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ABSTRACT

The theory of representative bureaucracy suggests that a demographically diverse public sector workforce (passive representation) will lead to policy outcomes that reflect the interests of all groups represented, including historically disadvantaged communities (active representation). Implicit in the passive-active link is the expectation that minority public administrators, in particular, will have similar attitudes to minority citizens on issues of critical import and relevance, and those attitudes, in turn, will influence policy decisions.

This research examined the attitudes of citizens and administrators on a series of survey questions focused on the responsibilities of local government administrators to advocate for the interests of the African American community. The survey results confirm the hypothesis that African American citizens and administrators are more likely to support governmental behaviors that specifically target the interests of the African
American community. An equally compelling pattern suggests that African American citizens and White administrators hold markedly different attitudes. These results support the research hypothesis that African American citizens and employees are more likely to support the types of behaviors and policies commonly associated with representative bureaucracy. Furthermore, attitude congruence was shown to be a significant predictor of the adoption of a minority advocacy role.

The research also employed the tool of attitude prediction to provide an explicit measure of the degree to which administrators could identify the preferences of the African American community. Although the research hypothesis that African American administrators could more accurately predict the views of African American citizens could not be confirmed, the accuracy of prediction was significantly related to the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

Overall, these findings suggest that demographic backgrounds and socialization experiences significantly influence attitudes regarding the desirability of a government workforce that seeks to represent the preferences of historically disadvantaged groups and the adoption of the minority advocacy role, and thereby expands our understanding of critical aspects of the theory of representative bureaucracy.
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Public administrators at all levels of American government play a key role in the shaping of public policy. While the nature and scope of their influence certainly varies, it has long been understood that officials in the so-called fourth branch influence the formulation and implementation of laws and programs. Indeed, "decisions by unseen bureaucrats affect the safety of our homes, the quality of our air and water, the conditions of our workplaces, the security of our shores, the education of our children, the vulnerability of our national defense, and the surety of banks and insurance" (Brehm & Gates, 1997, p. 1). Furthermore, Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman (1981) argued that, "to the extent that bureaucrats have come to be intimately involved with policymaking, they necessarily help shape decisions that are inherently political, and, in this limited sense, they cannot help but be political actors" (p. 112).

According to Meier (2000), there are two requisites for bureaucratic power in the policy process: resources and autonomy. Resources can be defined in terms of fiduciary authority, policy expertise or information, access to
influential decision-makers, specialized personnel, or other tools that place an agency in a position of influence on particular policy issues. Autonomy is defined as “the discretion to make decisions concerning agency activities” (p. 14).

Similarly, Rourke (1984) identified three primary sources of administrative power. First, bureaucrats command expertise due to the varied skills they bring to the policy making process which leads to an ability to acquire and share information and to the development of agency expertise (p. 20). The second source of power relates to the power of implementation that stems from allegiances forged with “the outside community, the legislature, and the executive branch itself” (p. 49). Finally, in addition to variations in the first two dimensions, there are differentials in the discretion necessary to carry out directives and in agency power stemming from the relative degree of organizational vitality and the quality of internal leadership (p. 91).

The authority and power vested in public administrators, when exercised responsibly, makes an invaluable contribution to the policy-making process. The question of how to ensure administrative responsibility, however, has beguiled scholars for as long as there has been a concentrated study of administrative behavior. The lack of electoral accountability
for public administrators and the ever-widening scope and functions of governmental activities have made the challenge of securing responsibility increasingly difficult. The varied sources and contextual nature of bureaucratic influence makes it unlikely that there can be one, best way to control administrative power, or make it responsive to public demands and desires (Meier, 2000, p. 123).

Indeed, there are numerous mechanisms designed to ensure that decisions made by individual administrators comport to organizational, governmental, and democratic goals. Gilbert (1959) advanced a simplistic, albeit illustrative, two-by-two typology of administrative relationships that served to categorize the assorted devises for maintaining responsible bureaucratic behavior. He combined two characteristics, formal - informal and internal - external, to capture the myriad of influences that shape and constrain administrative behavior (p. 382). The formal-internal sources of control occur within the executive branch and relate to such devises as top-level bureaucratic appointments and the budget proposal process. The formal-external sources of control concern the legislative and judicial branches in the forms of budgetary oversight, regulative constraints, and judicial review. Responsiveness to citizens and interest groups constitute the informal-external category. Last, informal-internal sources of control refer to
influences such notions of professionalism, organizational socialization, and expectations of ethical conduct in the public service.

These relationships collectively serve as “avenues” of administrative responsibility (p. 382). Indeed, Gilbert cautions that examinations of administrative responsibility should not “advocate exclusive reliance upon any one of these four relationships” (p. 382). His point is that examinations of particular examples of bureaucratic power and responsibility should remain grounded in the context of the myriad sources and constraints on administrative behavior.

Despite these varied mechanisms to ensure responsible action, bureaucrats still find room to apply their personal experience and expertise within their official capacities appropriately. This power to influence public policy decision-making and implementation is referred to as administrative discretion. Such discretion on the part of public servants is potentially troublesome in a democracy in light of the fact that public administrators are not directly accountable to the citizenry via elections or any other means. Hence, Levitan (1946) suggests, “the very continuance of the democratic system depends on our ability to combine administrative responsibility with administrative discretion” (p. 566). There are those who advocate minimizing administrative discretion and maintaining a
bureaucracy that acts as a neutral implementing agent for the will of the legislature and executive. Finer (1941) argues that “the servants of the public are not to decide their own course; they are to be responsible to the elected representatives of the public, and these are to determine the course of action of the public servants to the most minute degree that is technically feasible” (p. 336). A public administrator, according to Finer, “should realize the dangers in the belief that he has a mission to act for the good of the public outside the declared or clearly deducible intention of the representative assembly” (p. 341-2).

Nevertheless, the decentralized nature of governmental decision-making and the complexity of issues that executive agencies commonly confront necessitate an influential role for public administrators. This realization, however, begs more questions than it answers. The research presented here examines one important aspect of this issue: whether the demographic characteristics of public administrators impact their perception of how they should exercise discretion, and thereby influence public policy.

**Theory of Representative Bureaucracy**

Public organizations typically adopt an impersonal approach in their dealings with citizens. Downs (1967) suggests that
administrative impersonality is necessary for the proper performance of organizational responsibilities. Indeed, the principle of merit requires that personnel decisions be primarily motivated by performance-based considerations rather than the personal characteristics of applicants and employees (p. 68). The need for impersonality also applies to the relationship between the agency and the citizenry. Most public organizations are expected to provide all citizens equal treatment before the law, and the nature of that treatment is usually prescribed by a set of formal rules and procedures.

It is unrealistic, however, to expect public organizations, and the people employed in them, to operate in a purely rational fashion. Simon (1997) asserts that “differences among individuals can...affect their behavior in roles that are identical from an organizational standpoint...While we may conceive of an ideal role having only organizational goals among its premises, actual roles in organizations invariably incorporate both organizational and personal goals” (p. 158-9). Larson (1973) makes the case more strongly: “Administrators are not simply neutral tools who efficiently carry out policies laid down by the legislature, but in fact are deeply involved in formulating policies, concerned as much with ultimate results as with efficiency, and, while perhaps officially neutral, are deeply committed to the programs they administer” (p. 81).
Public administrators are not dispassionate automatons. They are fairly typical citizens (see Goodsell, 1994; Lewis, 1990) and, as such, bring their own personal characteristics and preferences to the workplace. While the personal idiosyncrasies of employees cannot drive all, or perhaps even most, policy-related decisions, it seems likely that they are brought to bear in certain circumstances and contexts. As stated by Meier (1993a), “Bureaucrats are no different than other people. When faced with choices, they will attempt to make decisions that reflect their own personal values” (p. 4).

One mechanism for easing the tension posed by the unelected bureaucracy to democratic governance is to foster a demographically and politically diverse bureaucracy, so that public administrators “may come to define the public interest in more comprehensive terms and therefore become more responsive to the nation’s overall political interests” (Rosenbloom, 1983, p. 221). Diversity within the public workforce also promotes responsible bureaucratic action. The internal informal category of administrative relationships advanced by Gilbert (1959) captures the notion that diversity can work to ensure responsible behavior through its inclusion of divergent perspectives in administrative deliberations. Furthermore, demographic heterogeneity may ultimately lead to policy outputs and impacts that benefit those groups previously excluded from
administrative decision making processes. This dispersal of power and benefits increases the likelihood that bureaucratic behavior will be both responsible and responsive.

The expected link between a diverse workforce and policies that benefit previously excluded groups is codified in the theory of representative bureaucracy. In this context, bureaucratic representation is theorized to have an inert, or passive, meaning and a behavioral, or active, connotation. Whereas passive representation embodies the idea that the public workforce should reflect the demographic diversity of the jurisdiction, active representation proposes that administrators will advocate for policies that reflect the interests of citizens with similar backgrounds. Formally stated, the theory of representative bureaucracy holds that “passive representation, or the extent to which a bureaucracy employs people of diverse demographic backgrounds, leads to active representation, or the pursuit of policies reflecting the interests and desires of those people” (Selden, 1997a, p. 5). Mosher (1982) provides an expansive definition of active representation: “individuals (or administrators) are expected to press for the interests and desires of those whom they are presumed to represent” (p. 14). For the public administrator, their social background results in a socialization experience that imparts values that, in turn, guide the decisions they make
and the discretion they exercise. The theory suggests, “if the attitudes of administrators are similar to the attitudes held by the general public, the decisions administrators make will in general be responsive to the desires of the public” (Meier & Nigro, 1976, p. 458).

Central to the theory of representative bureaucracy, therefore, is the notion that the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the nation should be reflected in the make-up of the public sector. More than simply celebrating the symbolic benefits of diversity, the theory proposes that the varied interests of the represented groups will be accounted for in the policy making process, and in final policy decisions. Thus, the theory is based on a clear set of core assumptions. It is assumed that political values are influenced by social background and that public administrators will have congruent values with citizens who have similar backgrounds. Public administrators, then, will act on those values in the decisions they make, the causes they advocate for, and in the discretion they exercise. Restated, the critical linkages in the theory are that background leads to attitudes that, in turn, affect the use of discretion and decision-making. There are numerous perceived benefits of such advocacy that have profound effects on public policy and the polity.
Benefits of Representative Bureaucracy

The benefits of representative bureaucracy can be grouped into those for American governance in general, for minority communities, for bureaucratic decision-making, and for public policy. A prescient issue in the debate over the desirability of a bureaucracy that is a microcosm of the diversity in American society is the concern that an unrepresentative public workforce is a potential threat to democracy. On this point, Levitan (1946) is clear: “to preserve democratic government in the United States - it is essential that...the base of recruitment for all positions and branches of government...shall be widened and made truly representative of American society” (p. 582-3). Indeed, “the principle justification for policy determination by administrative officials in a democratic system is completely destroyed when its personnel are not representative of the heterogeneous American community” (p. 584). Restated, “it is not the power of public bureaucracies per se, but their unrepresentative power, that constitutes the greatest threat to democratic government” (Krislov & Rosenbloom, 1981, p. 21). Long (1952) further asserts that public administrators “may be both more representative of the country and more democratic in composition than the Congress” (p. 812).

Of course, representative bureaucratic power cannot act alone to ensure responsible bureaucratic decision-making.
Representative bureaucracy is properly conceived as “an augmentation of, not a substitution for, traditional constitutional restraints” (Krislov & Rosenbloom, 1981, p. 197). Thus, Meier (1975) contends that “the ramifications for representative bureaucracy are self evident: we must consider it a control mechanism only within the broader network of external controls and additional internal controls” (p. 542).

More specifically, representative bureaucracy provides an opportunity for fundamental American values to be realized. Wise (1990) contends that “equal access to the material and intrinsic benefits of public service is a critical linkage to democratic rule in an administrative state, not only because it fosters individual opportunities for equality, but also because it advances collective opportunities for equal representation” (p. 568). Others posit that representativeness fosters the perception that government action is fair and equitable, and encourages compliance and general acceptance of policy due to the inclusive nature of the decision making process (Krislov, 1967; Rosenbloom, 1983).

In a unique investigation of the importance of representative bureaucracy, Thielemann and Stewart (1996) examined the demand for services in light of the characteristics of administrators and service-delivery personnel. They found that ethnic minorities living with AIDS were far more likely to
care if the directors of treatment programs were of the same ethnic group as themselves, although the differences between minorities and Anglos were much less for actual service delivery personnel. Their findings clearly demonstrate a demand for representative bureaucracy by the clients of government programs (p. 172).

Scholars also point to a number of distinct benefits that representative bureaucracy provides for minority groups. Representativeness fortifies the legitimacy of government action from the point of view of minorities (Esman, 1999; Stein, 1986) because they “have a greater sense of enfranchisement when the bureaucracies that serve them are visibly diverse” (Ricucci & Saidel, 1997, p. 423). Reeves (1972) demonstrates, however, that representation is a two way street: “In addition to providing the represented with access to power it also tends to bind him to the political system” (p. 5).

Thus, representation begets further representation. In an important contribution to the understanding of the impacts of representative bureaucracy, Meier and Smith (1994) found a reciprocal relationship between minorities holding public office and government jobs, so that “as a bureaucracy becomes more representative, so does political representation, and vice versa” (p. 801). As Kelly (1998) argues, when “minorities are in decision-making and implementing structures,
more...minorities are hired” (p. 204). Thompson (1978, p. 326) posits that “jobs are among the more valuable perquisites which governments allocate” and Kerr, Miller, and Reid (2000) added that government employment opportunities “confer good salaries, benefits, status, and security” (p. 772). At the group level, Wise (1990) argues that government is a principal employer in modern society and increased job opportunities for underrepresented minorities contributes to the relative level of economic equality.

Bureaucratic representativeness for its own sake could prove to be undesirable, however, if it results in an erosion of competency, and thus compromises the merit principle. Esman (1999), however, argues, “the costs of illegitimate government resulting from patently unrepresentative administration are likely to exceed the grievances provoked in ethnically divided societies when the merit system is abridged” (p. 365). Related, Meier, Wrinkle, and Polinard (1999) found that representative bureaucracies do not benefit one group at the expense of others. Indeed, the authors conclude that “discriminatory personnel policies result in less able employees, which, in turn, detrimentally affects agency performance. Representative bureaucracies do not erect such artificial barriers to organizational performance and thus will perform at a higher level” (p. 1037).
The bureaucratic decision making process also benefits from a diverse employee base. A representative bureaucracy benefits from the diverse skills and talents of its administrators, and exposes all employees to a broader social point of view (Krislov, 1967). Diversity may also result in increased employee motivation and improved levels of performance by affording the exchange of varied perspectives on particular policy questions (Soni, 2000).

A final type of benefit of representative bureaucracies is policies that reflect the preferences and interests of minorities. While conclusive evidence of a link between passive and active representation is limited to particular organizations and programs (e.g., Hindera, 1993a & 1993b; Meier, 1993b; Selden, 1997a & 1997b), research has demonstrated the core validity of the relationship between a diverse public workforce and resulting policies that benefit historically disadvantaged groups.

**Complexities of Representative Bureaucracy**

By definition, representative bureaucracy is justified, and perhaps necessary, because the traditional checks on bureaucratic power exercised by the legislature, executive, and judiciary are insufficient to assure responsible administrative decision-making. Kim (1994) perhaps overstates the point in his
suggestion that “representative bureaucracy is presented as a device of democratic control because these external controls are judged to be failures” (p. 391). Indeed, Larson (1973) echoes the case made by Finer (1941) that external controls “can be made more effective - in fact, must be made more effective if democracy is to survive” (p. 88). This line of reasoning proposes that strengthening the traditional oversight mechanisms exercised by the political branches will solve problems related to administrative accountability and responsibility. However, this perspective erects a false “either/or” posture with formal mechanisms on one side and informal checks, such as representative bureaucracy, on the other. Indeed, Gilbert (1959) was very clear in his admonition that the myriad checks on administrative power should work in concert, and not with an “exclusive reliance” on one or another mechanism or approach (p. 382). So, it is quite reasonable to advocate for informal measures to address the exercise of administrative discretion, such as representative bureaucracy, while also addressing the potential shortcomings of more formal and traditional methods of political oversight.

Others posit that the principle of merit selection for public personnel could be threatened if representative bureaucracy were to be adopted on a large scale. This argument holds that the majority of public administrators are hired
because they have a demonstrated capacity to perform the essential tasks of the position, as evidenced by written tests and other job-related criteria (Kranz, 1976). Larson (1973) asserts that a broad pursuit of representative bureaucracy “would entail seriously compromising or abandoning the central principles of the merit bureaucracy...and personnel policies and practices would necessarily be arbitrary and even capricious” (p. 85).

The dangers of widespread advocacy in the form of active representation have been identified and discussed by numerous scholars. Notably, Mosher (1982) warned that, “active representation run rampant within a bureaucracy would constitute a major threat to orderly democratic government. The summing up of the multitude of special interests seeking effective representation does not constitute the general interest” (p. 15). Similarly, Romzek and Hendricks (1982) conclude that “to endow an advocacy agency with sufficient power to make it effective may ultimately undermine any conception, however limited, of a unitary public interest to be served by a representative bureaucracy” (p. 81, emphasis in original). Such fears assume that efforts to increase diversity in public sector workforces have been so successful as to create an organizational climate where the advocacy of minority interests trumps adherence to the agency mission and the pursuit a more
general notion of the public interest. Simply put, there is little evidence in the literature that such a fundamental transformation of the demographics or motivation of the public service is imminent or likely. For example, Naff (1998) found that, “while a sizable minority of supervisors support concepts related to the achievement of a representative bureaucracy, it is, nonetheless, a minority” (p. 141).

A related problem with the theory is “the matter of which groups in the larger society should be represented” (Larson, 1973, p. 84). Kingsley (1944) contends that the dominant forces in society should be represented, while Mosher (1982) argues that a cross-section of the entire society must be represented. In the American context, representative bureaucracy is perhaps best conceived in the context of efforts to ensure equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. For the purposes of examining the theoretical and practical utility of representative bureaucracy, it would seem, therefore, that issues related to race, ethnicity, and gender provide the most appropriate focus as these are among the most salient demographic characteristics in contemporary American politics.

Assuming a bureaucracy that reflects societal diversity, Meier and Nigro (1976) doubted the validity of the supposed links between social origins and socialization experiences on the one hand, and social origins and political attitudes on the
other. The authors suggest that the critical link between attitudes and behavior in the theory of representative bureaucracy is speculative (p. 460). However, as noted earlier, more recent research focused on active representation has conclusively demonstrated evidence of such linkages in particular contexts (Hindera, 1993a; Meier, 1993b; Selden, 1997a).

The final theoretical issue related to representation is the thorny question of whether the entire bureaucracy, or only particular levels, must reflect societal diversity. Meier and Nigro (1976) hypothesize that “the responsiveness of bureau elites is the crucial question” (p. 460). Conversely, Thompson (1976) argues that, “members of the lower ranks who occupy discretionary positions are probably more likely to represent their...communities than their superiors” (p. 216). Interestingly, Meier (1993a) admits that his previous research efforts were “clearly incorrect” (p. 23) to have ignored street-level bureaucrats, and concludes that “the bottom line on bureaucratic location and representative bureaucracy remains unclear” (p. 25). For the purposes of examining the existence and effects of representative bureaucracy, it would only make sense to look within organizations where minorities and women have an operational interest and discretion over policy outcomes consistent with that interest.
Assuming that the bureaucracy reflects societal diversity (passive representation), there remains the question of how to determine if those public administrators hold similar attitudes to the communities they are purported to represent. Saltzstein (1979) argues that “the researcher must decide which values should be congruent” and questions whether attitude congruence should be demonstrated on “only those values felt most strongly by the group, generalized norms as to group goals and aspirations, values related to specific policy issues, or attitudes generally concerning the role of the bureaucracy” (p. 469). Even if attitude congruence is demonstrated in the abstract, Thompson (1976) posits that officials representing a particular group may have difficulty discerning the proper perspective for that group with respect to the organization’s mission (p. 205). These concerns are largely accounted for when the research, such as the study presented in this dissertation, focuses specifically on issues that are directly related to representative bureaucracy in an examination of attitudes and attitude congruence.

A final body of criticism focuses on the likelihood that active representation can overcome the numerous obstacles inherent within a bureaucratic organization. Minority administrators may face the threat of organizational sanctions for behavior that deviates for the core mission or seems to
violate the expectation of equal treatment in the delivery services (Mosher, 1982). Alternatively, administrators may not work in an agency with jurisdiction over relevant issue areas, and may be employed in a routinized job with little discretion or influence (Meier, 1993b). Similarly, individual administrators may be subject to peer pressure to conform to agential objectives (Thompson, 1976) and may lack a critical mass of like-minded colleagues who could be supportive of efforts to represent group interests (Thompson, 1978). Rather than undercutting the conceptual validity or practicality of the theory, these factors serve to highlight the reality that active representation is not likely to occur in all organizations or agencies.

Perhaps the assumption of the theory of representative bureaucracy most often critiqued is the notion that the socialization experience, and the resultant value structure, of administrators is somehow static or permanent (Dolan, 2002; Kim, 1994; Rehfuss, 1986; Romzek, 1990; Rosenbloom & Featherstonhaugh, 1977; Simon, 1997; Thompson, 1976). To the contrary, numerous scholars have argued that organizations socialize their employees so that “newcomers become aware of, and committed to, the shared interpretations and values of old-guard organization members” (Guy and Duerst-Lahti, 1992, p. 162). Gawthrop (1969) argues that for the individual
bureaucrat, “the organization’s values become his own; the choices that have to be made are made voluntarily and with the understood approval of the organization” (p. 136) so that employees “accept the view that individual interests and goals can be satisfied only if organizational goals and interests are realized” (p. 131). Thus, administrators of all groups come to adopt a shared “management ideology” that works against the theorized motivation to work for group interests (Rehfuss, 1986, p. 459).

While the muting effects of organizational socialization, and the other barriers to representative bureaucracy, are undoubtedly substantial, the question remains: do the personal values of public administrators reflect those of citizens who share their demographic backgrounds? Perhaps the view of Alexis and Wilson (1967) brings the necessary argumentative balance to the fore: “The decision maker’s behavior reflects his perceptions of people, roles, and organizations, in addition to his own values and emotions. Even the most intelligent of us act on the basis of images that include more than the objective facts of the decision situation” (p. 158).

**Research Questions**

The critical linkages in the theory or representative bureaucracy are as follows: social origins (passive
representation) lead to values and attitudes, values and attitudes, in turn, lead to decisions and behaviors (active representation). Recent research focused on active representation has tended to bypass questions of administrator attitudes and focuses directly on the link between origins and outputs. Examples of such studies include Meier and Stewart (1992) and Hindera (1993a & 1993b). Other research integrates the examination of attitudes in larger studies of the existence of active representation (e.g., Selden, 1997a; Naff, 1998). To the extent that evidence of active representation is discovered, the issue of attitudes is moot. The generalizability of research on active representation is limited, however, due to the small number of organizations that have been examined and the methodological challenges of measuring the impact of the actions of individual administrators on policy outputs.

As a result, research that is focused on the attitudes of public administrators, and in particular their disposition toward advocating for minority interests, remains relevant to the broader understanding of representative bureaucracy. Whereas research on active representation necessarily focuses on one agency or program, examinations of administrators’ attitudes can be conducted across departments, or indeed government-wide. Examples of such studies include Meier and Nigro (1976), Thompson (1978), Rehfuss (1986), and Dolan (2000).
In addition, research that provides evidence that public administrators are predisposed to advocate for minority interests shows the potential for active representation. The study presented here constitutes such a test for the potential for active representation. By comparing the attitudes of citizens and administrators in Athens-Clarke County, Georgia, this research seeks to determine if the two groups have similar attitudes with regard to the desirability of representative bureaucracy in a local government setting. Evidence that citizens and administrators have similar attitudes on the desirability of representative bureaucracy supports the type of administrative advocacy associated with active representation.

It is important to make explicit that this research does not constitute an examination of whether active representation has occurred, but rather seeks evidence that the potential for active representation is present. While it may seem that recent research on active representation has rendered questions of attitude congruence to be irrelevant, this study uses a government-wide sample to examine the attitudes of administrators in numerous departments. Unlike the findings from research on active representation that are bound to a particular agency or program, this research attempts to determine whether the potential for active representation can
exist in numerous departmental contexts within a local government.

The potential for active representation is measured in three ways in this research. The first method is a test for attitude congruence. The preferences of public administrators are compared to citizen responses on questions related to the quality of services provided by A-CC government and the responsibility of individual administrators to represent the interests of African American constituents. It is important that the focus of the questions be related to diversity because attitude congruence and the subsequent passive-active link, if it exists, are only likely to be found when minority administrators deal with issues that have obvious consequences for minority constituents (Meier & Stewart, 1992, p. 161). The first hypothesis is that African American administrators, as compared to White administrators, will have greater attitude congruence with African American citizens.

Second, administrators were asked to predict citizen attitudes as reflected in the citizens’ responses. While prediction may appear to be outside of the theory of representative bureaucracy, it provides a second, independent measure of the degree to which administrators can accurately represent citizen preferences. This examination is important because of the possibility that, although an administrator may
have different attitudes than citizens, an administrator may know what those citizen attitudes are and may feel a professional obligation, an organizational pressure, or a personal willingness to act on them. Restated, the ability of administrators to predict citizen attitudes is relevant to the theory of representative bureaucracy because it demonstrates an explicit awareness on the part of public servants of the preferences of those they serve. Thus, the second research hypothesis is that African American administrators, as compared to White administrators, will be better able to predict attitudes of African American citizens.

Last, this research seeks to expand our understanding of the factors that lead to a public administrator choosing to advocate for the interests of the minority, i.e. African American, community. Previous research has shown that those administrators who adopt the so-called minority advocacy role are more likely to engage in behaviors that are consistent with the notion of active representation (Selden, 1997a). While the examinations of attitude congruence and attitude prediction are important in their own right, careful examinations of the influence of attitude congruence and attitude prediction on the adoption of the minority advocacy role will contribute significantly to our broader understanding of the theory of representative bureaucracy. Thus, the final research hypothesis
is that attitude congruence and attitude prediction will be significant factors in the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

Outline of Dissertation

Having introduced the theory of representative bureaucracy and identified the main research questions in the present chapter, the remainder of this dissertation will be organized as follows. A review of the literature on representative bureaucracy, with a particular focus on research on the potential for active representation, encompasses Chapter Two. The research methodologies, and the justifications for their employment, are detailed in Chapter Three. A thorough examination of the survey results and tests for attitude congruence are presented in Chapter Four. The applicability of the tool of attitude prediction is analyzed in Chapter Five. A summary of findings and conclusions comprise Chapter Six.
The theory of representative bureaucracy rests, in part, on the notion that public administrators possess the power to influence public policy. As Meier (1993a) asserts, “A fundamental axiom of public administration as it struggled to escape the epistemology of Max Weber is that individual members of the bureaucracy exercise discretion” (p. 3). One of the core challenges of modern democratic governance is to limit and control the exercise of this bureaucratic discretion.

As was discussed earlier, there are numerous mechanisms that collectively work to restrain the potential abuses of bureaucratic power. Meier (2000) identifies a series of external checks employed by political institutions to control the bureaucracy. These overhead checks tend to work best when there is consensus on the goals of the bureaucracy and when the political institutions work together to control administrative power (p. 164). In addition, various checks on administrative power have been developed that are internal to the bureaucracy. One such internal control on the abuse of administrative discretion is the promotion of diversity in the bureaucracy so that it comes to mirror the demographic characteristics of the
population. Diversity works to control the abuses of bureaucratic discretion through its inclusion of a more heterogeneous collection of perspectives and interests in administrative decision-making and action.

Although conceived quite differently, the benefits and necessity of a diverse and representative public sector workforce were formally recognized as early as the Pendleton Act of 1883. The Act effectively laid the foundation for the development of a merit-based civil service at the federal level. Some of the key components of the Act were to require open competitive examinations in the hiring process, establish probationary periods for new employees, protecting civil servants from political and partisan pressure, and creating the U.S. Civil Service Commission to generally over-see the implementation and protection of the new merit system. In addition, requirements such as the prohibition of more than two members of the same family being eligible for public service and that the majority of clerical positions in Washington, D.C. being apportioned to the states served to instill the value of representativeness in the new federal civil service. The Pendleton Act, therefore, helped to formally establish the standard that the bureaucracy be “representative of the nation as a whole, in terms of geography, mobility, ideals, and outlook” (Van Riper, 1958, p. 101).
In his landmark history of the United States civil service (1958), Van Riper provides two key criteria for a bureaucracy to be representative. It must: “(1) consist of a reasonable cross-section of the body politic in terms of occupation, class, geography, and the like, and (2) must be in general tune with the ethos and attitudes of the society of which it is part” (p. 552). The first requirement is what came to be known as passive representation. The second requirement, congruence between citizen and administrator attitudes is a necessary precondition for active representation.

The conception of representative bureaucracy employed by Van Riper was surely influenced by the works of his contemporaries. In the first concentrated argument for a theory of representative bureaucracy, Kingsley (1944) suggested that, “administrative arrangements always reflect the character of the social structure of a nation” (p. 215). Thus bureaucracy, from a British perspective, is class-based, and should reflect the dominant class in society (Meier, 1975, p. 526). Analyzing the English civil service, Kingsley asserts that, “when Ministers and Civil Servants share the same backgrounds and hold similar social views...the bureaucracy is representative” (p. 273).

In the first discussion of representative bureaucracy as an alternative for controlling administrative power in the United States, Levitan (1946) defined “representativeness” in much
different terms than Kingsley. To Levitan, all levels and branches of U.S. government should be “widened and made truly representative of American society” (p. 583). He reasoned that the public would have a much higher regard for a bureaucracy that reflected the nation’s diversity, and “agencies, as a result, would experience tangible benefits from having a representative work force” (Selden, 1997a, p. 41).

Assuming that the degree of administrative discretion was likely to continue to increase, Long (1952) asserted that questions of administrative responsibility would be paramount. He argued that important interests were not being represented in Congress or before the President. Consequently, “these interests receive more effective and more responsible representation through administrative channels than though the legislature” (p. 811). Long further argued that public administrators “may be both more representative of the country and more democratic in composition than the Congress” (p. 812), and, therefore, may compensate for representational deficiencies born of Congress’ homogeneity. As a result, Long “made the empirical claim that the U.S. bureaucracy was representative and the normative contention that representative bureaucracy is beneficial” (Meier, 1975, p. 527). Thus, diversity is public sector workforces can be both a means to an end and an end in and of itself.
The Theory of Representative Bureaucracy

In a landmark discussion of representative bureaucracy, Mosher (1982) identified the two different conceptions of representation noted earlier that are implicit in the theory: passive and active. Passive representation, as explained in the previous chapter, “concerns the origin of individuals and the degree to which, collectively, they mirror the total society” (p. 15). It is important to note that the fulfillment of such a construct of representation “does not necessarily mean that a public servant with given background and social characteristics will *ipso facto* represent the interests of others with like backgrounds and characteristics in his behavior and decisions” (p. 16). Accordingly, active representation calls for administrators to “press for the interests and desires of those whom he is presumed to represent” (p. 14).

Having defined the two types of representation implicit in the theory, Mosher adds an important cautionary note. He asserted, “we know too little about the relationship between a man’s background and pre-employment socialization on the one hand, and his orientation and behavior in office on the other” (p. 16). Mosher identifies a number of variables that could intervene and disrupt the passive-active link. The recognition that the passive-active link is not as linear as it may first
appear provided the impetus for virtually all the subsequent research on the theory of representative bureaucracy.

**Passive Representation**

The preponderance of research and literature related to representative bureaucracy focuses on passive representation, or the degree to which the bureaucracy mirrors the demographic make-up of the citizenry. Passive representation serves as a necessary precondition for active representation. In language that predates empirical efforts to directly examine active representation, Meier (1975) argued that “the test of representative bureaucracy...is whether or not the social characteristics...of the bureaucracy mirror those exhibited by the American public” (p. 528). In this sense it is similar in construct to general notions of diversity and equal employment opportunity. Whereas equal employment opportunity efforts and affirmative action programs are legal mandates, passive representation and diversification efforts are initiated by organizations to promote equity and, ultimately, increase programmatic effectiveness and productivity (Klingner & Nalbandian, 2003).

There are two key aspects of passive representation that warrant examination. The first question concerns the degree of representativeness of the bureaucracy. The most common measure
of representativeness compares the percentage of government employees with a specific demographic characteristic and the percentage in the relevant population who share that characteristic (e.g., Dometrius, 1984; Gibson & Yeager, 1975; Hellriegel & Short, 1972; Lewis, 1988; Nachmias & Rosenbloom, 1973; Page, 1994; Rose & Chia, 1978; Subramanian, 1967). Different comparison groups have been used, including the national population, jurisdictional populations, and the size of the relevant population in the appropriate labor pool (Selden, 1997a). For example, Lewis (1988) compared the employment rates of women, African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asians in the federal government and found that the rates of employment for these groups increased between 1976 and 1986. These gains were seen throughout the employment hierarchy, as represented by pay scale, of the federal government. Despite such gains, Lewis concluded that the rates of progress were slow, and “it would take another thirty years at this rate before women and minorities fill half the positions at GS-13 and above” due in part to the reality that “even dramatic changes in hiring practices may take years to alter the face of the federal workforce” (p. 705).

A more sophisticated measure of workforce representation within an agency called the “measure of variation” (MV) was introduced by Nachmias and Rosenbloom (1973) and later used by
Grabosky and Rosenbloom (1975) and Kellough (1990). The MV statistic draws on the degree of representation for each racial or ethnic group present in the organization to create an index from 0 to 1 that reflects the overall representativeness in the agency (Kellough, 1990, p. 557-8). Kellough (1990) suggests that the primary advantage of the MV statistic is that “it provides a single figure which shows how close an agency approximates the situation in which there is an equal number of employees from all racial/ethnic groups” (p. 558). Thus, gains in minority employment do not necessarily translate into a higher MV score, since an overrepresentation of minorities can have the same affect as an overrepresentation of whites. Thus, rather than providing a direct measure of minority representation, Kellough (1998) asserts that the MV statistic reflects, “racial/ethnic heterogeneity based on the number of non-minority and minority individuals” (p. 169).

Overall, studies have shown that, while bureaucracies at all levels of governments are increasingly diverse, minorities are under-represented in certain departments and, perhaps more importantly, in top policy-making positions (e.g., Grabosky & Rosenbloom, 1975; Cayer & Sigelman, 1980; Dometrius, 1984; Riccucci, 1986; Kellough & Elliott, 1992; Page, 1994; Riccucci & Saidel, 1997). For example, Page (1994) concludes that in the federal government, “there continues to be a concentration of
African Americans in the lower salary grades, with nearly 29 percent of African Americans at or below GS-4, and 52 percent of African Americans at or below GS-8” (p. 46).

The second important aspect of passive representation focuses on the variables that account for variation in the level or degree of representation in the bureaucracy. Mosher (1982) suggested a number of possible measures of passive representation such as education, family income, socio-economic status, religion, race, and gender. Kingsley (1944) argued that social class should be the measure for assessing the representativeness of the British civil service. There is virtual consensus in the literature that race is the most important demographic attribute when analyzing bureaucratic diversity in the American context. Indeed, Rosenbloom and Featherstonhaugh (1977) found that “racial background continues to influence the outlooks of individuals even after they become public bureaucrats” (p. 879). Similarly, Meier (1993a) hypothesizes that “a linkage between active and passive representation is most likely to be found for racial variables” (p. 10). Race serves as the focal variable in the research presented in this dissertation.

Much of research on passive representation has focused on minority employment in state and local government. As a result, numerous environmental and contextual variables have been
explored in order to explain variation in minority hiring patterns. The most commonly explored factor is the relationship between employment rates and the percentage of the affected group in the overall population (Dye & Renick, 1981; Eisinger, 1982; Mladenka, 1989a & 1989b; Riccucci, 1986). Stein (1986) hypothesized that “As minority population grows, so does the minority component of the labor pool and the need for elected officials to recognize their minority constituencies” (p. 699). Indeed, her analysis confirmed that “The size of a city’s minority population is the single most important explanatory factor” for understanding hiring patterns (p. 708).

Interestingly, Lewis (1989) also concluded that labor force demographics are the most significant variable, however he found an inverse relationship in his examination of police departments. As Lewis explained, “as the black percentage in city labor forces increases, continuing or increased resistance to affirmative action effort within police departments is likely” (p. 262). He also found that “opportunities for advancement into the command ranks” of police departments were greater when there was increased representation in lower ranks due to internal promotion patterns.

A second important determinant of minority employment is the extent of political representation, as indicated by minority presence in executive and legislative positions. A number of
studies have concluded that the presence of a minority mayor leads to increased employment opportunities for minorities (Eisinger, 1982; Lewis, 1989; Riccucci, 1986; Saltzstein, 1986; Stein, 1986). Stein and Condrey (1987) also examined the influence of a non-minority mayor on minority employment and concluded that, “The probability that a white mayor will actively work to increase minority hiring is certainly a function of his/her reliance on black electoral support” (p. 103). Related are explorations of the effects of minority representation on council and boards (Mladenka, 1989a & 1989b). Dye and Renick (1981) conclude that “Representation on city councils is more important in gaining employment in administrative, professional and protective positions than any other single factor, including income and educational levels” (p. 484). Similarly, minority representation on local school boards leads to increased employment in teaching and administrative positions (Meier & Stewart, 1991; Meier, Stewart, & England, 1989). However, Meier and Smith (1994) assert that the relationship between political representation and minority employment opportunity are reciprocal, such that “As a bureaucracy becomes more representative, so does political representation, and vice versa” (p. 801).

A final factor potentially influencing patterns of state and local employment is legal involvement from the U.S. Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission. Stein and Condrey (1987) found that consent decrees in certain cities have been “successful catalysts for change” because they force cities to modify recruitment and selection procedures in order to increase the number and percentage of minority employees (p. 103). However, Stein (1986) concluded that the presence of court suits had a negative relation to minority representation due to the fact “that cities with the poorest records in minority hiring tend to have the greater number of suits” (p. 703).

The relevant variables for research focused on federal employment patterns are similar to those for state and local governments. Kellough (1990) found that smaller agencies were most likely to have racial and ethnic integration due to the fact that “smaller agencies tend to have larger proportions on their workforces located in positions in Washington, DC—a location providing ready access to a large minority labor pool” (p. 564). Grabosky and Rosenbloom (1975) suggest that the relative impact of one additional minority employee on the overall rate of minority representativeness is greater in smaller agencies.

Using panel data, Cornwell and Kellough (1994) concluded that, “female and minority employment shares tend to be higher in agencies with greater proportions of low-echelon (clerical and blue-collar) jobs” (p. 269). Furthermore, the authors found
that agencies that prioritize the redressing of social and economic inequalities tend to have higher rates of female and minority representation. This finding is consistent with Page (1994) who asserted that, “African American employment is higher in agencies with primarily black constituencies or in program areas of greatest interest to minorities (EEO, Affirmative Action, housing, welfare, urban transportation)” (p. 27).

With regard to political support, there appears to be little variation in employment opportunities for minorities and women in the federal civil service across presidential administrations despite differences in rhetorical expressions on the subject (Naff & Crum, 2000). The authors conclude that, “there is little or no relationship between the party in power and the demographic makeup of the rank-and-file civil service” (p. 107). The current trend of downsizing the size of the government workforce coupled the federal government’s fiscal deficit could exacerbate the disparity in employment opportunities since reductions in force tend to be aimed “at the low-end of the occupational hierarchy where most African Americans are concentrated” (Page, 1994, p. 31).

The relative degree of passive representation serves the precondition for the critical theoretical and operational link to active representation. Thus, the core question for the theory of representative bureaucracy is whether workforce
representation impacts organizational performance and public policy.

**Active Representation**

In his argument for a “new public administration,” Frederickson (1971) suggests that pluralistic governments are systematically biased in favor of established interests at the expense of minorities. He asserts that this condition is “morally reprehensible” and “constitutes a fundamental, if long-range, threat to the viability of this or any political system” (p. 311). Indeed, “A Public Administration which fails to work for changes which try to redress the deprivation of minorities will likely be eventually used to repress those minorities” (p. 311). The theory of representative bureaucracy, and specifically the component known as active representation, calls for such action. Mosher (1982) suggests that active representation calls for administrators to “press for the interests and desires of those whom he is presumed to represent” (p. 14).

Meier (1993a) identified a number of factors that influence when passive representation is likely to translate into beneficial policy decisions. In addition to the necessary precondition that an agency is passively representative of the population, active representation is hypothesized to be more
likely to occur when: the personal values of administrators are related to the policy issues at hand in the organization (p. 10), the agency mission and socialized values are in line with personal values (p. 17), opportunities to exercise bureaucratic discretion are relevant to personal values (p. 19), agency rules either do not limit discretion or reinforce personal values (p. 21), the organization has slack financial resources (p. 23), professional training and values are sensitive to the effect that decisions have on represented groups (p. 26), the organization employs representative administrators with high levels of education (p. 27), the organization has a critical mass of employees from the group that is represented (p. 28), and the administrators enjoy the support of elected officials and organized community groups (p. 28). Keiser, et al. (2002) further hypothesize that active representation is more likely in organizations that are decentralized and relatively less hierarchically structured (p. 28). In their examination of administrative discretion in the Farmer’s Home Administration, Sowa and Selden (2003) hypothesized that “administrators who perceive themselves as having more discretion in relation to internal agency processes and over the outcomes directed toward clients will be more likely to produce outcomes that favor minority interests” (p. 704). The authors concluded that such perceived discretion was positively correlated with policy
outcomes that are representative of minority interests. Broadly stated, these factors reflect Meier’s (2000) two preconditions for bureaucratic power and influence in policy-making process: resources and autonomy.

Within the conditions listed above, the theory of representative bureaucracy hypothesizes that minority public administrators will advocate for the corresponding interests of historically disadvantaged social groups. While such advocacy can take many forms, Hindera (1993a) suggests that empirical research examining active representation must focus on decision-making behavior that is allocative in nature since “these types of decisions determine how the benefits and burdens of society are to be distributed” (p. 96). In addition, Hindera (1993a) posits that research designed to assess the presence of active representation must identify the population that is being served and “the bureaucrats who are doing the representing” (p. 96). Given the operational challenge posed by these two preconditions, there is limited research that directly examines active representation. A review of the literature reveals only a handful of empirical studies focused on the link between passive and active representation, and all were published in the 1990s.

Hindera (1993a) examined the effects of the passive representation of African Americans and women in the Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission on the percentage of total charges filed on behalf of African Americans and women respectively. He found that charges that benefited African Americans were filed more frequently as the percentage of African Americans employed within the agency increased. The percentage of African Americans in the labor pool and EEOC offices located in smaller cities also had a positive relationship to the number of charges that were filed on behalf of African Americans. Interestingly, the opposite was true for women, as increased numbers of female administrators led to fewer complaints filed on behalf of women.

Hindera (1993b) extended his research to examine the interactive effects of African American and Hispanic representation. He concluded that as the percentage of African American investigators increased, so did the percentage of charges filed on behalf of African Americans. Conversely, increasing percentages of Hispanic and white investigators had a negative effect on the percentage of charges filed on behalf of African Americans. Hindera proposed an explanation based on self-interest for these findings: “a group might act contrary to another group’s interest in a constrained resource environment, thus favoring the relative position of the group” (p. 427). Thus each minority group should constitute its own unit of analysis, in addition to any testing for interactive effects.
In a more recent analysis of active representation at the EEOC, Hindera and Young (1998) identified four distinct bureaucratic environments relevant to the theory. The environments correspond to the relative size, in terms of the number of employees, of the relevant group in the organization. The authors found that as the relevant group increases from not achieving a critical mass, exceeding a critical mass, constituting a plurality, and being in the majority, the potential for active representation increases. These findings suggest, “bureaucracies can be staffed in such a way as to produce hyperresponsiveness toward specific clientele” (p. 668). Collectively, Hindera’s research provides clear evidence of the passive-active link as theorized.

Hindera and Young’s (1998) hypotheses of the importance of a critical mass of minority administrators is based on the findings of Meier’s (1993b) examination of the ability of Latino teachers to serve as active representatives for Latino students. Meier (1993b) concluded that, “teachers were more likely to be associated with positive results for Latino students than were principals” (p. 411). Meier (1993b), however, also concluded that a critical mass of principals was a necessary pre-condition for active representation to occur.

In their analysis of administrators, teachers, and students in Florida schools, Meier and Stewart (1992) confirmed three key
conditions, first hypothesized by Thompson (1976), for the passive - active link to occur. First, the bureaucrats in question must have a necessary degree of discretion over their actions and decisions (p. 167). Second, the analysis must be focused on “a demographic factor with a lasting impact” such as race (p. 167). Third, tests of representative bureaucracy must analyze policies that are directly related to the given demographic characteristics “so that the relationship between representation and policy would be immediately apparent” (p. 167). To these conditions, Hindera (1993a) adds that any research design must “include measurable decision-making behavior,” and must “be able to explicitly identify the ‘segment of the people’ which is being represented and the bureaucrats who are doing the representing” (p. 96, emphasis in original).

The research conducted by Selden (1997a) on active representation in the Farmers Home Administration’s Rural Housing Loans program satisfied all of these criteria. Selden concluded that the passive representation of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians positively influenced the allocation of loans favoring those groups (p. 139). Selden (1997b) asserts that such findings are “particularly important because active representation is found in an agency whose primary mission does not emphasize minority issues, that historically has employed low percentages of minorities, and that has implemented policies
that have adversely affected minorities” (p. 36). This research provides the somewhat elusive evidence of the passive-active link.

In addition to confirming the basic theoretical linkage of representative bureaucracy, Selden (1997a) found that “administrators who perceive their role as that of an advocate or representative of minority interests are more likely to make decisions that benefit the minority community” (p. 140). This notion of a minority representative role was expanded in Selden, Brudney, and Kellough (1998). The authors found that “race, education, age, party identification, years employed by the federal government, and perceived work obligations” collectively affect the likelihood that an administrator will view themselves as advocates for minority interests (p. 717), and it is the adoption of this minority representative role, rather than race or ethnicity itself, which explains the active representation of minority interests (p. 738). Whereas organizational socialization has traditionally been presented as a barrier to the realization of representative bureaucracy, this finding suggests that public administrators can be socialized, either in educational experiences or in organizational contexts, to prioritize service to historically disadvantaged populations.

Although empirical research efforts on active representation are few in number and recent in coming, they have
collectively served to bolster the relevance of the general theory of representative bureaucracy. Rigorous research has confirmed that which is expected intuitively, that in certain, very specific circumstances, there is a link between passive representation and policy outputs. Indeed, as Dolan and Rosenbloom (2003) conclude, much of the research on active representation (e.g., Meier & Stewart, 1992; Hindera, 1993a & 1993b) has examined the link between demographic characteristics and behavior, thereby bypassing the role of attitudes altogether.

An additional, and perhaps more significant, limitation of research on active representation, however, is the need for decision-making discretion and measurable outcomes. These requirements, coupled with the pre-conditions identified by Meier and Stewart (1992) and Hindera (1993a), have the effect of substantially limiting the universe of administrative settings where the existence of active representation can be tested. It is important to acknowledge, though, that those empirical studies where evidence of active representation was documented serve to confirm, in a limited way, the theorized link between passive and active representation. Recognition of active representation in a handful of contexts and environments does not, however, inform as to the full potential for active representation.
The notion of active representation, as defined by Mosher (1982), is the expectation that administrators will “press for the interests and desires of those whom they are presumed to represent” (p. 14). From this point of view, the mere advocacy of interests of certain groups constitutes active representation; there need not be tangible or measurable outcomes. There are a number of factors that may preclude advocating administrators from achieving policy outcomes consistent with the interests of the minority community. That does not mean, however, that active representation has not taken place. Furthermore, advocacy efforts may be unsuccessful in that policy outcomes do not necessarily favor minority interests, however, failed advocacy is advocacy nonetheless. Since we know from other research (e.g., Selden, 1997a) that administrators who adopt the minority representative role are likely to produce outcomes favorable to minority interests when they have the opportunity and inclination to do so, at a minimum there should be evidence that the administrator is inclined to press for those interests, and thus adhere to the role.

It seems safe to assume that active representation occurs far more frequently than the current state of the literature on representative bureaucracy suggests. It is simply the case that most incidences of active representation are beyond the reach of our present research capabilities. The import of this broader
concept of active representation is the need for a more thorough understanding of the potential for active representation, or the likelihood that administrators will advocate for minority interests.

**Potential for Active Representation**

In making what he calls a constitutional case for public administration, Rohr (1990) argues that it is important for bureaucracy to consist of “people who think as we think, feel as we feel” (p. 72). This implies that, in addition to looking like America, the collective attitudes held by public administrators should also be reflective of the interests of the citizenry. This argument is consistent with the theory of representative bureaucracy. Implicit in the passive - active link is the expectation of attitude congruence between administrators and the citizens they purport to represent. If it can be determined that “administrators and the public share value orientations,” then we can assert with greater certainty that “administrators will advocate and pursue courses of action the public would if it were able to congregate and had the administrator’s expertise and information” (Meier & Nigro, 1976, p. 458).

One of the core challenges to the theorized link between bureaucratic diversity and advocacy for minority interests is
the effect of organizational socialization. In his examination of the attitudes of senior-level managers in California’s bureaucracy, Rehfuss (1986) concluded that women and racial minorities share a “management ideology” with their white, male colleagues and this ideology “may work against direct representation of group interests” (p. 459). In contrast, Thompson (1976) found that differences persist by race on support for affirmative action programs, thereby countering the argument that organizational socialization suppresses all variation in attitudes. While this does not prove that divergent attitudes will lead to overt advocacy, he suggests that, “officials often sustain a latent predisposition to represent the substantive interests of their racial groups” (p. 208). Indeed, research focused on active representation has confirmed the link between such predisposition and active representation in certain contexts.

In early work on administrative attitudes, Garnham (1975) examined the attitudes of members of the Foreign Service office corps according to regional background, socioeconomic background, religion, and education (p. 44). He concluded that what little variance existed in attitudes was not explained by these background characteristics. Due to the homogenous demographics of the study’s population, however, gender and race were not considered in the analysis.
Also, as a correlate to a larger examination of passive representation, Meier (1975) compared the attitudes of federal, state, and local government employees to those of the general public on various issue positions. The findings suggest that public employees are generally more liberal in political orientation than the general population and, in particular, on the issue of government intervention to aid minorities (p. 541).

In an examination of the relationship of demography and attitudes, Meier and Nigro (1976) examined the effects of social background and agency affiliation on the attitudes held by supergrade (GS 16 to GS 18) federal administrators. Eight demographic variables were selected: father’s social class, urbanism, region, education, age, respondent’s first occupation, race, and gender (p. 461). Respondents were asked to indicate if they would prefer increased, decreased, or the same level of spending in a series of general policy areas. Meier and Nigro (1976) concluded that such background characteristics as race, gender, and social class are poor predictors of attitudes, although race was the best predictor. However, there was some correlation between policy area and certain social characteristics, suggesting that some traits are more important for shaping attitudes toward certain types of policies. It is also important to note that the authors only sought to explain how administrators’ attitudes are formed, and did not attempt to
Rosenbloom and Featherstonhaugh (1977) compared directly the attitudes of federal administrators and citizens on several measures of political participation. They found that, regardless of organizational position, African American administrators held significantly different attitudes from white administrators. Additionally, when compared to the attitudes of whites, African American bureaucrats and citizens tended to hold similar attitudes. Their analysis “strongly suggests that passive bureaucratic representation can serve as a prerequisite for greater active representation” (p. 879). Thus, “the ‘passive representatives’ of a group are...more likely to reflect the general outlook of their social community than are other bureaucrats” (p. 880). The authors caution, however, that demonstrating such a potential for active representation in minority administrators does not guarantee that those attitudes will manifest as “they may have insufficient opportunities to do so or may be ineffective in their efforts” (p. 881).

Rosenbloom and Kinnard (1977) undertook an exploration of the attitudes of high-ranking personnel at the Department of Defense that focused on “the extent to which they felt a responsibility toward and sought to aid other minority group members in obtaining placements with the federal bureaucracy”
They found that the passive-active link is complex, and is influenced by such expected factors as age, seniority, education, and position. Other important variables to be considered are “the frequency of requests to further minority interests, the attitudes of one’s colleagues toward one’s activities, and the extent to which one received preferential treatment in the past” (p. 42).

Expanding the research locus to include local, state, and federal administrators, Thompson (1978) examined attitudes toward the recruiting and hiring of under-represented minority groups. He concluded that most social characteristics were poor predictors of “how receptive to hiring minorities a civil servant will be” (p. 342). Significantly, however, both race and gender were found to have statistically significant relationships with the receptivity to hiring minorities.

Lewis (1990) compared the political, social, and personal attitudes of public administrators to those of the general public. He concluded that bureaucrats are “ordinary people” in terms of their attitudes about government spending and power (p. 226). Similarly, public administrators are not consistently in favor of bigger government, however they “tend to support wider roles for women and minorities” (p. 227). It is important to note that independent variables such as race, gender, and education were not controlled in the analysis.
Dolan (2000) explored the effect of gender on the likelihood that members of the federal Senior Executive Service would adopt an advocacy role for women’s issues. She concluded that female executives were more likely to assume an advocacy role when they work in an agency specifically related to women’s issues, and where there is a critical mass of female executives (p. 522). Rather than focusing on individual level variables, such as the adoption of an advocacy role, Kelly and Newman (2001) suggest that the connections between the type of state agency and equal employment opportunity implementation and outcomes explain why passively representative organizations “move to substantive policy representation” (p. 4).

Two key conclusions can be made regarding the state of the literature on the potential for active representation. First, the attitudes of federal-level administrators have been analyzed with much greater frequency than those of employees in state and local government. This stands in direct contrast to research on passive representation that is less likely to be focused on diversity in the federal ranks. Second, few of the published studies directly compared the attitudes of administrators and citizens. While this concern is placated somewhat by research confirming the passive-active link, those studies are small in number and apply to highly circumscribed contexts. Taken together, these two conclusions demonstrate the limited
exploration of the full potential of active representation.

The research presented in this dissertation analyzes the attitudes of both citizens and employees of a local community. While falling short of a full test of the passive – active link in the theory of representative bureaucracy, this study of attitudes sheds light on the likelihood that public administrators will act as advocates of minority interests.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As was previously discussed, there are two critical components to the theory of representative bureaucracy: passive and active representation. Research examining passive representation has demonstrated that, although government agencies are increasingly diverse, minorities are underrepresented in top policy-making positions. This finding is troubling in light of legal efforts, such affirmative action and equal employment opportunity policies, to diversify the public sector workforce. The benefits of diversity in government are manifold. Diverse public organizations send a symbolic message of enfranchisement and equality to minority communities, thereby signaling the importance of passive representation for all types of public agencies. Employment practices that foster opportunities for minorities also help fulfill the democratic ideal of inclusiveness by partially offsetting the disproportionate tendencies of electoral branches.

An additional benefit of diversity in public organizations is the potential that they will adopt policies that explicitly reflect the interests of minority populations. This organizational-level output is the result of individual-level
behavior by public administrators. As discussed earlier, recent research has shown that, in certain contexts, minority administrators will use their legitimate discretion to advocate for the interests of minority citizens and communities. This policy-oriented advocacy constitutes active representation. The necessary contextual factors for policy-related active representation to occur, however, potentially limits the applicability of the full-blown theory of representative bureaucracy to a wide variety of public organizations.

A third body of research provides a link between passive and active representation and may serve to make the theory more generally applicable. The theory of representative bureaucracy assumes that administrators and citizens with similar backgrounds will hold similar attitudes and those administrators will, in turn, press for citizen preferences. Although not all examinations of active representation have explicitly tested for such intervening attitude congruence, some have probed the relationship among social origins, attitudes, and policy outputs (Dolan & Rosenbloom, 2003, p. 115). For example, Selden (1997a) found that administrators who adopt a minority advocacy role are more likely to exhibit behaviors that are indicative of active representation. Such research, however, has not answered the fundamental question of whether citizens and administrators have similar conceptions regarding the desirability of an actively
representative workforce. By comparing the attitudes of administrators and citizens on a series of questions related to representative bureaucracy, the research presented in this dissertation purports to answer that important question.

**Research Topics**

Recognition of the importance of the attitudes of public administrators as compared to the views of citizens to the theory of representative bureaucracy still begs the thorny question of which attitudes are most relevant. Saltzstein (1979) contends that the issue of which values are to be examined is undefined in the theory, and that this presents “serious theoretical, conceptual, and methodological” problems (p. 469). In their critique of Rosenbloom and Featherstonhaugh’s research, Sigelman and Carter (1978) suggest a resolution to Saltzstein’s concern: “it should be shown that bureaucrats are clearly differentiated on policy-related attitudes of concern to the groups they represent” (p. 724). The following literature review focuses on the types of political and policy issues that have been examined with regard to the attitudes of administrators. Using Saltzstein and Sigelman and Carter as theoretical benchmarks, this review demonstrates the wide variety of governmental policies have been examined and suggests a resolution to the issue of what values
should be measured in order to demonstrate that the potential for active representation exists.

Garnham (1975) used three measures to assess the psycho-attitudinal mindset of members of the Foreign Service office corps: worldmindedness, psychological flexibility, and career satisfaction (p. 44). These dependent variables respectively reflect the extent to which the respondent “responds to foreign affairs on the basis of international rather than national considerations,” the “flexibility and adaptability of a person’s thinking and social behavior,” and the level of career satisfaction (p. 45). Due in no small part to the homogenous make-up of the research subjects, Garnham concluded that, “background characteristics are not related to several attributes of potential interest to foreign affairs analysts” (p. 49).

Meier and Nigro (1976) surveyed federal supergrade administrators, drawn from GS 16 through GS 18. Respondents were asked to indicate if they would prefer increased, decreased, or the same level of spending in the following series of policy areas: space exploration, environmental protection, health care, urban problems, crime control, drug abuse, education, improving the condition of minorities, national defense, foreign aid, and welfare (p. 461). On these measures,
the authors find that, “social origins say little about policy preferences in this case” (p. 467).

Rehfuss (1986) conducted interviews with senior-level managers in California’s bureaucracy. He used open-ended questions to assess “management ideology” (p. 457). Interview topics included to who the administrator feels responsible, why they sought their current position, and the major benefits and drawbacks to their position (p. 458). He concluded that all managers, including women and minorities, share a similar perspective that “may work against direct representation of group interest” (p. 459).

Other research on the attitudes of administrators has focused on topics that more directly address Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action policies and representative bureaucracy. Thompson (1976) found that differences persist by race on support for affirmative action programs. Similarly, Thompson (1978) surveyed public personnel administrators regarding their attitudes toward the recruiting and hiring of under-represented minority groups. Topics included whether public agencies have responsibilities to advertise vacancies in minority communities, recruit minority applicants, give preference to hiring minority applicants, and establish hiring targets and timetables (p. 330-1).
Rosenbloom and Kinnard (1977) explored the attitudes of high-ranking minority personnel at the Department of Defense. They analyzed attitudes related to whether “minority group members in high level positions should attempt to serve the special needs of minorities” (p. 38).

In more recent research, Dolan (2000) explored the effect of gender on the likelihood that members of the federal Senior Executive Service would adopt an advocacy role for women’s issues. Items used to construct an index that served as the dependent variable included support for government efforts to combat sexual harassment in the workplace, provide unpaid leave opportunities, and funding for child care (p. 526). Respondents were also asked if women and black applicants should be preferred if they are underrepresented (p. 526).

Among other topics, Kelly and Newman (2001) surveyed senior-level administrators in a number of states on issues related to Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action. They concluded that female administrators are “consistently more supportive of affirmative action than their male counterparts” (p. 22).

While the predilection of administrators to advocate for minority interests is an important factor in the passive-active link, the theory of representative bureaucracy suggests that administrators will share attitudes with citizens with similar
backgrounds and socialization experiences. Thus, a full exploration of the potential of active representation entails a direct comparison of administrator and citizen attitudes.

In one of the few studies to make such a direct comparison, Rosenbloom and Featherstonhaugh (1977) directly contrasted the attitudes of federal administrators and citizens, using race as their primary independent characteristic. The authors relied on data from a 1967 study on the attitudes of administrators that focused on a variety of issues related to political participation. Items on the survey included whether the respondent followed public affairs, would try to change national and local laws, voted in recent elections, and had a strong party identification (p. 876-7). They conclude, “black public servants are more likely than whites to be able to articulate values and perspectives which are most closely associated with blacks as a social group” (p. 881).

Lewis (1990) used data gathered from nationwide surveys conducted in the 1980s to compare the political, social, and personal attitudes of public administrators to those of the general public. Survey questions reflected such public issues as increased government spending, the freedom of speech, and confidence in people running government institutions. Of particular note is the finding that public administrators are more likely than citizens to have progressive attitudes on
racial issues (p. 224). He concluded, “bureaucrats in general seem to be quite ordinary in their politics, values, and personal lives” (p. 227). It is important to note that independent variables such as race, gender, and education were not controlled for in the analysis.

In terms of issue areas, research into the attitudes of administrators, and thus the potential for active representation, has cast a wide net. Important research has explored attitudes related to advocacy for minority interests and support for representative bureaucracy. However, none of those studies compared the attitudes of administrators to those of citizens directly. Conversely, studies that did make such a comparison didn’t focus on issues related directly to representative bureaucracy, per se. Furthermore, the relationship between attitude congruence and the adoption of the minority advocacy role has not been examined.

The research presented in this dissertation satisfies these criteria. Data are collected through a survey administered to public administrators and citizens. Survey questions utilized reflect general policy issues important to all citizens, but are especially important to African Americans. The survey was administered to administrators and citizens in Athens-Clarke County, Georgia (hereafter abbreviated “A-CC”), thereby permitting a direct comparison of attitudes on issues related to
representative bureaucracy between public administrators and the citizens they serve.

Survey Questions

As previously discussed, a key issue in any test for attitude congruence, as a proxy for the potential for active representation, is the determination of which values should be congruent. A number of previously published studies were consulted in drafting the survey questions for the study presented here. While the survey instrument of no one study was replicated, various questions were adapted and modified from numerous sources to address the purposes of this research. A review of these sources is essential to understanding the purpose of the study as well as the importance of the content of individual questions.

A series of articles have examined the perceived leadership responsibilities of high-ranking administrators. Schmidt and Posner (1986) surveyed senior level federal administrators and asked them to rate the importance of the following set of organizational goals, presented in descending order of perceived importance: effectiveness, leadership, high productivity, reputation, high morale, efficiency, service to the public, value to community, organizational stability, budget stability, and organizational growth (p. 448). This study was replicated
ten years later with strikingly similar results (Posner & Schmidt, 1994). Notably, the set of goals do not reference diversity, equal employment opportunity, or affirmative action directly, and these studies did not examine responses by race. Brudney, Hebert, and Wright (2000) applied a similar set of organizational goals in a study of the attitudes of state agency directors. They conclude that race and gender can have a direct effect on attitudes and behaviors and an indirect effect “through the mediating influence of the organizational role set” (p. 510). It is important to indicate that the independent variable for race was a dichotomous measure of white and nonwhite, consisting of African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans (p. 492).

In his discussion of the competing role demands on minority administrators, Herbert (1974) suggests that they face “the challenge of accepting the obligation of working for the development and operation of public programs which more effectively meet the needs of all people” (p. 563, emphasis in original). Indeed, it could be argued that this is the challenge facing all public administrators, minority or otherwise. However, for the minority public servant this may entail the adoption of an advocacy position. Herbert argues, “It may demand that the minority group perspective on public policy questions be researched, developed, and articulated,” so
that “minority administrators not forget who they are, or from whence they have come” (p. 563).

Herbert (1974) identifies six external and internal “forces” that affect the way in which minority administrators view their role and responsibility to the organization, the public, and the minority community (p. 560). These six forces are: system demands, traditional role expectations, colleague pressures, community accountability, personal commitment to the community, and personal ambition (p. 560). Murray, Terry, Washington, and Keller (1994) surveyed members of the Conference of Minority Public Administrators, a sub-organization of the American Society for Public Administration, to see if their role perception is consistent with Herbert’s typology. The authors conclude, “most minority administrators believed they should play strong advocacy roles, especially for underrepresented minority communities” (p. 415). Due to the fact that the majority of members in the Conference were minorities, the study was unable to determine if non-minority administrators share the same role perception.

Karnig and McClain (1988) examined the role perceptions of minority administrators and conclude that they “must be more than just good administrators, since they have deep obligations to the minority community and must help to destroy counterproductive stereotypes” (p. 151). The authors suggest a
series of strategies for minority administrators that would result in improved policy outcomes and increased opportunities for participation in decision-making processes for minorities. These strategies include serving as a spokesperson and advocate for the minority community, acting as a conduit of information, recruiting minority applicants for job vacancies, sensitizing others about racial stereotypes, and insuring that affirmative action policies are adhered to in contracts and personnel decisions (p. 152). These strategies suggest a definition of advocacy, and hence active representation, that is broader than merely examining programmatic outputs.

As part of a larger study on active representation in the Farmers Home Administration, Selden (1997a) examined the attitudes of administrators to determine if they had adopted a “minority representative role” (p. 124). Indices of questions were developed to assess the degree of minority representative role acceptance, traditional role acceptance, program publicity, role expectations, and economic hardship (p. 145-7). This analysis was furthered in Selden, Brudney, and Kellough (1998) who conclude, “to the degree that FmHA supervisors perceive their role as minority representatives, they will work to see that minority interests are reflected in the implementation of public programs” (p. 735). These findings suggest that the
adoption of this role is the link between passive and active representation.

A final study that was influential in the development of the survey questions used in this dissertation is a citizen survey conducted by the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at The University of Georgia for the Athens-Clarke County Department of Human and Economic Development in 1999. The survey sought to identify the policy priorities of county residents within the following four types of programs: public facilities, housing, economic development, and human services. Respondents were asked for demographic information, including race and gender, but the survey results were not analyzed according to these independent variables. Rather, demographic data were gathered to ensure that the pool of respondents mirrored the demography of the county. The study concluded that all program types were deemed to be important to the citizenry, but nevertheless provided invaluable guidance to agency staff as they made decisions regarding the expenditures of federal grant monies (CVIOG, 1999).

**Survey Format**

In light of the previous research on administrative roles and policy priorities, two sets of survey questions were developed for the test of the potential for active
representation presented herein. The questions were presented in the form of statements about which the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement. The first set of questions assesses the quality of government in A-CC, and in particular how well the A-CC government has addressed issues related to the African American community (see Table 3.1).

The second set of questions focus on the responsibility of individual administrators to represent the interests of the African American community in A-CC (see Table 3.2). These questions assess the degree to which public administrators of all racial backgrounds should act as advocates for African American constituents. As such, these set of questions examine the adoption of the minority representative role, previously identified as being associated with behavior that is consistent with active representation (Selden, 1997a; Selden, Brudney, & Kellough, 1998).

On page one of the citizen survey, respondents answered the first set of ten questions (See Appendix A for the Citizen Survey). Page two of the citizen survey contained the ten questions focused on the desirability of high-ranking administrators acting as advocates for the African American community. The questions on page three captured demographic data and provided space for comments.
Table 3.1: First Set of Questions

1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.

2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county’s most important problems.

3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African Americans.

4. A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.

5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce the barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.

6. African Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.

7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African American community.

8. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.

9. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.

10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.
Table 3.2: Second Set of Questions

11. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and perspectives of the African American community.

12. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of policies that specifically address the interests of African American citizens.

13. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African Americans.

14. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African American interests.

15. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to identify African Americans in their organization and support them with opportunities and positive feedback.


17. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively work to enhance the access of African American citizens to government decision makers, such as elected officials and department heads.

18. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for increased participation of the African American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.

19. High ranking employees of A-CC government should seek out qualified African American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.

20. High ranking employees of A-CC government should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.
The survey instrument used to measure the attitudes of administrators was largely similar to the citizen survey, with one notable exception (See Appendix B for the Administrator Survey). While page one contained the first set of general A-CC questions, the battery of questions on page two asked administrators to predict the percent of African American citizens who would agree and disagree with the questions presented on page one. The second set of questions, which appeared on page three, asked administrators to indicate the degree to they feel a responsibility to advocate for African American interests. The questions on page four measured demographic data and provided space for comments.

**Independent Variables**

Both administrators and citizens were asked a series of questions related to demographic characteristics, including race, gender, age, and education. In addition, administrators were asked about their political ideology and the number of years that they have worked for the A-CC government. Unlike similar studies of administrator attitudes, the employing agency or department of the respondent was not included due to the fear that such information could threaten the anonymity of an employee respondent working in a relatively small governmental context. While all of the aforementioned indicators are
incorporated into the analysis at various appropriate points, race serves as the primary independent variable in this study. Due to the limited number of respondents who indicated being Hispanic, Asian, Mixed, and Other, only those respondents who are African American and White are included in the data analysis presented here.

A wide variety of research has substantiated the substantive validity of focusing on the race variable. For example, Naff (1995) found that African Americans in the federal service “reported the greatest perceptions of discrimination against themselves” (p. 488-9) and that they link this discrimination to their organization.

The Gallop Organization conducted a wide-ranging poll on the state of race relations in the United States in 2001 and compared the results to a similar study conducted in 1997. They found that, while the general state of race relations has improved in recent years, significant differences of opinion persist on specific perceptions and experiences. The report concludes, “perceptions of unequal opportunity in education and housing, and of unfair treatment of blacks – especially by police – illustrate the concerns of many black Americans” (Gallop, 2001, p. 4). Interestingly, when compared to federal and state governments, all respondents indicated that local
government is doing the best job solving the community’s most important problems (p. 22).

Schuman and Gruenberg (1972) examined attitudes related to city services, such as the quality of public schools, parks, police protection, and garbage collection, and conclude “blacks are more dissatisfied with each service than whites” (p. 371). Turning from more general public services to those designed to special preference to minority populations, Tuch and Hughes (1996) contend that while blatantly racist attitudes have subsided in recent decades, “white support for specific policies designed to reduce race-based disadvantage, such as busing to achieve racial integration or racial preference in hiring and promotion, remains weak” (p. 723). Furthermore, the authors note that in a 1986 American National Election Study nearly 85 percent of whites opposed or strongly opposed affirmative action policies with regard to hiring and promotion (p. 731). Kellough, Selden, and Legge (1997) argue that, as opposed to affirmative action and other such preferential programs that seek to redistribute opportunities, “it would be more difficult for many to oppose programs, such as complaint processing and minority outreach, that are premised squarely on notions of equality of opportunity” (p. 55).
Survey Samples

The State of Georgia has 159 counties and a population of more than 8.3 million. The smallest county in terms of square miles is Athens-Clarke County, but outside of the city of Atlanta, it is one of the most visible communities in the state. This is largely due to the presence of the flagship institution of the state’s system of higher education, The University of Georgia. According to recent U.S. Census data, the county has a population of slightly more than 100,000, with a sizable percentage of that representing the transient population of university students.

A sample of 2,000 names and addresses of A-CC residents was purchased from a company called Genesys Sampling. One thousand names were randomly drawn from the entire population of the county. A second set of 1,000 names was randomly drawn from one particular census tract that had a disproportionately high percentage of African American residents (70.7 percent). The two samples were necessary in order to have a critical mass of African American respondents whose attitudes could be compared to those of A-CC administrators. Four waves of citizen surveys were mailed between May and September 2002. The contact information was incorrect or undeliverable for 1,107 names in the original sample population; therefore the adjusted population size for the citizen sample was 893.
Local government employees were identified with the assistance of the A-CC Personnel Department. The county is required to submit a yearly report to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) that accounts for all employees based on their function and job category. A-CC submits data for the following eleven, out of fifteen, functions: financial administration, streets and highways, police protection, fire protection, natural resources, housing, community development, corrections, utilities and transportation, sanitation and sewage, and other. Employees are further classified by one of eight job categories: officials and administrators, professionals, technicians, protective service workers, paraprofessionals, administrative support, skilled craft workers, and service and maintenance. Finally, the report submitted by A-CC indicates the salary range, race, and gender of all employees.

The sample for this study was drawn from all eleven functions, but only the top four job categories were used: officials and administrators, professionals, technicians, and protective service workers. These “upper” categories were deemed to have the necessary authority and discretion to best satisfy the theoretical requirements of the theory of representative bureaucracy. With the consent of the county manager of A-CC, surveys were distributed to employees using the
inter-office mail delivery system of the county government. Consequently, employees received their surveys at their offices. This method eliminated the need to access the home addresses of the employees, thereby reducing the degree of intrusion of the study. A total of 832 employees were identified. However, the contact information of 45 employees was incorrect due to retirements, transfers, and other personnel-related actions, leaving an adjusted population of 787 high-ranking employees.

Response Rates

A total of 326 citizen surveys were returned for a response rate of 36.5 percent. Twenty-four citizen surveys were unusable due to either the incompleteness of responses or the respondent indicated something other than African American or White to the race question. Therefore, 302 usable citizen surveys were received. While this is a comparatively low response rate for a citizen survey, this conclusion is somewhat tempered by the sensitive nature of the content of the questionnaire.

Genesys Sampling, the company from whom the list of A-CC citizens was purchased, stored contact information, but was unable to provide demographic data for the individuals in the sample. However, census data show that approximately 65 percent of the county population is White and more than 27 percent is African American. Due to the over-sampling of African American
citizens, 45.0 percent of the respondents to the citizen survey are African American while 55.0 percent are White. Since this study makes no attempt to generalize the survey findings to the A-CC population at large, this over-representation of African Americans is not a concern. Indeed, the analytic technique presented in Chapter 5 required a disproportionately large response rate from African Americans, so the over-representation was welcome, if not essential.

A total of 264 administrators responded to the survey, for a response rate of 33.5 percent. This constitutes a respectable response rate for a survey of this type. Twenty-two administrator surveys were unusable due to either the incompleteness of responses or the respondent indicated something other than African American or White to the race question. Therefore, 242 usable administrator surveys were received.

The county was very cooperative in terms of providing the names and contact information for the employees targeted for inclusion in this study as well as the race of individual employees included in the sample. Of the 787 employees in the “upper” four job categories that were successfully contacted, 77.4 percent are White and 20.5 are African American. Of the 242 usable responses, 79.3 percent were from White respondents and 20.7 percent were from African American administrators. The
racial characteristics of the responding administrators are strikingly similar to the population, thereby substantiating the representativeness of the survey results.¹

**Respondent Comments**

Comments submitted by some of the respondents indicated that they viewed the subject matter addressed in this research as politically sensitive. But the vast majority of both citizens and administrators did not take advantage of the option to “comment on any issues related to this study.”

Those comments that were registered by citizens and administrators, however, are classified into four groups. The

---

¹ The moderate response can be attributed to the sensitive nature of the issues addressed in the questions. More importantly for the employee survey, only one round of surveys was distributed due to an unanticipated controversy caused by the study.

Shortly after the surveys were distributed to county employees, a copy of the questionnaire came to the attention of a local radio talk show host. On June 11, 2002, the John Brethel Show of WGAU in Athens made the survey the subject of an hour-long discussion. The show began with a question-by-question verbatim reading of the survey instrument, including the name and contact information of the author (Brethel, 2002). The remainder of the program consisted of what can only be called a one-sided analysis and criticism of both the methodology employed and the content of the questionnaire by the host and listeners who called in with comments. Although the name and contact information of the author appeared on both the survey and the accompanying cover letter, no attempt was made by Mr. Brethel to contact the author to explain the import of the study or the purpose of the admittedly sensitive nature of many of the survey questions. Similarly, despite the emotional urge to defend one’s work, the author resisted the urge to call the program while it was on-the-air and engage in an inevitably futile attempt to defend the study. As a result of this undesirable local exposure, the county administrator requested that no further distribution of the survey be made to employees.

While these unforeseen extenuating circumstances provided valuable lessons in their own right, the public exposure did not threaten the viability of the study. Indeed, the modest response rate for the administrator survey is redeemed by the demographic representativeness of the respondents.
first group expressed concern about the use of race in the
distribution of government services, programs, and jobs. This
view is typified such statements as “One consequence of defining
groups by race is a continuation of racial division,” “I have
concerns with the use of funds and direction of policy that
targets one specific sector of society,” “I feel that people
should be treated fairly without regard to race,” “Although I’m
in favor of finding a qualified, active voice for African
Americans, I’m hesitant about encouraging any special efforts
that always seem to backfire,” and “The needs and perspectives
of all citizens in the Athens community should be addressed by
local policy makers; African American citizens should not be
necessarily singled out for special efforts or treatment.”

A second group espoused the view that there are racial
issues in the A-CC community: “Athens’ problems reflect the
blatant racial divide in the United States…To enjoy living in A-
CC you must be white and wealthy,” “I have witnessed a tendency
on the part of A-CC government to separate neighborhoods by
race,” “A-CC needs to continue developing diversity programs
extending into African American and Hispanic communities,” and
“Finding African Americans to participate in A-CC government is
a problem.”

A third group questioned whether race is the appropriate
demographic characteristic to focus on in a study such as this:
“I believe that social problems happen most to victims of classism as much as to victims of racism,” “While I do feel there is racial segregation in the community, the greater problem is poverty,” “These statements, if changed from African American citizens to low-income citizens, would be much more accurate,” and “I think that all lower to lower-middle income residents of A-CC, many of whom are A-CC employees, are ignored by the ‘decision-makers’.”

Finally, a selection of citizens acknowledged a need to address the issues addressed in the survey and appreciated the opportunity to respond: “Hopefully answers to these questionnaires will be taken seriously,” “This is an important study,” “This study covers all issues of concern that exist in my mind on a daily basis,” “Sounds like you are after something good,” and “Very pleased to have completed this survey.”

Conclusion

The research presented in this dissertation is designed to examine the potential for active representation in a local government setting. A variety of factors contribute to the fulfillment and importance of this purpose. First, the two sets of survey questions specifically address issues of palpable import to the African American community, i.e. the performance of A-CC government and the desirability of active
representation. Furthermore, the administrator survey includes a battery of questions that assess the degree to which the administrator has adopted the minority advocacy role. Second, the number of survey responses and the demographic representativeness of the respondents substantiate the use and reliability of the survey data. Third, the direct comparisons of responses from administrators and citizens provide an assessment of the degree to which public administrators represent the interests and attitudes of the population. The results of such comparisons are presented in Chapter Four. Fourth, the battery of prediction questions on the administrator survey presents the unique analytic opportunity to ascertain the extent to which administrators can express the preferences of citizens. The results from the prediction analysis are presented in Chapter Five. Finally, the measures of attitude congruence and attitude prediction are utilized in numerous examinations of the adoption of the minority advocacy role. These results are presented in Chapters Four and Five.
CHAPTER 4
ATTITUDE CONGRUENCE

The primary purpose of this research is to determine if the attitudes of administrators and citizens of the same race differ on public policy issues that are important to particular demographic groups. Consistent with previous research on the theory of representative bureaucracy, this study examines the attitudes of citizens and local government administrators on a series of questions of particular import to the African American community and analyzes the core assumption of the theory that common socialization experiences and backgrounds lead to congruent attitudes. By directly comparing the attitudes of administrators and citizens, this research provides a direct test of the potential for active representation.

Incorporating the notion of attitude congruence with the adoption of the minority advocacy role extends this analysis. Previous research has shown that role adoption is consistent with active representation, and, therefore, constitutes another conception of the potential for active representation. This chapter concludes by examining the interrelatedness of attitude congruence and role adoption.
Methods of Analysis

Two independent tests for attitude congruence are presented in this chapter. The difference of proportions test is used to examine the attitudes of citizens and administrators in A-CC on each of the twenty questions. First, the degrees of congruence between the attitudes of African American and White citizens on the one hand, and African American and White administrators on the other, are examined to test the assumption in the theory of representative bureaucracy that background, as indicated by race, is a predictor of attitudes. Second, the attitudes of African American citizens are compared to those of African American and White administrators. The research hypothesis is that there will be a higher degree of attitude congruence between African American citizens and African American administrators than between African American citizens and White administrators.

The second test for attitude congruence uses regression to examine the impact of demographic variables on the attitudes of administrators on each of the twenty survey questions. These regression equations expose the relative explanatory power of race, gender, age, and education on the attitudes of A-CC administrators. A composite regression equation measures the degree of congruence between the attitudes of African American citizens and African American and White administrators.
Finally, regression analysis is used to examine the adoption of the minority advocacy role, and the relationship between attitude congruence and role adoption.

**Difference of Proportions**

A difference of proportions test can be used to evaluate the extent to which African Americans and Whites respond differently to survey questions. Assuming two independent random samples, the null hypothesis is that there is no significant difference between the proportions from the groups examined. As was discussed, respondents to both the citizen and administrator surveys were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the twenty questions on a four-point scale: Completely Disagree, Generally Disagree, Generally Agree, and Completely Agree. Survey responses were collapsed into two categories for the difference of proportions analysis: Agree and Disagree. It was assumed that the positive or negative direction of the response was substantively more significant than the relative degrees of agreement and disagreement. Thus, the two negative responses and the two positive responses were pooled to create a dichotomous measure of agreement or disagreement. This variable was coded 0 for Disagree and 1 for Agree.
The responses of citizens and administrators are analyzed separately by race. Table 4.1 presents the results from the difference of proportions test for the first set of questions that measure how well A-CC government has addressed issues related to the African American community.

The attitudes of African American and White citizens were significantly different on nine of the ten questions in Table 4.1. Furthermore, African Americans were significantly more likely to agree on seven of those nine questions. On question 4, in particular, African American citizens were significantly more likely to agree that the A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county. While over two-thirds of White citizens also agreed with this statement, this observed disparity is particularly important because question 4 provides a direct assessment of the desirability of a representative bureaucracy in A-CC.

Two important issues deserve particular attention in the interpretation of these survey results. First, Whites were significantly more likely to agree with questions 1 and 7, however these results are conceptually consistent in light of the issues raised in those questions. The fundamental relationship between majority and minority power would lead one to expect that members of the majority group would have a higher degree of satisfaction with the overall quality of government
Table 4.1: Citizen and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 1-10 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African American Citizen (N)</th>
<th>White Citizen (N)</th>
<th>African American Administrator (N)</th>
<th>White Administrator (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td>70.1** (134)</td>
<td>85.5 (166)</td>
<td>86.0 (50)</td>
<td>79.2 (192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county’s most important problems.</td>
<td>57.0 (135)</td>
<td>56.4 (165)</td>
<td>66.0 (50)</td>
<td>51.0 (192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African Americans.</td>
<td>95.5*** (134)</td>
<td>62.8 (164)</td>
<td>94.0*** (50)</td>
<td>42.1 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td>83.2** (131)</td>
<td>67.7 (164)</td>
<td>88.0*** (50)</td>
<td>48.2 (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce the barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td>97.8*** (135)</td>
<td>74.8 (163)</td>
<td>90.0*** (50)</td>
<td>63.7 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. African Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td>76.3*** (135)</td>
<td>28.4 (162)</td>
<td>77.1*** (48)</td>
<td>12.3 (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African American community.</td>
<td>51.1*** (135)</td>
<td>73.5 (155)</td>
<td>69.4*** (49)</td>
<td>91.8 (184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td>53.4*** (131)</td>
<td>12.7 (150)</td>
<td>29.2*** (48)</td>
<td>1.1 (183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td>82.2*** (135)</td>
<td>26.3 (152)</td>
<td>61.2*** (49)</td>
<td>3.7 (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td>78.5*** (135)</td>
<td>43.6 (165)</td>
<td>70.0*** (50)</td>
<td>34.2 (190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of proportions comparing African American and White respondents within the Citizen and Administrator groups. Significance indicates that the observed difference in proportions is unlikely to have occurred by chance.
services. Conversely, one would expect members of a minority group to be more likely to perceive that public facilities do not meet their needs. The respective levels of agreement by race to questions 1 and 7 confirmed these expectations.

Second, a substantial range of agreement is observed on those questions where there is a significant difference between African American and White citizens. The statistically significant differences ranged from a discrepancy of 15.4 percentage points for question 1 to 55.9 percentage points for question 9. The average difference between African American and White citizens for the nine questions where the difference was significant was 32 percentage points. These descriptive statistics suggest that the observed differences in attitudes between African American and White citizens are both statistically significant and substantively stark.

The attitudes of African American and White administrators were significantly different on eight of the ten questions in Table 4.1. Significant differences were also found for the two groups of citizens on these eight questions. A similar pattern emerged, as African American administrators were also significantly more likely than their White colleagues to agree on seven of these questions. By a margin of 88 percent to 48 percent on question 4, African American administrators were significantly more likely to agree that workforce diversity
increases productivity in A-CC government. This represents a marked disparity of opinion within the sample of administrators regarding the validity and desirability of representative bureaucracy in A-CC government.

Similar to the observed citizen responses, White administrators were significantly more likely to agree with question 7. Over 90 percent of White administrators, as compared to nearly 70 percent of African American administrators, agreed that the county’s public facilities meet the needs of the African American community.

Likewise, there was substantial variation in the statistically significant differences in attitudes for administrators. These differences ranged from 22.4 percentage points for question 7 to 64.8 percentage points for question 6. The average statistically significant difference was 41 percentage points. Thus, the differences in attitudes between African American and White administrators are more than just statistically significant; the differences are substantially overwhelming.

The results are no less stark for the second set of questions that focus on the responsibility of individual administrators to advocate for the interests of the African American community. The data presented in Table 4.2 show that African American respondents were more likely to agree with
every question than White respondents. Indeed, the observed
differences in attitudes for both citizens and administrators by
race were statistically significant for all ten questions.

Interestingly, the average difference in attitudes of
African American and White citizens was the same 32 percentage
points as was observed for the first set of questions. The
differences ranged from 20.0 percentage points for question 16
to 46.9 percentage points for question 14. The differences in
attitudes between African American and White administrators,
however, were greater for the second set of questions than for
the first set. The differences ranged from 21.7 percentage
points for question 20 to 68.6 percentage points for question
12. The average difference was 51 percentage points. These
data further confirm that attitudinal dissimilarities exist
between African Americans and Whites in A-CC.

This conclusion is both consistent with, and contrary to,
the findings of Rosenbloom and Featherstonhaugh (1977). Those
authors found that, “there is considerable divergence between
the outlooks of federal employees and other citizens” (p. 879).
In other words, administrators, both black and white, tended
to hold attitudes that were more similar to each other than with
citizens, both black and white. Within each respondent group,
however, differences in attitudes were observed between blacks
and whites. The observed differences in attitudes presented in
Table 4.2: Citizen and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 11-20 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African American Citizen (N)</th>
<th>White Citizen (N)</th>
<th>African American Administrator (N)</th>
<th>White Administrator (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and perspectives of the African American community.</td>
<td>92.6*** (136)</td>
<td>63.6 (162)</td>
<td>92.0*** (50)</td>
<td>37.7 (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of policies that specifically address the interests of African American citizens.</td>
<td>86.8*** (136)</td>
<td>42.5 (160)</td>
<td>86.0*** (50)</td>
<td>17.4 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African Americans.</td>
<td>91.9*** (136)</td>
<td>55.1 (158)</td>
<td>96.0*** (50)</td>
<td>29.8 (188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African American interests.</td>
<td>94.1*** (135)</td>
<td>47.2 (159)</td>
<td>96.0*** (50)</td>
<td>28.9 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to identify African Americans in their organization and support them with opportunities and positive feedback.</td>
<td>92.6*** (135)</td>
<td>52.8 (159)</td>
<td>87.8*** (49)</td>
<td>35.1 (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. High ranking employees of A-CC government should encourage and recruit qualified African Americans for employment in A-CC government.</td>
<td>97.8*** (136)</td>
<td>77.8 (162)</td>
<td>94.0*** (50)</td>
<td>62.6 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively work to enhance the access of African American citizens to government decision makers, such as elected officials and department heads.</td>
<td>93.4*** (136)</td>
<td>63.6 (162)</td>
<td>98.0*** (50)</td>
<td>42.6 (188)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued): Citizen and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 11-20 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for increased participation of the African American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.</td>
<td>95.6*** (136)</td>
<td>65.8 (161)</td>
<td>94.0*** (50)</td>
<td>44.0 (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High ranking employees of A-CC government should seek out qualified African American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.</td>
<td>94.1*** (136)</td>
<td>72.2 (162)</td>
<td>94.0*** (50)</td>
<td>47.6 (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. High ranking employees of A-CC government should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.</td>
<td>87.9*** (132)</td>
<td>65.6 (160)</td>
<td>95.9*** (49)</td>
<td>74.2 (190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001
Note: Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of proportions comparing African American and White respondents within the Citizen and Administrator groups. Significance indicates that the observed difference in proportions is unlikely to have occurred by chance.
this research suggest that race is the dominant predictor of citizen and administrator attitudes, i.e. White citizens and White administrators largely hold similar attitudes and the same is suggested for African American citizens and African American administrators.

This preliminary examination and assessment of attitudes, however, does not constitute a full exploration of the notion of the potential for active representation. While the attitudes of White citizens are important to the understanding of attitudes in general, they do not provide a direct test of the potential for active representation. The theory of representative bureaucracy focuses on the representation of, and advocacy efforts for, minority populations. Thus, the degree of attitude congruence between minority citizens and minority public administrators constitutes a more precisely construed examination of the potential for active representation. A second difference of proportions test was performed to compare the attitudes of African American citizens to those of African American administrators and White administrators. The research hypothesis is that the attitudes of African American citizens and administrators will have a greater degree of congruence than those of African American citizens and White administrators.

The results from the first set of survey questions are presented in Table 4.3. No significant differences in the
attitudes of African American citizens and administrators were found for six of the ten questions. The differences on the four questions where significant differences were found ranged from 15.9 percentage points for question 1 to 24.2 percentage points for question 8. The average significant difference for African American citizens and administrators was 20 percentage points.

The comparison of attitudes held by African American citizens and White administrators yielded far different results. Statistically significant differences were found on eight questions and ranged from 34.1 percentage points for question 5 to 78.5 percentage points for question 9. The average significant difference was 46 percentage points.

African American citizens and administrators were also found to have a high degree of attitude congruence on the second set of questions. No significant differences were found for nine of the ten questions presented on Table 4.4. Their rate of agreement was significantly different on question 20, but the difference was only 8 percentage points.

Conversely, the attitudes of African American citizens and White administrators were significantly different on all ten questions in Table 4.4. The differences ranged from 13.7 percentage points for question 20 to 69.4 percentage points for question 12. The average significant difference was 51 percentage points.
Table 4.3: African American citizens and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 1-10 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African American Citizen (N)</th>
<th>African American Administrator (N)</th>
<th>White Administrator (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td>70.1 (134)</td>
<td>86.0* (50)</td>
<td>79.2 (192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county’s most important problems.</td>
<td>57.0 (135)</td>
<td>66.0 (50)</td>
<td>51.0 (192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African Americans.</td>
<td>95.5 (134)</td>
<td>94.0 (50)</td>
<td>42.1*** (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td>83.2 (131)</td>
<td>88.0 (50)</td>
<td>48.2*** (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce the barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td>97.8 (135)</td>
<td>90.0 (50)</td>
<td>63.7*** (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. African Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td>76.3 (135)</td>
<td>77.1 (48)</td>
<td>12.3*** (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African American community.</td>
<td>51.1 (135)</td>
<td>69.4* (49)</td>
<td>91.8*** (184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td>53.4 (131)</td>
<td>29.2** (48)</td>
<td>1.1*** (183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td>82.2 (135)</td>
<td>61.2** (49)</td>
<td>3.7*** (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td>78.5 (135)</td>
<td>70.0 (50)</td>
<td>34.2*** (190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of proportions comparing African American Citizens to African American Administrators and White Administrators. Significance indicates that the observed difference in proportions is unlikely to have occurred by chance.
Table 4.4: African American citizens and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 11-20 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African American Citizen (N)</th>
<th>African American Administrator (N)</th>
<th>White Administrator (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts</td>
<td>92.6 (136)</td>
<td>92.0 (50)</td>
<td>37.7*** (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectives of the African American community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate</td>
<td>86.8 (136)</td>
<td>86.0 (50)</td>
<td>17.4*** (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in favor of policies that specifically address the interests of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate</td>
<td>91.9 (136)</td>
<td>96.0 (50)</td>
<td>29.8*** (188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate</td>
<td>94.1 (135)</td>
<td>96.0 (50)</td>
<td>28.9*** (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts</td>
<td>92.6 (135)</td>
<td>87.8 (49)</td>
<td>35.1*** (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to identify African Americans in their organization and support them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with opportunities and positive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. High ranking employees of A-CC government should encourage and</td>
<td>97.8 (136)</td>
<td>94.0 (50)</td>
<td>62.6*** (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruit qualified African Americans for employment in A-CC government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively work to</td>
<td>93.4 (136)</td>
<td>98.0 (50)</td>
<td>42.6*** (188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance the access of African American citizens to government decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makers, such as elected officials and department heads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (continued): African American citizens and administrator responses by race: Percent agreeing with survey items 11-20 (number of respondents in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American Citizens</th>
<th>African American Administrators</th>
<th>White Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for increased participation of the African American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.</td>
<td>95.6 (136)</td>
<td>94.0 (50)</td>
<td>44.0*** (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High ranking employees of A-CC government should seek out qualified African American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.</td>
<td>94.1 (136)</td>
<td>94.0 (50)</td>
<td>47.6*** (191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. High ranking employees of A-CC government should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.</td>
<td>87.9 (132)</td>
<td>95.9* (49)</td>
<td>74.2** (190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of proportions comparing African American Citizens to African American Administrators and White Administrators. Significance indicates that the observed difference in proportions is unlikely to have occurred by chance.
Taken together, the tests for difference of proportions suggest a number of important conclusions. First, there is significant variation in the attitudes of African American and White citizens and administrators in A-CC in so much as those attitudes relate to representative bureaucracy. Second, the preliminary analysis supports the research hypothesis that, overall, African American administrators have greater attitude congruence with African American citizens than do White administrators. It is important to consider these conclusions as merely preliminary because the influence of other demographic factors has not been included or considered in the analysis. By holding the explanatory effect of race constant, regression analysis can examine the extent to which the attitudes of administrators can be explained by other factors such as gender, age, and education.

**Regression Analysis**

A regression equation was constructed for each of the twenty questions in order to understand the effects of four independent variables on the attitudes of administrators: race, gender, age, and education. The dependent variable measures a respondent’s level of agreement to a given statement on a four-point scale: Completely Disagree equaled 1, Generally Disagree equaled 2, Generally Agree equaled 3, and Completely Agree
equaled 4. No middle or neutral option was provided so that the respondent had to provide an answer with a positive or negative direction.

As indicated earlier, race was measured as a dichotomy: 0 for White and 1 for African American. Thus, a positive coefficient for RACE would indicate that African American administrators are more likely to agree with the statement than Whites and a negative coefficient would indicate a greater degree of agreement by Whites. The research hypothesis posits that race will be a significant predictor of administrator attitudes and that African American administrators will be more supportive of issues pertaining to representative bureaucracy.

The gender of respondents was measured as 0 for female and 1 for male. A positive coefficient for GENDER would indicate that male administrators are more likely to agree with a question and a negative direction would indicate a greater degree of female agreement. In an examination of attitudes broadly related to representative bureaucracy, Thompson (1978) concluded that, “administrators who are white, male, and/or older do tend to be significantly less receptive to recruiting nonwhites” (p. 335). Thus, the research hypothesis for GENDER is that females will be more likely to support efforts to encourage a representative bureaucracy in A-CC.
The quotation from Thompson (1978) also suggests that the age of the administrator will be negatively related to support for representative bureaucracy. On the administrator survey, age was measured on a five-point scale: 0-20 equaled 1, 21-35 equaled 2, 36-50 equaled 3, 51-65 equaled 4, and 66 or older equaled 5. Thus, the research hypothesis posits a negative coefficient for AGE, which would suggest that support for representative bureaucracy decreases with increases in the age of the administrator.

The fourth independent variable used in the question-by-question regression analysis measured the highest level of education completed by the respondent. EDUCATION was measured on a five-point scale: 1 equaled from less than high school, 2 equaled high school/GED, 3 equaled some college, 4 equaled bachelor’s degree, and 5 equaled post-graduate degree. Meier and Nigro (1976) found that, for certain policy areas, increased education was positively related to administrator’s attitudes (p. 465). Thus, the research hypothesis for EDUCATION posits a positive relationship between the level of education and support for representative bureaucracy.

In most regression equations there exists some intercorrelation among the independent variables. The problem of multicollinearity occurs when two or more independent are highly correlated and thus do not serve as independent
predictors for the dependent variable. The most practical tests for multicollinearity are to examine the bivariate correlations between the independent variables and to regress each of the independent variables on all the other independent variables. If this later exercise results in a large $R^2$, i.e. approaches 1.0, then multicollinearity exists. Both tests were conducted for the four independent variables and no evidence of multicollinearity was found.

Regression results for the first set of ten questions are presented in Table 4.5. There was a substantial range in the explanatory power of the ten equations as indicated by the $R^2$ statistic. This statistic measures the amount of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables. This ranged from a low of .054 for question 2 to a high of .421 for question 9. Indeed, the equations for only three of the questions (3, 6, and 9) accounted for more than one-quarter of the variance in administrator attitudes. Nevertheless, at least one independent variable was a statistically significant predictor of attitudes in each of the questions.

The race of the administrator was a statistically significant predictor of attitudes at the .001 level on eight of the ten questions. The unstandardized coefficients for RACE were in the expected direction, i.e. positive, for seven of
Table 4.5: The impact of demographic variables on administrator attitudes on survey items 1-10 (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>2.274</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.148**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county’s most important problems.</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.159**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African Americans.</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>.012***</td>
<td>-.244*</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.208***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>1.065***</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce the barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>4.511</td>
<td>.712***</td>
<td>-.310*</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. African Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>3.252</td>
<td>1.295***</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>.181***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African American community.</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>-.463***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.162***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>.726***</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>4.328</td>
<td>1.309***</td>
<td>-.299**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>4.505</td>
<td>.741***</td>
<td>-.348**</td>
<td>-.191*</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
these equations. Although White administrators were significantly more likely to agree to question 7, a negative coefficient was expected due to the content of the question.

The results for the other three independent variables were less consistent. Females were significantly more likely to agree on five of the ten questions. The respondent’s age was significant for only two questions, and the coefficient was in the positive direction for question 6 and negative for question 10. Finally, EDUCATION was significant in 6 of the equations, with the coefficient for question 7 being the only one in the negative direction. These findings suggest that female administrators and administrators with higher levels of education are more supportive of representative bureaucracy.

Overall, the regression equations for the second set of questions explain more of the variance in administrator attitudes. The $R^2$ statistics presented in Table 4.6 ranged from a low of .129 for question 20 to a high of .381 for question 12. Notably, more than one-quarter of the variance was explained in six of the ten equations (i.e., questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18). Furthermore, all four independent variables were statistically significant for questions 12 and 17.

The race of the administrator was a highly significant predictor of attitudes on all ten of the questions. The coefficients for RACE were all in the positive direction, as was
Table 4.6: The impact of demographic variables on administrator attitudes on survey items 11-20 (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and perspectives of the African American community.</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>3.858</td>
<td>1.059***</td>
<td>-.246*</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.123*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of policies that specifically address the interests of African American citizens.</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>1.077***</td>
<td>-.367***</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>.120*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African Americans.</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>3.724</td>
<td>1.172***</td>
<td>-.252*</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.199***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African American interests.</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>4.155</td>
<td>1.269***</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.177**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. High ranking employees of A-CC government should make special efforts to identify African Americans in their organization and support them with opportunities and positive feedback.</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>3.242</td>
<td>.951***</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.165**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. High ranking employees of A-CC government should encourage and recruit qualified African Americans for employment in A-CC government.</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>3.162</td>
<td>.720***</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.175*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively work to enhance the access of African American citizens to government decision makers, such as elected officials and department heads.</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>1.114***</td>
<td>-.245*</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 (continued): The impact of demographic variables on administrator attitudes on survey items 11-20 (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. High ranking employees of A-CC government should actively advocate for increased participation of the African American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>3.624</td>
<td>1.075***</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High ranking employees of A-CC government should seek out qualified African American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>.943***</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. High ranking employees of A-CC government should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>.565***</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
expected, and they all reached significance at the .001 level. The results were similar for the variable measuring the education of the administrator. It was significant and in the expected direction for all ten questions in Table 4.6. The gender of the administrator was significant and in the expected directions in four of the equations. Likewise, AGE was significant in four of the questions but, contrary to Thompson’s (1978) conclusion, it had a positive relationship with the dependent variable. Thus, older administrators were more likely than their younger colleagues to support issues related to representative bureaucracy. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis of Selden, Brudney, and Kellough (1998) who argued that, by the late 1990s, older bureaucrats came from a relatively liberal generation who collectively experienced the civil rights movement and the struggles for social equality. Thus, the young bureaucrats who were more supportive of representative bureaucracy in Thompson’s analysis in the late 1970s are perhaps the same bureaucrats, although a few decades older, who show support in this analysis.

The results for the twenty regression equations demonstrate a compelling pattern with regard to the determinants of administrator attitudes. Race was the predominant predictor of attitudes, reaching statistical significance, and being in the expected direction, for eighteen of the twenty questions. The
other demographic characteristics of administrators reached significance with varied frequency, and were in the expected direction for gender and education. Overall, the question-based regression equations add credence to the preliminary conclusion that race is a significant predictor of the attitudes of administrators.

**Attitude Congruence Model**

All of the preceding measures of the attitudes of citizens and administrators were based on particular survey questions. Two preliminary conclusions emerged: 1) race is the most significant predictor of administrator attitudes and 2) there is a pronounced pattern of attitude congruence between African American citizens and African American administrators. A final regression equation was constructed to validate these preliminary findings.

The theory of representative bureaucracy is fundamentally focused on the efforts of public administrators from minority and historically disadvantaged groups to serve the needs of minority and historically disadvantaged populations. Research has shown, however, that both minority and nonminority administrators can act as advocates for minority interests (Selden, Brudney, and Kellough, 1998). Thus, it is important to test for the potential for active representation for both
African American and White administrators. This can be achieved by examining the degree of congruence between the attitudes of African American citizens and both African American and White administrators.

The dependent variable was constructed from the survey responses of African American citizens. As noted earlier, the response options for each of the twenty questions were on a four-point scale, with two negative options and two positive options. The percent of African American citizens who chose the negative options were summed, as were the percentages that chose the positive options. These dichotomous statistics reflect the percentage of African American citizens that generally agreed or disagreed with each question. Similarly, the response of each administrator reflects whether he or she agreed or disagreed with a particular question. A comparison of an administrator’s response to the responses of citizens can reveal the percentage of African American citizens who concur with the administrator’s perspective on the particular issue addressed in each question. For example, if a given administrator and 30 percent of African American citizens agreed with a question, then it could be said that the administrator’s attitude is congruent with 30 percent of the African American citizen respondents on that question. For each administrator, the percentages of African American citizens who gave answers corresponding to those of the
administrator to each of the twenty questions were summed and averaged. This statistic indicates the average percentage of African American citizens who hold congruent attitudes with the administrator. A higher percentage indicates a greater degree of attitude congruence for the administrator with the attitudes of African American citizens in A-CC.

Descriptive statistics for the dependent variable demonstrate that considerable variance exists in the degree of attitude congruence between administrators and African American citizens. Overall, the percentages have a range of 67.08, with a low of 16.52 percent and a high of 83.60 percent. The dependent variable also appears to have a normal distribution of scores. The mean percentage was calculated as 50.71 with the median at 48.55. The standard deviation was 21.84. Similar descriptive statistics were calculated separately for African American and White administrators. While the range, minimum score, and maximum score for the two groups were nearly identical, there was a marked difference in the respective means: 76.29 for African American administrators and 44.58 for Whites. These descriptive statistics suggest that the dependent variable is suitable for use in regression analysis and that such analysis may confirm the predictive strength of race.

The attitude congruence model used all four of the independent variables previously used in the question-based
regression analysis: race, gender, age, and education. As previously discussed, RACE and EDUCATION are expected to have a positive relationship with the dependent variable, and GENDER and AGE are expected to have a negative relationship. Two additional independent variables were introduced in this model. The political ideology of each administrator was measured on a five-point scale: 1 equaled Very Liberal, 2 equaled Liberal, 3 equaled Moderate, 4 equaled Conservative, and 5 equaled Very Conservative. Thus, a negative coefficient for IDEOLOGY would indicate that ideologically liberal administrators have attitudes that are more consistent with those of African American citizens. The research hypothesis posits that IDEOLOGY will be negatively related to the dependent variable. Administrators were also asked to indicate the amount of feedback on important issues they receive from the African American community. The responses were measured on a four-point scale: 1 for None at all, 2 for Not very much, 3 for Fair amount, and 4 for Great deal. It is expected that attitude congruence will be positively related to the FEEDBACK variable.

Each of the six independent variables in this model was compared using bivariate correlation and was regressed on the other independent variables. These tests revealed no evidence of multicollinearity.
The regression results are presented in Table 4.7. The model explained a substantial amount of the variance in the dependent variable, as evidenced by the $R^2$ of .461. This finding suggests that the six independent variables account for 46.1 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. The coefficients for the independent variables, RACE, GENDER, EDUCATION, IDEOLOGY, and FEEDBACK, were all statistically significant and in the expected direction. Indeed, the race, gender, and ideology of the administrators were all statistically significant at the .001 level.

Table 4.7: Attitude congruence of administrators and African American citizens (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.213</td>
<td>25.602***</td>
<td>-7.183 ***</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>3.393**</td>
<td>-4.870 ***</td>
<td>2.281*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

The findings for the RACE variable are particularly striking. The unstandardized coefficient of 25.602 suggests that the degree of attitude congruence increases 25.6 percentage points for African American administrators. These findings confirm the primary research hypothesis that the attitudes of African American administrators are more congruent with the attitudes of African American citizens than those of White
administrators, even when the influence of other important variables, namely gender, age, education, political ideology, and amount of feedback from the African American community, are controlled.

**Minority Advocacy Role Models**

In addition to providing additional evidence of the validity of the passive-active link, Selden’s research (1997a) also contributed a new perspective to the understanding of the potential for active representation. Selden concluded that administrators who adopt a minority advocacy role are more likely to press for the interests of minority communities (p. 140). The analysis was expanded by Selden, Brudney, and Kellough (1998), who found that various characteristics, such as race, education, and age, affect the likelihood that an administrator will adopt such a role orientation. The race of the administrator, however, is regarded as one of the strongest factors that explained the adoption of the minority advocacy role (Sowa & Selden, 2003).

As was mentioned, the second set of ten survey questions on the administrator survey focus on the responsibility of individual administrators to represent the interests of the African American community in A-CC (see Table 3.2). As such, these set of questions examine the adoption of the minority
representative role, previously identified as being associated with behavior that is consistent with active representation. Regression analysis, therefore, can be used to confirm the relationship between race and minority role acceptance.

The dependent variable is an index that represents the extent to which administrators agree that they should exhibit behaviors that are consistent with active representation, and thus the minority advocacy role. Responses to the ten questions were measured on a four-point scale: Completely Disagree equaled 1, Generally Disagree equaled 2, Generally Agree equaled 3, and Completely Agree equaled 4. The average response was calculated for each administrator, providing a measure of the extent to which the administrator had adopted the minority advocacy role.\textsuperscript{2}

The independent variables that measure race, education, and feedback are expected to have a positive relationship with the dependent variable. Conversely, the variables representing gender, age, and ideology are expected to have negative coefficients.

The regression results presented in Table 4.8 show that the model explained nearly 40 percent of the variance in the adoption of the minority advocacy role (i.e., $R^2 = .399$). The race, education level, and political ideology were all

\textsuperscript{2} Two administrators did not respond to the battery of questions and have been excluded from this analysis. On rare occasions a respondent skipped a question, and their average response statistic has been adjusted accordingly.
significantly related in the expected direction to role adoption. Notably, gender and age failed to reach statistical significance by the slimmest of margins, with significance levels of .055 and .067 respectively. Thus, administrators who are African American, politically liberal, and have higher levels of education are more likely to adopt the minority advocacy role.

Table 4.8: Adoption of the minority advocacy role (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>3.902</td>
<td>.877***</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.134**</td>
<td>-.174***</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, *** p < .001

The research presented in this dissertation has argued that attitude congruence between citizens and administrators constitutes the potential for active representation. The research of Selden and colleagues has suggested that role adoption is also an important factor in determining such potential. To date, no study has examined the inter-relatedness of these two concepts.

Attitude congruence is a function of life-long socialization experiences that both includes and predates one’s career as a public administrator, and therefore the possible adoption of a minority advocacy role. Thus, the time-based
causal relationship would suggest that attitude congruence occurs prior to and, indeed, may influence role adoption. The research hypothesis, therefore, is that attitude congruence will be a significant predictor of the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

The regression results presented in Table 4.9 clearly demonstrate that attitude congruence is the predominant predictor of role adoption. Overall, the model explains 80 percent of the variance of the dependent variable. Attitude congruence, however, is the only independent variable that achieves statistical significance, and does so at the .001 level. This finding suggests that it is attitude congruence with the minority community, rather than race, or any other demographic characteristic, which explains the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

Table 4.9: Attitude congruence and role adoption (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.032***</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001

**Findings and Discussion**

The comparisons of survey data presented in this chapter suggest a number of key findings. The difference of proportion
tests clearly show that attitudes are consistent by race for both citizens and administrators. More specifically, African American citizens and administrators were significantly more likely to support governmental behaviors that specifically target the interests of the African American community. While this finding may not be substantively surprising, the consistent pattern of attitude congruence was unmistakable. Indeed, an equally compelling pattern was observed that suggests that African American citizens and White administrators hold markedly different attitudes.

The regression analysis expanded the scope of the inquiry by accounting for the influence of other demographic variables on the attitudes of administrators in A-CC. The results from the question-based regression equations confirmed the strong predictive power of race on attitudes, but also revealed that female and highly educated administrators are also consistent supporters of issues related to representative bureaucracy.

The attitude congruence regression model explained a relatively large percent of the variance in the average percent of African American citizens who share a given administrator’s views. Race proved to be a powerful predictor for attitude congruence. Administrators who are female, highly educated, ideologically liberal, and receive large amounts of feedback
from the African American community also hold attitudes that are congruent with African American citizens.

Furthermore, the findings of previous research on the minority advocacy role were largely confirmed. Specifically, African American administrators were more likely than White administrators to adopt the role. More importantly, the inclusion of attitude congruence in the analysis overwhelmed all other predictors of role adoption, including race. This finding both legitimizes the renewed focus on attitude congruence and expands our understanding of the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

Overall, this analysis presented a compelling argument that the potential for active representation exists within the bureaucratic ranks of the A-CC workforce. The various measures of attitude congruence consistently demonstrate a pattern of attitude congruence between African American citizens and administrators, while also showing significant attitudinal differences between African Americans and Whites. This supports the fundamental link in the theory of representative bureaucracy that similar backgrounds lead to similar values and attitudes.

Attitude congruence between citizens and administrators, however, represents an innate representation of minority interests. An administrator may have the same attitudes and interests as a group of citizens but not necessarily be aware of
that congruence. Merely identifying attitude congruence does not mean that the administrator is aware of what the attitudes of citizens are so as to be able to act on those shared preferences. Conversely, the possibility exists that an administrator does not hold the same attitudes as a given group of citizens, but that administrator is explicitly aware of that group’s preferences and feels an ethical, professional, altruistic, organizational, or other type of pressure to act on them. Thus, a second conception of attitudes is relevant. The second section of the administrator survey asked respondents to predict the preferences of African American citizens. The accuracy of prediction is relevant to the theory of representative bureaucracy precisely because it provides an explicit measure of the degree to which administrators can identify the preferences of the African American community. Furthermore, examining the relationship between attitude prediction and the minority advocacy role is critical to a full understanding of the potential for active representation. The prediction analysis is presented in Chapter Five.
In his discourse on administrative responsibility, Friedrich (1940) observed that, in conjunction with the notion of technical responsibility, “political responsibility is needed to produce truly responsible policy in a popular government” (p. 14). The lack of direct accountability to the citizenry via elections, however, makes the necessary influence of political responsibility, conceived as the dominance of public opinion, on administrative decision-making difficult to identify. Friedrich suggested that, rather than waiting for feedback from the public and elected officials to bureaucratic acts, administrators work to anticipate probable reactions and consider those factors when making policy decisions. Such a pro-active approach amounts to a form of strategic self-preservation: “The mere knowledge that the representative assemblies can stop a policy from going forward, that a row in the public press may destroy all chances of initiating an activity which the administrator holds to be desirable, will make him keenly interested in and desirous of anticipating the reactions of public and Parliament or Congress alike” (p. 15-6).
The theory of representative bureaucracy supposes that the common socialization experiences of particular demographic groups lead to similar attitudes within those groups and that these shared attitudes will manifest themselves in policy decisions when representatives of those groups are in bureaucratic positions. The theory assumes that by virtue of their shared backgrounds, African American administrators, for example, will share the interests and preferences of African American citizens. Attitude congruence, therefore, may be an unconscious consequence of background and socialization, rather than the result of deliberate and purposive efforts to assuage public opinion.

Friedrich’s principle of bureaucratic anticipation suggests that administrators possess an intrinsic awareness of the preferences of citizens and integrate those preferences into policy deliberations. Such a conception of attitude anticipation does not, however, imply that administrators necessarily agree with the preferences of citizens. Indeed, the notion that public administrators must serve the public interest suggests that administrators, in certain situations, must make decisions that are discordant with their own personal beliefs, attitudes, or preferences. It may simply be the case that influences such as professional expectations, organizational obligations, or personal willingness compel an administrator to
maximize the preferences of citizens at the expense of their own personal judgments or attitudes. Thus, the implication of Friedrich’s principle of anticipation for the theory of representative bureaucracy is the possibility that an administrator may satisfy the potential for active representation more fully if they are able to expressly identify or articulate the preferences of minority citizens. Stated differently, administrators may be less likely to effectively adopt a minority advocacy role if they are unaware of minority preferences. Furthermore, the relative ability of an administrator to accurately anticipate citizen preferences may work independently of, or in conjunction with, the degree of attitude congruence.

**Attitude Prediction**

The theory of representative bureaucracy suggests that attitude congruence, and the adoption of a minority representative role, are important preconditions for active representation. This research proposes to augment the notion of the potential for active representation with an explicit measure of the awareness of citizen attitudes on the part of administrators. One method of examining the degree to which administrators, both minority and non-minority, understand the interests of citizens is to ask administrators to predict
citizen responses to a series of questions related to the policy issue of interest. To date, the tool of administrator prediction has seen scant use in public administration research, and has not been used in conjunction with the theory of representative bureaucracy.

The first known use of administrator prediction is Lester Milbrath’s (1981) analysis of citizen and stakeholder preferences regarding the development of a water quality plan on the Niagara Frontier. Having surveyed both groups for their own opinions on a number of issues, Milbrath asked numerous stakeholders, such as elected officials, environmentalists, developers, industrialists, and, most notably, staff and consultants, to predict how the public would answer the questions (p. 484). Generally, stakeholder predictions were more cynical and negative than actual citizen responses. It is important to note that Milbrath provided no theoretical or methodological justification for the use of prediction as a research tool.

The only other use of administrator prediction found in the public administration literature is an article by Melkers and Thomas (1998), who explicitly examine whether prediction could be a useful adjunct to citizen surveys. They first surveyed a sample of Atlanta residents about a broad range of city services and facilities and then asked city administrators to predict
citizen responses. The authors hypothesized that variation in the ability to accurately predict citizen preferences can be explained by the following variables: the volume of citizen complaints that administrators hear, the ability of employing departments to resolve complaints, and the existence of relevant objective technical standards. The survey results supported the latter two hypotheses. Though the results varied by department, administrators tended to be “pessimistic about citizen ratings, expecting more negative evaluations than citizens actually report” (p. 327).

Unlike Milbrath (1981), Melkers and Thomas (1998) acknowledged the uniqueness of the prediction concept, and their conclusions pointed to a number of possible benefits of the technique. First, assuming that there is a pattern of overly negative perceptions, prediction could boost bureaucratic morale by highlighting the fact that most citizens are satisfied with governmental performance (p. 328). Second, prediction can identify “either problems with services or program directions where administrators may have been acting at odds with citizen preferences” (p. 328). Last, and perhaps most importantly, predictions “could provide a new valuable window into variability among public administrators” (p. 329).

It is interesting that the authors did not examine whether variability in the accuracy of administrative prediction was
related to the demographic characteristics of the administrators themselves. Thus, while theirs is the most sophisticated and deliberate use of prediction in the public administration literature, Melkers and Thomas did not attempt to link the tool of administrative prediction to the theory of representative bureaucracy.

To be sure, administrative prediction of citizen preferences, strictly defined, is outside of the theory of representative bureaucracy as it is currently conceived. As theorized, value congruence between minority administrators and citizens is achieved by virtue of a shared background and common socialization experience. However, value congruence can occur as a result of factors other than a shared background. Indeed, scholars have long recognized that the socialization process continues throughout one’s lifetime (Romzek, 1990; Simon, 1997; Thompson, 1976). Furthermore, a finding of attitude congruence between an administrator and the citizenry does not insinuate that the administrator in question can also confidently express the preferences of the citizenry. As Melkers and Thomas (1998) argue, “administrators presumably attempt to make decisions at least partially on the basis of what they believe citizens perceive and want” (p. 328). The theory of representative bureaucracy, as currently conceived, does not account for this perception of citizen preferences on the part of the
Administrator prediction of citizen responses to a set of survey questions provides such a measure. Adding such an explicit acknowledgment of citizen preferences to the theory of representative bureaucracy could augment the practicality and vitality of the theory.

**Data Analysis**

This study compares the abilities of African American and White administrators to predict the attitudes of African American citizens. It is important to recall that the responses of White citizens are not included in this analysis. Since the theory of representative bureaucracy addresses the interests of historically disadvantaged and minority groups, only the responses from African American citizens are used to assess the accuracy of administrator’s predictions.

The central question for this aspect of the study is: Are African American administrators better able to accurately predict the attitudes of African American citizens than are white administrators? It is hypothesized that African American administrators will be able to predict African American citizen attitudes more accurately than white administrators. Therefore, administrators, both African American and White, were asked to predict the responses of African American citizens to ten of the
questions that were also used to test for attitude congruence (see Table 5.1).

Regression analysis was used to examine the accuracy of administrator’s predictions of the attitudes of African American citizens on average and for each of the ten questions. The dependent variable was constructed by subtracting the actual percentage of African American citizens who agreed with each question from the prediction given by administrators on Section II of the administrator survey. Section II of the administrator survey asked the administrators to predict the percent of African American citizens who would agree with each question. The difference between the actual and predicted percentages reflects the degree of accuracy of an administrator’s prediction. The research hypothesis does not account for the direction of the difference, i.e. positive or negative, so the absolute value of the difference was used. A small difference signifies a relatively accurate prediction, such that a difference of zero indicates that the administrator accurately predicted the percentage of African American citizens who agreed with the question. A relatively large value for the dependent variable indicates that the administrator was not able to accurately predict attitudes, i.e. the administrator may have over or under predicted the citizens’ responses.
Since the dependent variables measured the absolute value of the difference between the predicted percentage of agreement and the actual percentage of agreement, the maximum possible range for each equation is a function of the percentage of African American citizens who agreed with the question. Thus, the range is the greater of \(x\) or \((100-x)/\), where \(x\) signifies the percentage of African American citizens who agreed with the question. Since the percentages of African American citizens who agreed with questions 1-10 are all greater than 50 percent, the maximum possible ranges for the analysis presented here is \(x\). For example, 70.1 percent of African American citizens agreed to question 1, so the maximum possible range is 70.1. Indeed, the actual range of the predicted percentages was 69.1. Indeed, the actual ranges for all eleven dependent variables were within two percent of the actual percentage of African American citizens who agreed with the question. The eleven dependent variables ranged from a low of 50.0 for questions 7 and 8 to a high of 96.6 for question 5.

Notably, nine of the dependent variables were also skewed in a positive direction. This phenomenon occurs when data tend to be greater than the mean, thereby artificially inflating the mean. Consequently, the median of the variable is a more reliable measure of central tendency since it is unaffected by the skewed data. The medians for the eleven dependent variables
varied from a low of 15.5 for question 3 to a high of 26.6 for question 8. This analysis of the ranges and medians of the eleven dependent variables provides superficial evidence that there is sufficient variance for use as dependent variables in regression analysis.

One consequence of the method used to construct the dependent variables is that the expected directions of the coefficients of the independent variables are in the opposite directions than was seen in the attitude congruence models. The question-based attitude prediction models contain five independent variables. Variables measuring the race and education level of the administrator are expected to have a negative relationship with the dependent variable. Conversely, the gender, age, and political ideology of the administrator are expected to have positive coefficients. No evidence of multicollinearity was detected among these independent variables.

As the regression results in Table 5.1 show, the question-based equations explained a minute amount of the variance in the dependent variable. The $R^2$ statistics for the ten question-based equations ranged from a low of .013 to a high of only .080. Furthermore, RACE was not statistically significant in any of the equations, thereby suggesting a preliminary rejection of the research hypothesis for prediction. Indeed, looking at all of
the independent variables included in the analysis, only AGE was significant in question 18 and EDUCATION was significant in questions 8 and 9.

Due to the statistically insignificant findings on the question-based regression equations, a composite regression equation was constructed. The dependent variable represents the average absolute value of the differences in predicted – actual percentages across the ten questions for each administrator. The results for the composite regression model are presented on the last row of Table 5.1. The results were similarly insignificant, with an $R^2$ of only .062 and EDUCATION was the only statistically significant independent variable.

Overall, these regression results are somewhat surprising. None of the models explained a significant amount of the variance in the accuracy of administrators to predict the attitudes of African American citizens. Further, none of the demographic characteristics, race included, exhibited even the faintest hint of predicting the ability of administrators to explicitly recognize the preferences of African American citizens in A-CC. Thus, White administrators, for example, could predict the attitudes of African American citizens with the same degree of accuracy, or inaccuracy, as African American administrators.
Table 5.1: The impact of demographic variables on administrator prediction of the attitudes of African American citizens (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>13.245</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>4.457</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.723</td>
<td>1.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county’s most important problems.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>20.064</td>
<td>-1.216</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>-1.308</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African Americans.</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>11.893</td>
<td>-4.927</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>-3.122</td>
<td>4.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A-CC government is more productive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>23.452</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>-1.026</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>-2.457</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce the barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>5.388</td>
<td>-4.420</td>
<td>6.079</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-2.253</td>
<td>2.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. African Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>21.244</td>
<td>-6.459</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-3.379</td>
<td>-2.301</td>
<td>3.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African American community.</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>19.419</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>24.597</td>
<td>2.389</td>
<td>-.426</td>
<td>4.242**</td>
<td>-2.852*</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>31.793</td>
<td>-1.796</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>-4.237*</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>16.635</td>
<td>-5.239</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>-1.549</td>
<td>-.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average accuracy of prediction for questions 1-10</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>18.955</td>
<td>-2.606</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>-2.268*</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
Not withstanding the combined effects of using the absolute value and the positive skewness, the ranges and medians of the data in the dependent variables appeared to have sufficient variance to warrant use in regression analysis. Nevertheless, the equations explained an insignificant amount of the variance and race was not a significant predictor of the accuracy of administrator prediction. Although it is inherently more difficult to interpret results that do not reach statistical significance, these findings suggest that White administrators are equally able, or unable, to predict the views of African American citizens as are African American administrators. The possibility exists that White administrators may know the interests of the African American community (prediction) but neither share those views (congruence) nor choose to act on their knowledge of African American interests (role adoption). More importantly, the research hypothesis that African American administrators will be able to predict African American citizen attitudes more accurately than white administrators, however, could not be confirmed.

**Congruence-Prediction Model**

The preceding analysis assumed that the demographic characteristics would directly influence the accuracy with which an administrator could predict the attitudes of African American
citizens. The conceptually validity of this assumption was bolstered by the evidence that such characteristics influence the relative degree of attitude congruence between an administrator and African American citizens. The race of an administrator, in particular, was hypothesized to have a significant impact on both the attitudes of the administrator and their ability to express the attitudes of African American citizens. Furthermore, attitude congruence and attitude prediction have heretofore been conceived as independent phenomena.

The final regression model examines the possibility that the ability to predict citizen attitudes is, in part, a function of attitude congruence. Such a conception of attitude prediction on the part of administrators suggests that perhaps attitude congruence is a necessary precondition of the ability to predict the views of citizens. Since the ability to accurately predict citizen views inherently requires an intimate understanding of their interests and preferences, it is reasonable to assume that administrators who hold similar attitudes to citizens will be more likely to predict citizen’s attitudes.

The dependent variable for this model represents the average absolute value of the differences in predicted – actual percentages across the ten questions for each administrator.
Seven independent variables are included. The variables RACE, EDUCATION, and FEEDBACK are expected to have negative relationships with the dependent variable, while GENDER, AGE, and IDEOLOGY are hypothesized to have positive coefficients. The final independent variable, called CONGRUENCE, represents the average percentage of African American citizens who hold congruent attitudes with the administrator on questions 1 – 20. The research hypothesis is that the relationship between the degree of congruence and the ability to predict will be negative. This hypothesis may seem counterintuitive, but it is due to the process used to construct the variables. No evidence of multicollinearity was detected among the seven independent variables.

The regression results for the congruence-prediction model are presented in Table 5.2. Overall, the independent variables explained only 11.8 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. Consistent with the preceding models examining prediction, RACE did not reach statistical significance. The variable measuring attitude congruence, however, was significant at the .001 level and in the expected direction. This finding suggests that attitude congruence with African American citizens enhances the ability of administrators to predict the views of those citizens.
Table 5.2: The impact of demographic variables and attitude congruence on administrator prediction of the attitudes of African American citizens (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.118</td>
<td>48.256</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td>-.299***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001

**Minority Advocacy Role Models**

The observed relationship between attitude congruence and attitude prediction takes on greater significance in the context of the adoption of the minority advocacy role. The analysis in Chapter Four demonstrated that congruence is a significant predictor of role adoption. That investigation is extended here, by considering the significance of prediction on role adoption.

Regression analysis is used to examine the extent to which the ability to predict the views of citizens affects the adoption of a role that suggests a predilection to advocate for those citizens. The causality logic of suggests that explicit awareness of the interests of minority citizens necessarily predates the largely voluntary choice to advocate for those citizens. Thus, the dependent variable is the role index that was introduced in Chapter Four. This index measures the extent to which administrators agree that they should exhibit behaviors that are consistent with the minority advocacy role.
In this model, the accuracy of prediction is utilized as an independent variable. Since a smaller value for this variable represents prediction accuracy, the research hypothesis suggests that PREDICTION will have a negative relationship with the dependent variable. The independent variables that measure the administrator’s race, level of education, and amount of feedback from the African American community are expected to have positive relationships with the dependent variable, while the gender, age, and political ideology of the administrator are hypothesized to have negative coefficients.

The regression results presented in Table 5.3 show that the accuracy of prediction is a significant factor in the expected direction in the equation examining the adoption of the minority advocacy role. The race of the administrator is also shown to be a significant predictor, as are the level of education, and political ideology. Thus, administrators who more accurately predict the attitudes of the African American community, and are African American, better educated, and politically liberal are more likely to adopt the minority advocacy role.

Table 5.3: Attitude prediction and role adoption (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>4.237</td>
<td>.868***</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>-.162**</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
The final regression analysis presented in this dissertation seeks to integrate all of the preliminary findings regarding the adoption of the minority advocacy role into one composite model. Namely, this model attempts to understand the factors that lead to role adoption by including both attitude congruence and attitude prediction, in addition to the six variables measuring demographic characteristics. Thus, the role index serves as the dependent variable with eight independent variables. The variables measuring attitude congruence, race, level of education, and amount of feedback from the African American community are expected to have positive relationships with the dependent variable. Conversely, attitude prediction, gender, age, and political ideology are hypothesized to have negative coefficients.

The results for this composite regression model are presented in Table 5.4. The $R^2$ of .797 suggests that the model explains nearly 80 percent of the variance in the adoption of the minority advocacy role. Attitude congruence, however, is in the expected direction and is the only independent variable that reaches statistical significance. Notably, the effects of race and attitude prediction that were observed in the model that did not include attitude congruence are overwhelmed by the inclusion of attitude congruence in this model.
Table 5.4: Attitude congruence, attitude prediction, and role adoption (n = 242) (unstandardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.031***</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001

**Findings and Discussion**

The tool of administrator prediction was hypothesized to add an explicit measure of the degree to which administrators are able to identify, and thereby account for, citizen attitudes. Although few applications of attitude prediction were found in the public administration literature (Milbrath, 1981; Melkers & Thomas, 1998), the analysis presented in this dissertation substantiates its use with regard to the potential for active representation, and thus the larger theory of representative bureaucracy.

Although the explanatory power of the model was relatively weak, this analysis provided evidence that attitude congruence with African American citizens is a significant factor in the ability to accurately predict the attitudes of those citizens. This finding leads credence to the prediction tool in the study of representative bureaucracy.

The analysis of prediction in conjunction with the minority advocacy role was more compelling. This model showed that
African American administrators and administrators who could more accurately predict the views of African American citizens were more likely to adopt the role. These findings were overwhelmed, however, when the degree of attitude congruence was included in the analysis.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

The theory of representative bureaucracy suggests that public administrators will make policy-related decisions that, in part, reflect their socialization experiences and backgrounds. This linkage is formally stated in the notions of passive and active representation. Whereas passive representation embodies the idea that the public workforce should reflect the demographic diversity of the jurisdiction, active representation proposes that administrators will advocate for policies that reflect the interests of citizens with similar backgrounds.

Empirical research has focused on four key aspects of the theory of representative bureaucracy. First, researchers have examined the relative degree of representativeness of governmental workforces and have generally concluded that bureaucracies are increasingly diverse, although the progress has been slow and minorities are still under-represented in top policy-making positions. The second important body of research related to passive representation seeks to determine the factors that lead to governmental diversity. The preponderance of
research on the theory of representative bureaucracy has addressed these two aspects of passive representation.

The research in this dissertation has examined the relationship between the demographic characteristics and the attitudes of public administrators. This third aspect of the theory of representative bureaucracy focuses on the likelihood that public administrators will advocate for the interests of citizens with similar backgrounds, and thereby constitutes an examination of the potential for active representation. Thus, the final body of literature investigates whether workforce diversity leads to policy outputs that favor groups represented in the bureaucracy. This research, therefore, explicitly tests whether passive representation is likely to lead to active representation.

Recent research focused on active representation typically bypasses the issues related to attitudes and focuses directly on the link between origins and behavior. This strategy is valid since evidence of actual active representation necessarily implies that the potential for active representation exists. Due to the limited number of studies focused directly on active representation, however, questions of the potential for active representation remain important to the larger understanding and relevance of the theory of representative bureaucracy.
Examining the attitudes of administrators on issues related to representative bureaucracy provides evidence as to whether administrators are predisposed to advocate for constituent interests. The methodological preconditions of examinations of active representation all but require the research to be focused on one department or program. Attitudinal surveys, on the other hand, can be administered across departments, or indeed government-wide. Such an expansive locus serves to enhance the generalizability of the research findings.

The purpose of the research presented in this dissertation was to build upon work examining the attitudes of public administrators in so far as those attitudes relate to representative bureaucracy. Moreover, this research went beyond many earlier examinations of the potential for active representation by directly comparing the attitudes of citizens and administrators. This comparison not only reveals the degree of attitude congruence between administrators and the citizens they serve, but also makes known the level of support that exists within the two groups for policies and behaviors that are consistent with the theory of representative bureaucracy.

The data for this research was collected through two mail surveys. The first survey was sent to a random sample of residents of A-CC while the second was sent to high-level employees of the county government. The response rates for the
surveys were sufficient to permit comparisons between the two
groups of respondents. Furthermore, the survey respondents were
demographically similar to the larger populations, thereby
enhancing the validity and generalizability of the findings.

Various methodological techniques were used to determine if
the potential for active representation exists within the cadre
of high-ranking A-CC administrators. The difference of
proportions test was the first analytic tool that was used to
compare the attitudes of citizens and administrators. These
tests clearly showed that attitudes are consistent by race for
both citizens and administrators. More specifically, African
American citizens and administrators were significantly more
likely to support governmental behaviors that specifically
target the interests of the African American community. An
equally compelling pattern suggests that African American
citizens and White administrators hold markedly different
attitudes. These results support the research hypothesis that
African American citizens and employees are more likely to
support the types of behaviors and policies commonly associated
with representative bureaucracy.

Regression models were constructed to verify the
preliminary conclusion that attitudes are substantially
different by race. These models confirmed the role that race
plays in the shaping of attitudes, but also revealed that other
demographic characteristics are consistent with support for representative bureaucracy. Specifically, administrators who are female, highly educated, ideologically liberal, and routinely receive feedback from the African American community hold attitudes that are generally supportive of representative bureaucracy.

Measures of attitude congruence greatly expanded our understanding of the adoption of the minority advocacy role. Although preliminary analyses showed that African Americans were more likely to adopt the role, this influence was overwhelmed by the inclusion of the degree of attitude congruence between the administrator and African American citizens in the model.

The research presented in this dissertation also employed the tool of attitude prediction in relation to the theory of representative bureaucracy. This analysis provided evidence that attitude congruence with African American citizens is a significant factor in the ability to accurately predict the attitudes of those citizens.

The analysis of prediction in conjunction with the adoption of the minority advocacy role was more compelling. This model showed that African American administrators and administrators who could more accurately predict the views of African American citizens were more likely to adopt the role. These findings
were overwhelmed, however, when the degree of attitude congruence was included in the analysis.

Overall, the data analysis presented in this dissertation supports one of the critical aspects in the passive-active link. Namely, this research has shown that race, and other demographic characteristics, is substantially related to the attitudes held by both citizens and public administrators. Furthermore, the attitudes that were measured in this analysis directly related to the issue of representative bureaucracy. Taken together, these findings suggest that demographic backgrounds and socialization experiences significantly influence attitudes regarding the desirability of a government workforce that seeks to represent the preferences of historically disadvantaged groups. More importantly, the renewed focus on measures of attitude congruence are substantiated the finding that it is attitude congruence, rather than race for example, that explains the adoption of the minority advocacy role.

**Policy Implications**

These examinations of citizen and administrator attitudes lend credence to the argument that a diverse bureaucracy leads to the representation of diverse interests in governmental behavior and decision-making. This research clearly shows that African American citizens, in particular, favor a public sector
workforce that advocates for their interests and needs. Similarly, the survey results show that African American administrators are far more likely than their White colleagues to agree with those citizens and, therefore, are more likely to advocate for those interests. The finding that African American administrators are more likely to adopt the minority advocacy role provides further evidence of the likelihood to engage in active representation.

To the extent that political leaders prioritize pluralistic decision-making within the bureaucratic ranks, this research suggests that a continued emphasis on policies that aim to diversify the public sector workforce is warranted where under-representation of minorities persists. Although the nature and scope of such influence certainly varies, it is a commonly accepted notion that public administrators play an important role in public policy deliberations and decision-making. The nature of such decisions varies from the implementation of the organizational mission, the setting of budgetary priorities, the distribution and availability of services, hiring and other personnel matters, the extent of direct community involvement in decision processes, and so forth. It stands to reason that various stakeholders will have different perspectives on each of these issues, and the burden partially falls on public administrators to ensure that all the varied interests are
included to the extent feasible. The research presented in this
dissertation concludes that, indeed, the interests of African
American citizens differ from those of White citizens.
Similarly, the attitudes of African American administrators
differ from those of White administrators. To the extent that
the political leaders in A-CC and elsewhere seek to incorporate
the interests of the African Americans in public-policy
decision-making, this research suggests that African American
administrators are uniquely situated and, perhaps more
importantly, seem willing to do so.

Research Limitations

Examining the potential for active representation is
important because it lends credence to the link between social
origins and attitudes that is fundamental to the overarching
theory of representative bureaucracy. The research presented in
this dissertation, for example, shows that African American
administrators across the several departments of a local
government are inclined to advocate for the interests of
citizens who share a common background and socialization
experiences. Although the establishment of the potential for
advocacy is important, these findings are tempered by the
absence of direct observations of advocacy, or non-advocacy, in
action. Thus, this research falls short of a direct observation
of the larger passive-active link in the theory of representative bureaucracy.

Turning to the assessment of administrator attitudes and attributes more directly, the conclusions drawn from this research are limited by two measurement issues. First, only two racial groups, African Americans and Whites, were included in the data analysis due to the small number of survey responses from other groups. The attitudinal patterns observed in this research, therefore, may not apply to communities with large populations of Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, etc. Second, the survey instrument used for the local government administrators was unable to capture data that indicated the department in which the administrator works or the function which they serve. For many administrator respondents, revealing this information would have compromised their anonymity due to the relatively small number of workers in their offices. Ideally, the data analysis would have accounted for department and function to examine whether attitudes are related to these workplace characteristics.

**Future Research**

The examination of citizen and administrator attitudes presented herein suggests that different stakeholder groups have different expectations from local government with regard to
advocacy for minority group interests. To the extent that representative bureaucracy is viewed as desirable behavior within the field of public administrators, it is of critical importance to understand the patterns of support and opposition on the part of citizens and administrators alike. This research makes clear that not all are in agreement with the positive normative value that is often placed on workforce diversity and minority advocacy in the public sector. Future research should attempt to document the communal and organizational conditions that are necessary for the potential for active representation to be actualized. Further efforts to document patterns of active representation are similarly essential to making the theory of representative bureaucracy broadly applicable to the practice of public administration.
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ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY CITIZEN SURVEY

Thank you for participating in this important study. We know that your time is valuable, so we have made this survey as short as possible. It should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete.

Please reply by September 4, 2002

Section 1: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following set of statements.

Please completely shade in the bubble.

1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that Athens-Clarke County (A-CC) government provides.

2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county's most important problems.

3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African-Americans.

4. A-CC government is more predictive when its workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.

5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.

6. African-Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.

7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African-American community.

8. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.

9. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.

10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.
Section II: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following set of statements.

Please completely shade in the bubble.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High ranking employees of A-CC government...</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. should make special efforts to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and perspectives of the African-American community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. should actively advocate in favor of policies which specifically address the interests of African-American citizens.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. should actively advocate in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African-Americans.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. should actively advocate for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African-American interests.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. should make special efforts to identify African-Americans in their organization and support them with opportunities and positive feedback.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. should encourage and recruit qualified African-Americans for employment in A-CC government.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. should actively work to enhance the access of African-American citizens to government decision makers, such as elected officials and department heads.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. should actively advocate for increased participation of the African-American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. should seek out qualified African-American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: The following set of questions ask for some basic demographic characteristics. Please answer all of the questions.

Please completely shade in the bubble:

21. What is your race?  ☐ African-American  ☐ White  ☐ Hispanic  ☐ Asian  ☐ Mixed  ☐ Other

22. What is your gender?  ☐ Female  ☐ Male

23. What is your age?  ☐ 20 or younger  ☐ 21 - 35  ☐ 36 - 50  ☐ 51 - 65  ☐ 66 or older

24. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
   ☐ Less than High School  ☐ High School / GED  ☐ Some College
   ☐ Bachelors Degree  ☐ Post-Graduate Degree

25. How aware do you think high ranking employees of A-CC government are regarding the policy preferences of the African-American community?
   ☐ Not at all aware  ☐ Not very aware  ☐ Somewhat aware  ☐ Very aware

Please use the space below to comment on any issues related to this study.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope to the address below:
Mark Bradbury
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
The University of Georgia
e/o Campus Mail Service
240 Riverbend Road
Athens, GA 30605-9851
ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY EMPLOYEE SURVEY

Thank you for participating in the important study. We know that your time is valuable, so we have made this survey as short as possible. It should take you no longer than 15 minutes to complete.

Please reply by June 28, 2002

Section 1: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following set of statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please completely shade in the bubble</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county's most important problems.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African-Americans.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A-CC government is more productive when it's workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A-CC government should support programs that reduce barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. African-Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African-American community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section II:
The next section repeats the questions from Section I, but this time you are asked to predict the opinions of African-American citizens in A-CC. You are asked to predict the percent of African-American citizens in A-CC who completely or generally disagree and completely or generally agree with each statement. Please allocate the full 100% for each statement. Refer to the example below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely or Generally Disagree</th>
<th>Completely or Generally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Citizens of A-CC are good people.</td>
<td>3 5 %</td>
<td>6 5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of services that A-CC government provides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A-CC government is doing an excellent job solving the county's most important problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A-CC government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of African-Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A-CC government is more productive when it's workforce reflects the racial diversity of the county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A-CC government should support programs that reduce barriers to employment, such as the lack of affordable quality day care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. African-Americans have fewer opportunities than whites to get affordable housing in A-CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Public facilities in A-CC meet the needs of the African-American community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC public transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. African-Americans are treated less fairly than whites by A-CC law enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Race relations are a problem in A-CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following set of statements.

Please completely shade in the bubble.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Disagree</th>
<th>Generally Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I should make special efforts to provide information to policy-makers concerning the needs and perspectives of the African-American community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I should actively advocate in favor of policies which specifically address the interests of African-American citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I should actively advocate in favor of a more equitable distribution of services to African-Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I should actively advocate for organizational change to ensure responsiveness to African-American interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I should make special efforts to identify African-Americans in their organization and support them with opportunities and positive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I should actively work to enhance the access of African-American citizens to government decision makers, such as elected officials and department heads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I should actively advocate for increased participation of the African-American community in the shaping of policy for A-CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I should seek out qualified African-American citizens who can be recommended to sit on boards and commissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I should sensitize others to stereotypes about race.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section IV: The following set of questions ask for some basic demographic characteristics. Please answer all of the questions.

31. What is your race?  ○ African-American  ○ White  ○ Hispanic  ○ Asian  ○ Mixed  ○ Other

32. What is your gender?  ○ Female  ○ Male

33. What is your age?  ○ 0 - 20  ○ 21 - 25  ○ 26 - 30  ○ 31 - 65  ○ 66 or older

34. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
   ○ Less than High School  ○ High School / GED  ○ Some College
   ○ Bachelors Degree  ○ Post-Graduate Degree

35. How would you describe your political ideology?
   ○ Very Liberal  ○ Liberal  ○ Moderate  ○ Conservative  ○ Very Conservative

36. What department do you currently work for?

37. What is the title of your job?

38. How many years have you worked in your current department?  □ □ years

39. How many years have you worked for A-CC government?  □ □ years

40. How much feedback on important issues do you receive from the African-American community?
   ○ None at all  ○ Not very much  ○ Fair amount  ○ Great deal

41. How aware do you think you are regarding the policy preferences of the African-American community?
   ○ Not at all aware  ○ Not very aware  ○ Somewhat aware  ○ Very aware

Please use the space below, or attach additional sheets, to comment on any issues related to this study.

Thank you for your participation.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope to the address below:
Mark Bradbury
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
The University of Georgia
c/o Campus Mail Service
240 Riverbend Road
Athens, GA 30605-9851