accountability to goals and objectives that are set by elected leadership while leaving managers flexibility to operate the programs and services as best suited to the local context? I hope this can be discussed at our workshop. Also, how can we design a study to understand the impacts of different types of leadership approaches on the values and outcomes I have listed above in this paper?

Government organizations need to continue to be creative and think outside the regular management styles to become more networked and partnership-oriented, more results-based, more concerned about involvement of citizens in policy formation, and more externally focused overall. We need to consider what the best style of leadership for managers is in this effort. We also need to consider more carefully what values we are highlighting in our public service and government by using the NPM reforms, and if these are the best values for promoting the welfare of democracy and involvement in public service careers. This is a real challenge to transform our thinking as well as our organizations. As Comptroller Walker says in his talks: "Transformation is about creating the future than perfecting the past."

References

- Behn, R. D. (1998). What Right do Public Managers have to Lead? *Public Administration Review* 58(3): 209-24.
- _____(2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review* 63(5): 586-606.
- (2002) Government Performance and the Conundrum of Public Trust. *Market-based Governance: Supply Side, Demand Side, Upside and Downside*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Berman, E. (1998). *Productivity in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berry, F. & Wechsler, B. (1995). State Agencies' Experience with Strategic Planning: Findings from a National Survey. *Public Administration Review* 55 (2): 159-168.
- Berry, F. (2000). Using Strategic Planning to Manage Strategically in the Public Sector. In *Handbook of Public Management Practice and Reform*, edited by K. Tom Liou, 261-290. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- _____(2007). Performance Budgeting Internationally: Assessing its Merits. In *Practice-Based Performance Management: An International Handbook*, edited by Patria de Lancer Julnes, Frances S. Berry, Maria Aristigueta, Kaifeng Yang. Sage Publications: Oak Park, CA.
- Berry, F., Brower, R., & Flowers, G. (2000). Implementing accountability in Florida. *Public Productivity & Management Review* 23(3): 338-358.
- Berry, F. & Flowers, G. (1999). Public Entrepreneurs in the Policy Process: Performance-based Budgeting Reform in Florida. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management*, 11(4): 578-617.
- Borins, S. (2002) Public Management Innovation in Economically Advanced and Developing Countries," *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67:715-731.
- _____(2000). Loose Cannons and Rule Breakers, or Enterprising Leaders? Some Evidence about Innovative Managers. *Public Administration Review* 60 (6):490-499.
- Bryson, J. & Roering, W. (1987). Applying Private-sector Strategic Planning in the Public Sector. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53(1): 9-22.
- Bryson, J. (2004). *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. 3d ed. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Brudney, J., Hebert, T., & Wright, D. (1999). Reinventing Government in the American States. *Public Administration Review* 59(1):19-30.
- Covey, S. (1991). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Denhardt, R., Denhardt, K. & Glazer, M. (2000). Citizen-Driven Strategic Planning in Local Government. In *Handbook of Strategic Management*, 2d ed. edited by Jack Rabin, Gerald Miller and W. Bartley Hildreth, 709-720. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Donahue, J.D. and J.S. Nye, eds. (2002) *Market-based Governance: Supply Side, Demand Side, Upside and Downside*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Foreman, C. (1995). Reinventing Politics: The NPR Meets Congress. In *Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform*, edited by D. Kettl and J. DiIulio, 152-168. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Franklin, A. (2001). Serving the Public Interest? Federal Experiences with Participation in Strategic Planning. *American Review of Public Administration* 31(2): 126-138.

- Franklin, A. & Long, E. (2003). The Challenge of Changing Federal Management Processes. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior* 6(4): 534-552.
- Gore, A. (1993). *Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less: Report of the National Performance Review*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2005). *Electronic government: Funding of the Office of Management and Budget's initiatives*. GAO-05-420. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (2004a). *Results-Oriented Government: GPRA has Established a Solid Foundation for Achieving Greater Results*. GAO-04-594T. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (2004b). *Information Technology Management*. GAO-04-49. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (2004c). *Performance Budgeting: Observations on the Use of OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool for the Fiscal Year 2004 Budget*. GAO-04-174. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (2002) Results-Oriented Cultures: Insights for U.S. Agencies from other Countries' Performance Management Initiatives GAO-02-862: August 2. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (1998). *The Results Act: Assessment of the Government-wide Performance Plan for Fiscal Year 1999*. GAO/AIMD/GGD-98-159. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (1997). *Managing for Results: Using GPRA to Assist Congressional and Executive Branch Decision-making*. GAO/T-GGD-97-43. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (1996). *Effectively Implementing Government Performance and Results Act*. GAO/GGD-96-118. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (1992a). *Program Performance Measures: Federal Agency Collection and Use of Performance Data*. GAO/GGD-92-65. Washington, DC: GAO.
- _____. (1992b). *Performance Measurement: An Important Tool in Managing For Results*. GAO/T-GGD-92-35. Washington, DC: GAO.
- Government Performance Project (GPP). 2005. Grading the States' 05. Available at <http://governing.com/gpp/2005/intro.htm>, retrieved 01/17/06.
- _____. (2003). *Paths to Performance in State and Local Government*. Syracuse: Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute.
- _____. (2001). Grading the States 2001. <http://governing.com/gpp/2001/gp1intro.htm>, retrieved 01/17/06.
- _____. (1999). Grading the States 1999. <http://governing.com/gpp/1999/gp9intro.htm>, retrieved 01/17/06.
- Hatry, H., Morley, E., Rossman, S., & Wholey, J. (2005). How Federal Programs Use Outcome Information. In *Managing for Results 2005*, 196-276. Edited by J. Kamensky and A. Morales. Washington, DC: IBM Center for the Business of Government.
- Ho, A. (2003). Perceptions of Performance Measurement and the Practice of Performance Reporting by Small Cities. *State and Local Government Review* 35(3): 161-173.
- Holzer, M. and K Callahan (1998). *Government at Work: Best Practices and Model Programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Huang, J. & Berry, F. (1998). Organizational and Management Impacts of Strategic Planning: The Experience of Florida State Agencies. Paper presented at the American Society for Public Administration, Seattle, Washington.

- Ingraham, P., Thompson, J., & Sanders, R. ed. (1997). *Transforming Government: Lessons from the Federal Reinvention Laboratories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ingraham, P., J. Sowa and D. Moynihan. (2004). Linking Dimensions of Public Sector Leadership to Performance. In *The Art of Governance*, eds. P. Ingraham and L. Lynn. Georgetown University Press: Georgetown, DC
- Kelman, S. (2005). *Unleashing Change: A Study of Organizational Renewal in Government*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kettl, D. (2000). *The Global Public Management Revolution: A Report on the Transformation of Governance*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kissler, G., Fore, K., Jacobon, W., Kittredge, W., & Stewart, S. (1998). State Strategic Planning: Suggestions from the Oregon Experience. *Public Administration Review* 58 (4): 353-359.
- Liner, B., Hatry, H., Vinson, E., Allen, R., Dusenbury, P., Bryant, S. & Snell, R. (2001). *Making Results-Based State Government Work*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kravchuk, R. & Schack, R. (1996). Designing Effective Performance Measurement Systems under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. *Public Administration Review* 56(4): 348-358.
- Melkers, J. & Willoughby, K. (2005). Models of Performance-Measurement Use in Local Governments. *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 180-190.
- _____. (2001). Budgeters' Views of State Performance Budgeting Systems: Distinctions Across Branches. *Public Administration Review* 61(1): 54-64.
- _____. (1998). The State of the States: Performance-Based Budgeting Requirements in 47 out of 50. *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 66-73.
- Miller, G., Rabin, J. & Hildreth, B. (1987). Strategy, Values, and Productivity. *Public Policy Review* 11(1): 81-96.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: Free Press.
- MOGHA. (2005). *Initiatives for Government in Korea: Selected Successful Practices*. Souh Korea.
- Moore, M. (1995). *Creating Public Value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moynihan, D. (2006). Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 78-90.
- _____. (2005a). Why and How do State Governments Adopt and Implement "Managing for Results" Reforms? *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 15(2); 219-243.
- _____. (2005b). Goal-based learning and the future of performance management. *Public Administration Review* 65 (2): 203-216.
- _____. (2003). Managing for Results. In *Paths to Performance in State & Local Government* 153-172. Syracuse: Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute.
- Office of Management and Budget. (2002). *The President's Management Agenda*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- OMB Watch. (2004). Office of Management and Budget May Be the Only Government Programs' Evaluator. Available at <http://www.ombwatch.org/article/articleprint/2113/-1/90> , retrieved 06/25/05.

- OECD (2000). *Government of the Future*. Paris:OECD.
- _____(1997) *In Search of Results: Performance Management Practices*. Paris:OECD.
- _____(2005) *Modernizing Government: The Way Forward*. Paris:OECD.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, G. (2001). *The Future of Governing*. Lawrence, KS: The University Press of Kansas.
- Poister, S. & Streib, G. (1989). Management Tools in Municipal Government: Trends over the Past Decade. *Public Administration Review* 49(2): 240-248.
- _____. (1994). Municipal Management Tools from 1976 to 1993. *Public Productivity & Management Review* 18(2): 115-25.
- _____. (1999). Strategic Management in the Public Sector: Concepts, Models, and Processes. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 22(3): 308-25.
- _____. (2005). Elements of Strategic Planning and Management in Municipal Government. *Public Administration Review* 65(1): 45-56.
- Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rainey, H. (2003). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 3rd Edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Rainey, H. and J. Rhy. (2004). Framing High Performance and Innovation in Government: A Review and Assessment of Research. In *The Art of Governance: Analyzing Management and Administration*, eds. Patricia Ingraham and Lawrence Lynn. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ring, P. & Perry, J. (1985). Strategic Management in Public and Private Organizations. *Academy of Management*, 10(2): 276-86.
- Rivenbark, W. (2003). Strategic Planning and the Budget Process: A Survey of Municipal Government. *Government Finance Review* 19(5): 22-27.
- Snell, R. & Grooters, J. (2000). *Governing for Results: Legislation in the States*. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Streib, G. (1992). Applying Strategic Decision Making in Local Government. *Public Productivity & Management Review* 15(3): 341-354.
- Terry, L. D. (1998). Administrative Leadership, Neo-managerialism, and the Public Management Movement. *Public Administration Review* 58 (3): 194-2000.
- Vinzant, D. & Vinzant, J. (1996). Strategic Management and Total Quality Management: Challenges and Choices. *Public Administration Quarterly* 20(2): 201-219.
- Walters, J. (1998). *Vision Statements: Cities and the Vision Thing*. Governing Magazine, Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Wang, X. (2001). Assessing Public Participation in U.S. Cities. *Public Performance & Management Review* 24(4): 322-336.
- Weyland, K., ed. (2004) *Learning from Foreign Models in Latin American Policy Reform*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Willoughby, K. (2004). Performance Measurement and Budget Balancing: State Government Perspective. *Public Budgeting & Finance* 24(2): 21-39.
- Willoughby, K. & Melkers, J. (2000). Implementing PBB: Conflicting Views of Success. *Public Budgeting & Finance* 20(1): 105-120.
- Yang, K. & Callahan, K. (2005). Assessing Citizen Involvement Efforts by Local Governments. *Public Performance and Management Review* 29(2): 191-216.

Table 1. Desirable Values to Promote, and their Linkage to Specific Administrative Reforms

VALUES		ADMINISTRATIVE	REFORMS	
	Performance Measures	Strategic Planning, mission-oriented government	Process Improvements	e-government
Professionalism	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Maybe
Transparency	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Citizen Empowerment	Maybe	Maybe	No	Maybe
Accountability	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
High Quality Services	Maybe	Maybe	Yes	Yes
Accessibility	No	Maybe	No	Yes

VALUES		ADMINISTRATIVE	REFORMS	
	Civil Service Reforms	Deregulation	Contracting Out	Decentralization
Professionalism	No	Maybe	Maybe	Maybe
Transparency	No	Maybe	No	Maybe
Citizen Empowerment	No	No	No	Maybe
Accountability	Maybe	No	No	Maybe
High Quality Services	Maybe	Maybe	Maybe	Maybe
Accessibility	No	No	Maybe	Maybe

Table 2 Comparing Incremental with Transformational Change

INCREMENTAL CHANGE	TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE
Evolutionary	Disruptive
Tactical	Strategic
Total Quality Management (TQM)	Business process, re-engineering
Improve existing processes	Create new processes
Streamline program operations	Profoundly change business operations
Structural and organizational change	More attention to cultural change
Do things differently	Do different things
Short term	Sustained/long-term
Small efficiency gains	Quantum leaps in effectiveness and cost savings
Partial, small scale	Enterprise-wide
Bits and pieces	Multi-faced, integrated