

PLS 500 – Public Administrative Theory

Topic: Navigating the Political Environment

Environment

- Gaus (1936, Stillman 2000, 80 – 87)
 - He found that several important elements were useful for explaining the ebb and flow of the functions of government – they are the raw material of politics
 - People (e.g., demographic trends)
 - Place (e.g., where the people live)
 - Physical technology
 - Social technology (e.g., changes in social institutions)
 - Wishes and ideas: what you don't know won't hurt you. The demands of the citizenry.
 - Catastrophe
 - Personality
- Typical environmental conditions (e.g., variables) (See Rainey 1997, Table 4.1)
 - Technological conditions
 - Legal conditions
 - Political conditions
 - Economic conditions
 - Demographic conditions
 - Ecological conditions
 - Cultural conditions
- Descriptive and Analytical Conditions
 - Aldrich (1979) identifies 6 concepts (See Rainey 1997, Table 4.2)
 - *Capacity*: the extent to which the environment provides a supply of necessary resources
 - *Homogeneity-heterogeneity*: degree to which important components of the environment are similar or dissimilar
 - *Stability-instability*: degree and rapidity of change in important components or processes of the environment
 - *Concentration-dispersion*: degree to which important components of the environment are separated or close together
 - *Domain consensus-dissensus*: degree to which the organization's domain is generally accepted, disputed, or contested
 - *Turbulence*: degree to which changes in one part of the environment in turn create changes in other parts of the environment
- How the Environment Makes Organizations Change
 - The way in which the environment causes organizations to change is the subject of some debate. There are at least three dominant models of how the environment forces organizations to change
 - Biological Metaphor: Population Ecology

- Rejects the contingency theory depiction of organizations as rational, speedy adapters to environmental changes.
- The population ecology or organizational ecology writers include Martin Landau, Howard E. Aldrich, and John Child
- As an organization's task environment changes, the organization must adapt to survive. If it doesn't adapt, it is selected against and the organization dies
- Problems
 - It assumes that perfect competition among organizations exists (the selection mechanism)
 - View overlooks the importance of management strategies
 - Implies what managers do matters very little because environmental conditions determine outcomes
- The Rational Metaphor
 - People who direct organizations are more-or-less omniscient in that they know everything they need to know to interpret events and trends in the environment. They can evaluate potential responses to environmental changes and then change the organization to deal with these environmental changes.
 - Strategic planning implicitly accepts the idea that the rational model best characterizes the organizations relations with its environment
 - Problem
 - Both the rational and population ecology perspectives treat organizations as elementary and nonconflictual elements within another conflict system
- The Political Metaphor
 - Includes writers such as James G. March, Jeffrey Pfeffer, and James D. Thompson
 - Represents a sort of compromise between the biological and rational models. Neither the environment nor the rational organization is recognized as consistently dominant in determining organizational change.
 - Instead, organizational change is a product of unremitting political interaction among individuals and groups within an organization who are cutting their own deals with each other and other individuals and groups operating in the external environment

Organizational Change Cycles

- Births
 - According to Delacroix and Carroll (1983, 276) an organizational birth is the “creation of an operating entity that acquire inputs from suppliers and provides outputs to a given public”
 - Births also take place through legislative actions as government organizations are born
 - Factors affecting birth rates include (Hall 1991)
 - Nature of preexisting organizations (they provide resources, define domains, provide legitimization)
 - Social environments of organizations
 - Environment and the characteristic of the founder (Kimberly 1979)
- Transformations (Hall 1991)

- New organizations are usually small and suffer from a liability of newness since new organizations have exceptionally high death rates. High mortality rate also exists among government organizations (Starbuck and Nystrom 1981)
- See population ecology and different organizational theories for their respective arguments on the change process
- Innovations (Hall 1991, 194; Rogers 1995)
 - Vast amount of literature on the adoption of innovations
 - Characteristics of the adopter
 - Characteristics of the innovation
 - Adoption process
 - Diffusion process
- Death (Hall 1991)
 - The idea of death is one of the hottest topics in the organizational literature.
 - Death is the final aspect and ultimate outcome of process of organizational decline
 - When death occurs in the public sector (and to some degree in the private sector) is an open question
 - Is a merger a death?
 - Is the repackaging of a government program a death and birth or just change?

Categorizing Organizational Theories

- Categorizing organizational theories is not easy (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
 - They can be distinguished according to whether they concentrate on the needs, objectives, methods, and problems of management (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
 - They can be categorized based on the personal and social needs of workers within organizations (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
 - They can be categorized by attempts by organizations to adapt to their social, political, or economic environments (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
 - On another level it is possible to identify numerous specific theories, each with its own emphasis and assumptions (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
 - Some of these theories overlap to an extent, sharing certain values and viewpoints while differing significantly in other respects (Gordon and Milakovich 1995)
- Environmental Determinism and Human Choice
 - Herbert Kaufman (1985) in *Time, Chance, and Organizations* argues that human choice does not count much in shaping organizations. Others disagree.
 - See Astley and Van de Ven (1983) and Henry (1995) for a good review of the disagreement.
 - Some argue that it is the central and pervasive question in modern organizational theory
 - It is also an area where the public/private distinction appears to have special usefulness
 - See Table 4-2 in Henry (1995) for a good summary
 - Main disagreement is the impact of the task environment (determinism) and the impact of the organization's leaders, managers, and members (choice)

- Four main perspectives (See Table 4-2 in Henry (1995))
 - Weak choice, strong determinism (Q1)
 - Organization is essentially at the mercy of the environment
 - Autonomous and self-aware decision making by members of an organization is useless. The environment will select out these organizations. Control is external to the organization.
 - Research on population ecology, economic history, and political systems contributes to this perspective
 - Strong choice, weak determinism (Q4)
 - This is the extreme opposite of Q1
 - It is this kind of dominance over their task environment that some have characterized organizations as being hierarchically structured, rationally behaving, autonomous entities that have the ability to implement the will of the people
 - Organizational change is achieved through rationally deduced decisions made by top management and implemented along rational lines using the appropriate division of labor
 - Center of control is entirely internal and the generic strategy is to be highly creative and risk taking
 - Research on decision theory, strategic planning, and business management
 - Weak choice, weak determinism (Q3)
 - This is an unstable condition, both internally and externally, and one finds that organizations either die quickly or reform themselves as a way to move to another quadrant
 - View is that organizations are federations of semiautonomous parts that constantly engage in bargaining with each other and outsiders to achieve their ends
 - Relationship with the environment is political and organizational change is achieved through bargaining, negotiating, and mutual political adjustment.
 - Center of organizational control is latent, because there is no real center of authority
 - Generic strategy is reactive
 - Research on public choice, political pluralism, and organizational development inform this perspective
 - Strong choice, strong determinism (Q2)
 - Here we have a contest among equals and organizations compete in a system of perfect competition
 - This perspective does not envision some sort of Weberian monocrat making all of the decisions. Rather, different parts of the organization and individuals within the organization recognize and respond to challenges by the environment.
 - The organization has a medium level of autonomy as there is a struggle between the forces of the environment and the limits of choice
 - Planning, as in Q1 is short-term and solution driven. However, there is some slack search also.
 - Literature on systems theory, structural/functionalism, and contingency theory informs this perspective
 - Could make a case that public organizations are more diverse and found in more boxes Q1, Q3, Q4) while private firms tend to be found in Q2.

Public Administration in the U.S. is Guided by Four Constitutional Principles

- Federalism: a system that allocates certain powers by a constitution to a national government and other substantive powers to a sub-national level of government
- Separation of Powers: Power is divided among three branches of government: executive, legislative, and judicial
- Citizens are guaranteed certain rights and liberties
- Constitution prescribes the means by which citizens can hold their government accountable and compel public officials to answer for their actions

What Is Federalism?

- Latin *foedus* means covenant
- A federal system has both central and sub-national levels of governments with substantive powers assigned to both levels of government
 - Sharing of powers between different levels of government
 - Stands in contrast to a unitary (centralized) system (e.g., France and Great Britain)
 - Political rationale is that it prevents all governmental powers from accumulating at the top level of government and thereby safeguards against having a national dictatorship
 - Chiefly concerned with the structural characteristics of a government system - constitutional authority, legal power, questions of jurisdiction
- American system is a federal-state-local-private partnership, a super complex of institutions that combine in different ways for different policy issues within the framework prescribed by the American constitutional system
- No one intentionally designed the system to operate as it does today. Federalist system has evolved overtime
- Dominant model of federalism is one based on a matrix structure or polycentric institutional arrangements
 - This model is called “cooperative federalism” - see below
 - Polycentric (noncentralization - multiple centers) is different from decentralization.
 - Decentralization requires a center where decisions are made about what should be decentralized. Those who decentralize can recentralize.
 - Polycentrism refers to having more than one center of authority. Accordingly, it is different than being decentralized
- Changing patterns in federal-state relations over time due to
 - Increase/decrease in the velocity of government (size of programs, diversity of programs)
 - Growing complexity and interconnectedness of issues and programs
 - Progressive routinization of administrative procedures
 - Shifts in character of recruitment to political life

Federalism Models

- Dual Federalism Model
 - Functions and responsibilities of federal & state governments are separate and distinct (Layer cake model)
 - A system for dividing authority between federal and state governments that left considerable autonomy to each jurisdiction
 - Wasn't until the "New Deal" that the idea takes hold that federal & state governments were complementary parts of a single mechanism for coping with problems
 - However, the underlying philosophical concept remained for some time
- Cooperative Federalism Model
 - Through the 1950s, cooperative federalism provided an excellent description of federal state relations
 - Perpetual tension in the search for a balance between the centers of power
 - This model enabled federalism to survive the growing period of federal-state interdependence
 - During the 1960s, the model begins to give way to other models (creative federalism, new federalism, picket fence federalism, etc.)
 - "Cooperative" does not imply that intergovernmental relations are always peaceful and friendly
 - "Antagonistic cooperation"; work together but not always willingly or in a friendly spirit and may perceive different and contradictory goals
 - Cooperation is negotiated. If not negotiated, cooperation is either coercive or antagonistic. Accordingly, this concept incorporates many of the forms of competition noted in competitive federalism
 - Many examples where the federal and state governments cooperate in regulating sectors of the economy where Congress has not preempted state authority (e.g., transportation, banking, consumer product safety, highway safety, the environment)

Changing Patterns of Federalism

- Era of Dual Federalism (1789 - 1933)
 - Functions and responsibilities of federal & state governments are separate and distinct (Layer cake model)
 - Wasn't until the "New Deal" that the idea takes hold that federal & state governments were complementary parts of a single mechanism for coping with problems
- Era of Cooperative Federalism (1933 - 1960)
 - National involvement in traditional local issues increases (e.g., unemployment insurance, economic development, etc.).
 - Role of federal government increases in importance. System begins to resemble more of a marble cake even though it appears to be structured as a layer cake.
 - System gets more centralized. Search for a balance of power between federal-state-local-private begins
 - Important events shaping these trends
 - Depression: public pressure to protect individuals from economic catastrophes. This led to building new national institutions (e.g., Social Security Act, Welfare, etc.)

- Post-W.W.II: Worldwide expansion of responsibilities. Economic boom provides money for government expansion.
- Perception that states were performing badly. States were overtly racist and defiant of federal desegregation efforts. This led to strengthening existing institutions.
- State's governance infrastructure was weak. Governors had few powers, small staffs, departments poorly organized. Legislatures were part time, unprofessional staffs, rural areas tended to dominate. Local governments equally bad.
- Era of Creative Federalism (1960 - 1968)
 - Some argue that just a continued refinement of cooperative federalism concept
 - Period of extensive growth in federal aid to state and local governments
 - Assertion of federal authority (e.g., Civil Rights Act)
 - “Great Society” programs (e.g., Model Cities, Medicaid)
 - Proliferation of grants and revenue sharing
 - Important turning point in federal-state-local relations
 - Federal government had a far more significant presence in the daily lives of state & local administrators
 - Intergovernmental system became much more difficult to manage
 - State & local officials became very dependent on federal \$
 - Matching component required state & local governments to put up money
 - Many grants went directly to agencies/programs. Governors and mayors less power
- Era of New Federalism (1968 - Present?)
 - The Nixon Administration proposed a series of initiatives:
 - Revenue sharing
 - Increased use of block grants
 - Administrative reforms to expedite and simplify the grant application and review process
 - Somewhat interrupted during Carter Administration
 - Reagan Administration was perhaps the most systematic and perhaps most sustained effort to remake the federal system since the New Deal. Reagan strongly believed in a more limited role for the national government and proposed:
 - An additional series of block grants
 - A dramatic simplification of intergovernmental aid
 - A devolution of responsibilities for many policies from the national to the state/local level
 - Administrative simplification such as reducing red tape and the burden of federal mandates
 - Revenue sharing was pulled in 1986 for budgetary reasons
 - Reagan's efforts were challenged by many and many of the more ambitious proposals were ultimately set aside in favor of more block grants
 - Some argue that this is just a continued refinement of cooperative federalism concepts. Others say it represents centralized federalism
 - Disrupted old patterns, but did not fundamentally change them. For example, President Reagan's commitment to reducing size and scope of federal government didn't result in any real reduction in the size of government

- Central themes during this recent period are:
 - Decentralization and defunding.
 - Shifting more responsibility to the states. Based on the premise that states could implement many programs more effectively and responsibly.
 - Increased use of mandates – state and local governments increasingly are asked to do more with less

Intergovernmental Relations (IGR)

- Important body of activities and interactions occurring between governmental units of all types and levels within the federal system
 - Concerned with the number and variety of government units
 - Number and diversity of different types of public officials
 - Intensity and regularity of contacts and interactions among officials
 - Importance of officials' attitudes and actions
 - Preoccupation with financial policy issues
- More concerned with process: functional, fiscal, and administrative
- No one intentionally designed the intergovernmental system to operate as it does today. It continues to evolve

Summary of Trends in Federal-State Relations

- Administrative discretion of federal agencies has been reduced
- Rise of administrative presidency
 - Nixon impounds agency funds - Congress takes away this authority
 - Use of political appointments to affect agency policy and direction increases
 - Decreased influence of senior career officials
 - Executive orders increasingly used to circumvent Congress
- Growing congressional oversight of federal agencies
 - Placed new curbs on administrator's discretion
 - Increasingly professionalized congressional staff
 - Creation of expert advisory institutions (e.g., CBO, OTA, GAO)
- Increased openness of the political system at all levels
 - Sunshine laws
 - Public participation requirements
 - Facilitated citizen's group challenges (e.g., CWA and CAA)
 - Intrusion of outside groups in agency affairs
 - Media has played a growing role
 - Local media can better inform constituents
 - State legislatures are more responsive to constituents
- Political environment of average agency is considerably less supportive and more adversarial
- Less money & more responsibility at the state level
 - Increased use of federal mandates
 - Direct orders to comply with certain rules
 - Conditions to receive federal aid
 - Adds confusion about who is in charge

- In some cases, the federal government has given states more flexibility to tailor programs to their unique circumstances
 - Examples would include waivers for programs that don't meet strict federal guidelines
- Increased intergovernmental lobbying

How States Responded to the Challenge of Increased Responsibilities

- Executive branch reforms
 - Longer terms
 - Development of professionalized staffs
 - Reduced numbers of independently elected officials
- Legislative branch reforms
 - Adopting new & sharply revised constitutions
 - Reapportionment
 - Professionalized staff
- Strengthened and diversified revenue systems
 - States have shown a great capacity to generate needed resources
 - Economic growth and new revenue sources (e.g., income taxes, lotteries, etc.) during the 1980s provided revenue for new initiatives
 - States expanded faster than federal and local levels
- Increased capacity of state & local agencies
 - Modernized institutions
 - Improved budgeting processes
 - Information management systems
 - Productivity measurement
 - Increased professionalism of staff
 - Expanded number and variety of administrative agencies responsible for addressing policy issues at the state level
- “States as Laboratories”
 - Key innovators (e.g., economic development, environment, growth management, education, health care, welfare reform, etc.)
 - Rising role for states in domestic policy
 - Lobbying to shape federal initiatives

Fiscal Federalism

- Looks at the fiscal issues related to the operation of the federal system. Encompasses the flow of money among national, state, and local levels of government and the intergovernmental aspects of federal taxation
 - Examines where grant money flows and what the impacts are
 - How revenue and expenditure patterns change overtime
 - Looks at the impacts of fiscal policies (e.g., impacts of tax policies or distributive programs)
 - Why states choose different fiscal policies
- The fiscal components of federal-state relations have undergone dramatic alterations during this century

- Both federal and state governments have displaced local governments in the public finance of the United States
- Federal government collects more than half of all public revenue and expends close to two-thirds of all government expenditures (difference is due to deficit spending)
- Reason for federal dominance is 16 amendment to the constitution in 1913 which authorized the federal income tax
- 1978 was the peak year in terms of the federal transfer of funds to state and local governments

Grants

- Major feature of fiscal federalism is the *grant-in-aid*: A transfer of money from one government to another.
 - It is nearly always a conditional grant. Accordingly, one level of government attempts to influence the actions of another using a monetary award or the conditions attached to the award.
 - Volume of federal grants-in aid peaked in 1978.
 - Almost all grants are matched with nonfederal moneys
- Categorical vs. Block grants.
 - *Categorical grants* are highly specific and rather rigid and address narrow policy issues
 - The typical categorical grant has strings attached
 - There are three types of categorical grants
 - *Formula grants* are distributed by an administratively or legislatively based formula
 - *Project grants or discretionary grants* are distributed at the discretion of federal administrators (about 73% of categorical grants are project grants)
 - *Formula/project grants* are grants awarded at the discretion of federal administrators, but within the bounds of a formula such as the amount of money awarded per state
 - *Block grants* are formula grants which allow the recipient to exercise more discretion with respect to the way the federal funds are spent
 - Most are awarded to state governments, although some like the community development block grants are awarded directly to local governments
 - By awarding money to local governments, the federal government can exert more control over urban affairs (inner city redevelopment) (this is a more liberal oriented approach)
 - Political argument (often from conservatives) is to combine several categorical grants and place less restrictions on their use in order to provide state and local governments with more control
 - Until 1965, virtually all federal grants were categorical. Movement towards block grants is often a conservative argument that the state and local governments “know best” and it is a means of shifting control away from Washington and towards the states. Accordingly, liberals typically resist it.
- General revenue sharing offers state and local governments the greatest level of discretion. Revenues were distributed to the states based on a formula with virtually no restrictions or strings attached

- Program lasted between 1972 and 1986 and transferred \$84 billion to state and local governments (about 14% of the total aid package)
- Still present in a limited sense (e.g., mineral rights and grazing fees) which return some of the revenue to state and local governments
- Problems with grant system:
 - Numerous requirements often cause unintended difficulties
 - No clear way to coordinate the combined impact of grants
 - Difficulty in accounting for the outcomes and impacts of the grants

Mandates

- Definition
 - A mandate is a federally imposed intergovernmental regulation that requires the government receiving a federal grant to advance specific social and national goals, or meet certain national standards, which may or may not pertain to the accompanying grant
 - May impose a financial sanction for noncompliance
 - May impose civil or criminal penalties
 - Reflects the tension between local autonomy (decentralization) and federal control (centralization)
- Mandates which are a tool which gives the federal government more control over state actions (e.g., it increases centralization). Come about as a result of legislative enactments and/or adoption of federal regulations.
 - One study found that nearly 1,300 federal regulations have been placed on state and local governments and the average number of regulations affecting these jurisdictions was 570 regulations per government
 - Number of intergovernmental regulations rose by 160% in the 1970s
 - Number of intergovernmental regulations represents a larger proportion of a shrinking legislative agenda
 - All of this was accompanied by much talk of deregulation
- At the federal level, mandates often take the form of:
 - *Direct orders* are an instruction from the federal government to state and local governments which, if not followed, can result in civil or criminal penalties (Equal Opportunity Act 1972 bans discrimination, 1977 CWA bans dumping of sewerage at sea)
 - *Cross-cutting requirements* are mandates that stipulate compliance with specific federal policies by all governments receiving federal grants. They are the most numerous and apply to virtually all federal financial assistance (e.g., comply with antidiscrimination statutes, NEPA, etc.)
 - *Cross-over sanctions* permit the federal government to punish a state by reducing or withdrawing federal aid in one or more programs if the standards are not being satisfied in a different program (e.g., cut highway funds if don't enact minimum drinking age or pass motorcycle helmet laws)
 - *Partial preemption* Occurs when subnational governments are, in limited ways, denied their traditional prerogatives because the federal government demands that states adopt and administer program standards set by Washington if the states want the federal aid (e.g., CAA and CWA).
- At the state level, mandates often take the form of:

- *Establishing the rules of the game*: Setting rules for local elections, establishing limits on local government actions, designation of local officials
- *Spillovers or service*: Spillover mandates relate to services (e.g., hospitals, health, education, welfare) that benefit persons outside of the local jurisdiction
- *Interlocal equity*: Prevents local governments from engaging in activities that would harm their neighbors (e.g., environmental protection, land use, and tax assessment)
- *Loss of local tax base*: State laws exempting property from local property taxes (e.g., university property, state buildings, etc.) or food or medicine from local sales taxes
- *Personnel mandates*: Deals with pension benefits of local government employees, wages, personnel standards, working conditions
- Rationales for mandates
 - Federal or state government believes that the mandated activity is of such importance that discretion for engaging in the activity can not be left to state or local officials
 - The mandate could be justified on the grounds of achieving some desirable public purpose (e.g., clean water, equitable education for all students)
 - Federal or state officials may decide that uniformity in services (e.g., education) is essential
 - Tradition is often used to advance the argument for federal or state mandates when it doesn't appear justified on other grounds
 - It is a way of saving federal or state governments money that they can use in other ways
- Governors and mayors have a valid complaint about the federal government -- it imposes costly rules and supplies no money to pay for them
 - Columbus Ohio study of complying with 14 environmental mandates would cost the city \$1.6 Billion over 10 years -- \$856 a year per family for 10 years
 - New unfunded mandate legislation makes it more difficult for Congress or a federal regulatory agency to impose costly requirements on state and local governments

Accountability

- Definition
 - The means by which public agencies and their workers answer to the citizens directly and indirectly for the use of their powers, authority, and resources
- Key questions are
 - To whom are administrators accountable?
 - At the most basic level it is the citizens
 - More complicated though. Also accountable to president/governor/mayor, congress/state legislature/city council, courts, interest groups, professional associations, and the media
 - For what are administrators accountable?
 - To make laws work as intended with a minimum of waste and delay
 - Exercise lawful and sensible administrative discretion
 - Recommend new policies and changes in the current policies when needed
 - Enhance citizen confidence in government
 - How do you assess accountability?
 - Often accountable to many different groups and the demands each places may conflict

- Often many different organizations are involved in addressing a problem. Who then gets blamed for administrative failures
- Often no rule tells agencies how to resolve interagency conflicts since the existing rules are typically what caused the conflict in the first place

Accountability Mechanisms

- External/Formal
 - Legislative oversight (e.g., sunset laws)
 - Inquires into agency performance that result in formal or informal recommendations to improve agency performance
 - Rule-making by legislatures
 - Give detailed requirements that agencies must follow in developing rules or implementing a program
 - Legislative veto
 - Requirement in a law that an agency must secure explicit approval from the legislature or a committee before acting. For example, legislature must approve rules adopted by an agency before they can take effect
 - Sunshine laws
 - Requirement that meetings and decisions are made in public
 - Budgetary review and enactment
 - Opportunity to assess agency performance during budget hearings and in authorization process
 - Investigations/Legislative Audits
 - Congress/legislatures have broad authority to investigate agency operations, demand information on agency performance. It can also use organizations like the GAO to investigate and evaluate the performance of agency programs
 - Legislative casework
 - Members will frequently intervene on behalf of constituent to solve problems or have special services provided. Frequently these requests receive special attention from an agency
 - Control of one government by another
 - Power of one unit of government to check the power and authority of another level of government. Example, state agency may have to approve a local government's comprehensive land use plan or zoning requirements before they take effect
 - Ombudsman
 - An official who receives complaints from citizens and investigates alleged wrongdoing or unfair treatment
 - Ratification of appointments
 - The Senate committees can make their preferences known or reject appointments that appear hostile towards their preferences
 - Judicial review
 - Courts can ensure that agency adheres to statutory requirements. Examples are citizen suits brought by groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council to ensure that a city or company complies with CWA requirements

- Electoral processes
 - Chance for the electorate to change policy by voting for candidates who advocate specific changes
- External/Informal
 - Monitoring by interest groups/client groups
 - Interest groups typically pay close attention to the implementation and outcomes of public policies. Often have their own information on outcomes that they distribute. Will often monitor administrative decisions (e.g., issuance of environmental permits)
 - Monitoring by the professional community
 - Professional associations will often monitor the actions of its members and could intervene in agency decision-making processes or testify before congress/legislatures
 - Freedom of information laws
 - Includes access to meetings, minutes of meetings, and formal documents pertaining to agency operations. Example would be the information pertaining to a permit decision. Some information may be held confidential if it pertains to national security or patents
 - Media
 - Countless examples of how the media monitors agency decision-making processes as well as the implementation and outcomes of programs. See the short cases for some detailed examples.
- Internal/Formal
 - Executive control
 - Executive has the authority to control the actions of those below him/her in the hierarchy
 - Budget preparation and management
 - Regular opportunity to assess and control the actions of an organization and redirect resources within an organization
 - Rule-making procedures
 - Must follow specific procedures to ensure those opportunities for public comment, etc.
 - Inspectors general and auditors
 - Most federal agencies have an office, which investigates wrong doings and initiates criminal proceedings. Typically financial records of programs are audited on a periodic basis.
 - Chief financial auditors
 - They typically develop an accounting system to detect fraud and abuse and report such instances to top officials or the OMB
 - Investigative commissions
 - Look at each of the long cases. In each instance, a special investigative commission was created to investigate an agencies actions and make recommendations
- Internal/Informal
 - Professional standards
 - Various professions (e.g., law, medicine, accounting, engineering, etc.) have standards and ethical guidelines that its members must follow or could lose their certifications

- Ethical codes and values
 - Must adhere to society's ethical standards and moral values.
- Whistle-blowers
 - When employees encounter mismanagement or wrong doing within their organization. While the proper bureaucratic response is to confront the problem within the organization. However, there are times when the high-level officials are part of the problem and the only way to address this wrongdoing is to publicize it outside the agency (e.g., go to the press)

Other Ways to Categorize Accountability Mechanisms

- Barbara S. Romzek and Melvin J. Dubnick (1994) in trying to assess accountability in the Challenger Disaster sees four alternative systems of accountability (See also Romzek 1996)
 - Four alternative systems are based on variations in two critical factors
 - Source of agency control (internal vs. external)
 - Degree of control over agency actions (high vs. low)
 - Hierarchical/Bureaucratic accountability systems (internal control, high degree of control over agency actions)
 - Expectation of public managers are managed through focusing attention on the priorities of those at the top of the bureaucratic hierarchy.
 - Characteristics include the superior-subordinate relationship, orders are unquestioned, standard operating rules and procedures, and close supervision
 - Superior-subordinate relationship
 - Supervision is the basis of the relationship
 - Legal accountability (external control, high degree of control over agency actions)
 - An outside individual or group is in a position to impose formal sanctions or assert formal contractual relations
 - Typically, the outsider makes laws or other policy mandates that the public administrator is obliged to follow
 - Principle-agent relationship
 - Fiduciary/contractual responsibility is the basis of the relationship
 - Professional accountability (Internal control, Low degree of control over agency actions)
 - Public officials must rely on skilled or expert employees to provide appropriate solutions to problems. These employees expect to be held accountable for their actions but insist agency managers give them the latitude to do the best job possible
 - Layperson-expert relationship
 - Deference to experts characterizes this accountability system
 - Political accountability (external control, Low degree of control over agency actions)
 - Question is whom does the public official represent and to whom is he/she accountable. Is it the public or the person that appointed them (elected official)
 - Constituent-representative relationship
 - Responsiveness to constituents (e.g., public, elected officials) characterizes this accountability system
 - Argument is that professional accountability system which helped put a man on the moon no longer dominated in the 1980s and this helped lead to the Challenger Disaster

Implementation

- Definition
 - Policy implementation refers to the connection between the expression of governmental intention and the achievement of results in the world of action (O'Toole 1996)
 - Implementation is a process, or series of decisions and actions directed towards putting a policy or program into effect
 - Outputs refer to the extent to which programmatic goals have been satisfied
 - Outcomes are the changes in the larger societal problem that program is designed to address
- Implementation is a very different approach to studying public administration (Kettl 1995?). Implementation emerged in part as an attempt to build a bridge between old administrative theory and the new administrative realities brought on by the “great Society” programs.
 - New theory of implementation was designed to be Hargrove’s (1975) “missing link” between policy making and outcomes.
 - Traditional public administrationists were surprised to read Pressman and Wildavsky’s (1973, 1984) conclusion that there was no literature on “implementation”
 - Many traditionalists (e.g., Gaus) viewed administration as implementation
- What was new about implementation was not its rejection of traditional public administration, but rather its focus.
 - Whereas traditional public administration focused on the organization, especially their structures and processes, implementation shifted its unit of analysis to the program (or policy) and the results they produced.
 - Borrowed from systems analysis as the guiding model for formulating implementation frameworks
- If the ferment and excitement of a field of research is better measured by disorder and a lack of conceptual clarity than by order and agreement on theoretical constructs then the field of implementation is both a healthy and exciting area for research (Ingram 1990)
 - No generally agreed upon “implementation theory” (O'Toole 1986; Lester, et al. 1987)
- Lots of metaphors used to explain implementation
 - Implementation as a linear process
 - Implementation as the politics of mutual adaptation
 - Implementation as gamesmanship
 - Implementation as the conditions necessary to achieve your objectives
 - Implementation as a communication problem
 - Implementation as a contingency theory
- Three stages in the development of implementation research (Goggin, et al. 1990)
 - First generation studies were largely case studies
 - Second generation studies were largely syntheses of existing studies, which resulted in frameworks for examining program implementation. This developed into two dominant approaches
 - Top-down approaches
 - Bottom-up approaches
 - Third generation studies are more “scientific” and focus on synthesizing top-down and bottom-up approaches

- *First generation studies*
 - Typically, these studies used case studies to examine how a single authoritative decision was carried out either at single or multiple locations
 - Research indicated that problems were everywhere
 - It often appeared that implementation research was devoted to the study of policy failures with failure understood as the inability of public programs to achieve their legislative objectives
 - Pressman and Wildavsky (1973, 1984) argued that
 - Programs plagued by three problems:
 - The complexity of joint action
 - Problem of control
 - Implementation environment was complex with many opportunities for participants to play games.
 - Criticisms
 - often criticized as being atheoretical, case-specific, overly pessimistic, and noncumulative (Goggin, et al. 1990; Lester, et al. 1987; O'Toole 1986)
 - Results were largely the product of the cases researchers chose to study (Kettl 1995?)
 - Subtle bias towards studying intergovernmental programs (Kettl 1995?)
 - Researchers often assumed federal goals should be local goals. However, in some programs the objective was to adapt broad national goals to specific local conditions (Kettl 1995?)
 - Inferences of “success” and “failure were far too simple-minded (Kettl 1995?)
- *Second generation studies*
 - The next generation of studies shifted the focus to identifying variables crucial to implementation success and linking them together in conceptual frameworks. Some of the more important contributions were by
 - This research is marked by important syntheses of previous research and an attempt to identify systematic variations among programs by testing these frameworks.
 - Among the contributions of these studies was the recognition that implementation varies over time, across policies, and from one program to the next (1986)
 - Two dominant perspectives developed with important contributions in each school of thought
 - Top-down researchers
 - Bottom-up researchers
 - Important variables often cited included policy form and content, organizations and their resources, and timing (Goggin, et al. 1990; O'Toole 1986)
 - *Top-Down Research/Forward-Mapping/Programmed Approach*
 - Characteristics of this research (See the table at the end of notes)
 - Based on the assumption that implementation problems can be minimized through the careful preprogramming of implementation procedures by legislatures and federal officials
 - Strong focus on giving practical advice to policy formulators
 - Critics point out that:

- Focus on the federal government controlled variables at the expense of other important factors at the state and local level
- Top-down research has been accused of viewing implementation as a purely administrative process and either ignores the political aspects or eliminates them
 - The old politics-administration dichotomy
- By starting with a statute, they forget important factors which happened earlier in the policy-making process
- They give too much weight to the importance of statutory framers
- The analyses illustrated but could not prove the value of their formulations
- No real indication of which variables were most important in determining program success
- Neglects the argument that the purpose of many federal programs is to adopt broad national goals to local conditions
- Can lead to inappropriate conclusions because implementors may not be able to control the variables in question
- Vague goals can be a strength in that they provide much needed flexibility when the problem is complex and implementors are unsure how to best address or manage the problem
- Bottom-Up Research/Backward-Mapping/Adaptive Approach
 - Characteristics of this research (See table at the end of the notes)
 - Based on the assumption that implementation is shaped by the bargaining and mutual adaptation among implementors and their clients (Elmore 1982; Berman 1978, 1980)
 - Effective implementation requires a process that allows policy to be adapted based on the unfolding interaction of a policy with its institutional setting (Berman 1980, 211)
 - Advantage of Berman's (1978) approach is that it is useful in helping to explain some of the difficulties which may be encountered in implementation and which implementation approach may be most effective
 - Less concerned with providing advice to policy formulators, but in describing the implementation process. When advice is given, it primarily stresses the importance of providing flexibility to implementors
 - Critics point out that:
 - Often criticized for assuming the implementation should occur in a decentralized environment where opportunities for bargaining exist (O'Toole 1986, 205)
 - Often overemphasizes the level of local autonomy that is present
 - More focused on methodology or policy analysis (e.g., backwards mapping) and have implicit normative factors (e.g., local control). It does not give an overall sense of what variables are most important in influencing program success
 - In a sense, there is no dependent variables
 - It is not possible to make predictions
 - Some researchers argue that this approach is best in all circumstances. However, there clearly are times when local discretion may be undesirable from a national perspective
 - Not as well structured with respect to the relationships among variables as the top-down conceptual frameworks

- Normative criticism is that control in a democratic system should reside with policy formulators not policy implementors
- Overall criticisms of this dichotomy of perspectives
 - Basically, each approach neglects that part of the implementation process that the other focuses on
 - This dichotomy of approaches leads many researchers within each camp to advance what amount to principles, which Simon (1947) criticized 50 years ago. Yet their exceptions to many of these “principles” (Need for well structured statues vs. importance of providing flexibility)
 - This battle of opposing views neglects the fact that there is some utility to both approaches
 - Top-down and bottom-up researchers often choose to study different “types” of policies (Matland 1995)
 - Both approaches fail to examine the role of the state implementor who may be caught between pressures from above and below
 - Surprisingly little research focuses on the role of states in intergovernmental implementation or used states as the primary unit of analysis
 - Much of this research is inherently intergovernmental in nature, yet the analysts don’t fully consider the intergovernmental aspects of the implementation problem.
 - Very simplified perspective on the implementation process
 - Need to more explicitly consider implementation’s intergovernmental dimensions or adopt network perspectives (e.g., O’Toole 1997)

Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up Approaches to Policy Implementation

Top Down	Implementation Strategy	Bottom-Up
Programmed	Approach	Adaptive
Federal Officials	Key Actor	State/Local Officials
High	Control of Federal Officials	Low
Compliance	Measure of Success	Consensus
Low	Discretion of Implementor	High
Narrow	Scope of Policy Change	Broad
Well Defined	Policy Clarity	Less Defined
Minor	Degree of Organizational Change	Major
Low	Conflict over Policy Goals and Objectives	High
Relatively Stable	Uncertainty of Policy Environment	Unstable
Well Defined	Implementing Procedures	Less Defined
Centralized	Implementation Network	Decentralized
Tightly Coupled	Institutional Setting	Loosely Coupled

Other Disagreements Which Underlie Second Generation Studies

- When does implementation begin? (Ingram 1990)
 - Most scholars separate policy formation from policy implementation (e.g., Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983)
 - Chronologically it is thought to begin after the adoption of a policy, but before the routinization of operations, activities, and tasks that are governed by the policy (Schneider 1982, 716). However, there are problems with this approach
 - Problem with this approach is that it distorts reality. Implementors try and influence the scope and substance of policies (Ingram 1990)
 - There are often reauthorizations, which cause minor adjustments in existing programs. Are reauthorizations really “new” implementation cycles or continuations of the previous cycle?
 - Policies are often vague and conflicting. Accordingly, is it really appropriate to begin with the statute and presume that it structures implementation (Ingram 1990)
 - There are a wide range of intermediate activities. The federal agencies often develop elaborate regulations and guidance documents, which will be used to approve state or local programs. These activities often occur concurrently with state and local efforts to develop programs.
 - Policy continues to evolve instead of being initially established and perhaps thereafter reformulated (Browne and Wildavsky 1984). Implementation is a process of mutual adaptation in which policies and programs adapt to their environment and each alters the other (Browne and Wildavsky 1984)
 - Important to look at the development of a program over time
 - Implementation scholars should select their starting point with the ultimate goal of improving policy (Ingram 1990)
 - A related question is what is being implemented? While the word policy is often used, many analysts are referring primarily to federal statutes. What about all of the other

- things being considered when putting together and implementing the program (e.g., state statutes, existing agency policies, federal guidance, etc.)
- Better to use a broad definition of policy
 - Elmore (1985) argues it may be better to consider portfolios of policies
 - When does implementation end? Does it end? (Ingram 1990)
 - Van Horn (1979, 9-10) argues implementation analysis should only be concerned with measuring the extent to which the policy outputs of implementing agencies conform to the various objectives rather than with the policy's ultimate impact on target groups
 - If the underlying causal theory is inadequate, why blame implementors if they put all relevant aspects of the program in place
 - No reason to connect process with outcomes
 - Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) point out that terminating implementation analysis prior to policy effects excludes some of the most interesting aspects of the analysis. Mainly, is the causal theory adequate?
 - Is public administration basically implementation? Many traditionalists would argue that public administration is implementation (Kettl 1995?). Indeed, many of the variables, which are identified as important, are the subject of a great deal of public administration research.
 - What are the most important variables? (Ingram 1990)
 - Many “discoveries” of factors affecting implementation really are not new, but rather are reformations of public administration insights concerning bureaucratic behavior and relationships in the federal system (Ingram 1990)
 - Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) offer the most elaborate framework which contains 17 independent variables and they also identify 6 conditions for implementation success
 - O'Toole (1986) surveyed the implementation research and identified various variables important to implementation success
 - Some like Goggin (1986) argue that researchers are finding diminishing returns by adding additional variables to frameworks. Key is to establish causal relationships
 - Some suggest that presence of an implementation entrepreneur and external monitoring can make the crucial difference (Ingram 1990)
 - Some scholars have built on Lowi's (1964, 1972) typology of policies and have argued that the patterns of benefits and costs associated with a policy largely determine the relationships that emerge in implementation and whether implementation will succeed. Accordingly, implementation varies by policy type (Ripley and Franklin 1986; Hargrove 1980; Meier 1987)
 - Advantage of this type of approach is that policy typology-based studies may be useful in helping to explain some of the difficulties which will be encountered in implementation (Ingram 1990)
 - Ingram (1990) notes that depending on the characteristics of the policy being implemented two basic problems emerge
 - The implementing agency may not have the will, competence, skill, and resources to perform implementation
 - Implementing agency must be good at constituency politics
 - Frequently cited variables include
 - Resources

- Clarity of policy message
- Content of policy message
- Communication of policy message
- Consistency of policy message
- Messages from constituency groups
- Dispositions of implementors
- Implementor's organizational capacity
- Political environment
- Socio-economic environment
- What implementation strategies are employed?
 - Bardach (1977) notes that a wide variety of games are played by actors in the implementation process
 - Goggin, et al. (1990) use implementation "behavior" as their dependent variable
 - Surprisingly little comparative research has looked at the different implementation strategies that different actors/organizations in the same program play.
 - Best study is by Thomas W. Church and Robert T. Nakamura (1993) *Cleaning Up the Mess: Implementation Strategies in Superfund*
- What is "successful" implementation? How do you Measure Success?
 - Compliance
 - The most simple criterion is whether statutorily prescribed goals are met (e.g., Matland 1995; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983; Van Horn 1979)
 - Problem is that how do you measure this when the legislation is vague, inconsistent, and contradictory character of legislation. In these situations Matland (1995, 155) argues that the choice of a standard becomes more difficult and general societal norms and values come into play
 - Why not focus on regulations and guidance documents
 - Policy impacts/outputs (e.g., Ringquist 1993)
 - Problem is that the causal theory of the policy may be flawed
 - Impacts are important in so far as they provide may play an important role in policy feedback, although process may play an even greater role
 - Over the long term, outcomes may play an important role in major restructuring of programs (e.g., welfare reform, Section 319 NPS program). Over the short term, process and programmatic concerns may be more important
 - Feasibility (Linder and Peters 1987)
 - Effort (Thompson and Scicchitano 1985)
 - Implementation behavior (Goggin, et al 1990; and, Sorg 1983)
 - Goggin, et al. (1990) use defiance, delay, strategic delay, and compliance
 - Oliver (1991) discusses a variety of strategic behaviors that implementors may exhibit in response to institutional pressures
 - Institutionalization (from organizational theory) (Zucker 1987)
 - Policy evolution and improvement (Ingram 1990)
 - As Wildavsky (1979) notes in *Speaking Truth to Power*, policy problems are seldom solved, they are only worked on. Furthermore, solving one problem often leads to

- other problems because of negative and sometimes hidden consequences of government actions
- The test of implementation success is less whether specific problem-related objectives are achieved than whether the resulting problems are preferable to the initial problems (Ingram 1990)
- Ann Schneider (1982, 726-29) suggests relative criteria by asking “good as compared to what?”
 - Compare operations under a new policy with operations under an old program
 - Performance of agencies under one policy can be compared to performance of a similar agency under a different policy
 - Alternatively, rather than be preoccupied with criteria, focus could be on improvement
- Johnson (1995) suggests the following distinctions can be made
 - *Idealistic Perspective*: It provides a permanent solution to the problem
 - *Legalistic Perspective*: It complies with a legislative mandate
 - *Responsive Perspective*: It is continually shaped by the situation in which the policy is applied. Program changes in response to demands of public and program participants
 - *Experimental Perspective*: It is shaped by the experiences and responses of administrators as they encounter problems
- All of these disagreements combined with the bottom-upper’s arguments illustrates that a straightforward, unidimensional approach to implementation analysis is not likely to succeed (Ingram 1990)
 - Researchers must recognize that implementation experience varies and that approaches adopted by the analyst must be tailored to particular circumstances (Ingram 1990)

Third generation studies

- It attempts to synthesize top-down and bottom-up perspectives. It is explicitly more scientific
 - It attempts to build on theories in other fields.
 - For example, Goggin, et al (1990) use a communications perspective.
 - Researchers are shifting their attention away from an emphasis on how policies should be implemented to how the implementation process should be studied (e.g., Sabatier 1991; and, Goggin, et al. 1990)
 - A contingency perspective is beginning to emerge as a leading perspective (e.g., Matland 1995; Ingram 1990; and Berman 1980)
 - Either top-down or bottom-up approaches can be effective depending on the situation
 - Researchers have begun to recognize that it is important to study implementation from a longitudinal perspective (e.g., Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993; Sabatier 1991; Goggin, et al. 1990)
 - The hope is that the longitudinal perspective will help improve our understanding of how variations across settings, policies, and time are linked to independent and intervening variables influencing implementation behavior
- Criticisms
 - None really.

- Most analysts agree that a more systematic approach to implementation research is needed
- Most analysts agree that top-down and bottom-up approaches are insufficient
- Most analysts agree that we should find ways to combine top-down and bottom-up approaches
- Most analysts agree there is a need for research which considers a longitudinal approach
- Most analysts agree that different approaches are better in different situations - hence a switch to more of a contingency perspective
- *Ambiguity-Conflict Model*
 - Is described in an article by Richard E. Matland (1995) entitled “Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation”
 - It is a contingency model in which four implementation perspectives are described based on a policies ambiguity (includes policy means as well as goals) and the level of conflict in the policy system. Presented as dichotomous to simplify discussion even though the theoretical constructs are continuous.
 - Administrative Implementation
 - Low ambiguity, low conflict
 - Conditions permit rational decision making
 - Outcomes are determined by resources
 - Example: Smallpox eradication
 - Political Implementation
 - Low ambiguity, high conflict
 - Typical conditions for political decision making
 - Outcomes are determined by power. Must be able to force their will on other participants
 - Example: Busing
 - Experimental Implementation
 - High ambiguity, low conflict
 - Outcomes will largely depend on which actors are most active and most involved
 - Contextual conditions dominate the process
 - Program differs from site to site
 - Example: Headstart
 - Symbolic Implementation
 - High ambiguity, high conflict
 - Outcomes will be determined by the coalition strength
 - Example: Community action agencies

Intergovernmental Policy Implementation

- Most policy implementation is intergovernmental in nature
 - Numerous cases in which two or more organizations, sometimes even complex networks of organizations, are required to coordinate or cooperate to achieve policy success
 - Can be conceptualized as a problem of cooperation and coordination
 - Two broad reasons interorganizational action is often more difficult (O’Toole 1996)

- Mechanisms for coordinating with an agencies may hinder interorganizational coordination
- Forms of inducement to interunit cooperation are typically weaker than those available in simpler structures
- Intergovernmental implementation can also create a variety of barriers to interagency collaboration do to “turf” (Bardach 1996)
- Process of *intergovernmental policy implementation* in network settings is not well understood (O’Toole 1996) and neither is managing intergovernmental networks (Agranoff 1986, 1991; and Gage and Mandell 1990)
 - Early work focused on “iron triangles” linking interest groups, key congressmen and committee chairs, and career bureaucrats
 - Later research focuses on broader networks
 - *Issue networks* (Heclo 1978, See Stillman 2000, 447 - 456): a shared knowledge group having to do with some aspect of public policy. Most now use the term policy network.
 - *Policy networks*: Organizations focused on a particular policy area. Hard to know where one policy network ends and another begins. Focus of this research tends to be on policymaking rather than implementation.
 - *Implementation structures*: organizations (governmental and nongovernmental) involved in implementing a policy or program. Others use the term *interorganizational network* to describe the same phenomena. *Collaboration* research also focuses on similar phenomena.
 - Network and exchange models have been developed in recent years by social scientists, yet implementation researchers have not utilized this research to help improve their understanding of the implementation process (O’Toole 1996)
- O’Toole (1996) argues that interorganizational implementation cannot be treated as a pure instance of a self-forming network, nor as a strait forward case of principles and agents
 - Top-down approaches have minimized the self-forming nature of networks and see it as more of a principle agent problem
 - Bottom-up researchers also neglect that there is a principle-agent component and see implementation as essentially a problem of self-forming networks
 - Implementation contains elements of both (O’Toole 1996)
- Problems with interorganizational implementation (O’Toole 1996)
 - Uncertainty: participants lack knowledge of other actor’s true preferences. A large number of actions and the availability of different implementation strategies creates another source of uncertainty that can be difficult to model. In addition, someone else’s actions open up additional strategies for participants engaged in bargaining. Complicated structure of the network and the connectedness of interactions may introduce additional uncertainties. Accordingly, it becomes a problem of nested games.
 - Problems of monitoring and enforcement
 - Current models can not provide much insight on what is expected to happen in interorganizational settings
 - Strategies that can be employed to improve interorganizational implementation
 - Managers can be active in initiating certain moves that don’t alter the structure of the strategic situation

- Signaling preferences
- Making commitments
- Iteration or repeating actions in a predictable way
- Managers can propose appropriate or potentially appropriate pareto-efficient equilibria (to use game-theoretic language)
- Managers can facilitate the play of strategic games when interests are closely aligned, but coordination is needed
 - Managers can use persuasion to influence preferences
- Attempt to change interunit structure or relationships to try and increase or encourage cooperation

Interorganizational Relations (Hall 1991) (IOR)

- Accumulated knowledge is highly fragmented and the scholarship is uneven (Hall 1991)
- Characteristics of the environment
 - A number of characteristics have been identified as being important for creating or sustaining IORs (Hall 1991)
 - Legal mandates may require them
 - Cultural conditions may support or repress IORs
 - Organizations in highly complex technological environments tend to know each other
 - As turbulence increases (interconnectedness of environmental factors), IORs are expected to increase
 - Heterogeneous environment would likely have a higher capacity for IORs
 - Complexity would tend to increase IORs
 - Still more work needs to be done. Some like environmental capacity are unclear.
- Situational factors. Five factors appear to be crucial for IORs (Hall 1991)
 - *Awareness*: Organizations vary in terms of their awareness of other organizations around them. Hierarchy of awareness
 - General awareness of other organizations
 - Mutual acquaintance among organizations
 - Specific and programmed interactions
 - *Domain consensus-disensus*: Two factors are important.
 - Consensus or disagreement on the domain.
 - Issue of ideological *compatibility*
 - *Geographical proximity*: Distribution of organizations in geographic space has been given little attention, but should be important
 - *Localized independence*: Degree to which organizations are dependent on the local area for their resources
 - *Size*: Size of the actual or potential network.
 - At any given time there are a finite number of organizations available for interaction
 - Larger the network, the weaker the quality of the relationships
- Reasons for interaction (Hall 1991)
 - *Ad Hoc Bases*: Little or no previous patterning in the relationship between organizations, but an unusual problem or circumstance may arise that creates a one-time need for cooperation

- *Exchange Bases*: This has been the dominant focus of interactions. It involves any voluntary activity between organizations that has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their respective goals
- *Formalized agreements*: The degree to which the interdependency between organizations is officially recognized. It is typically written down and may be legally or contractually binding
- *Mandatedness*: The extent to which relationships are governed by laws or regulations
- Resource flows (Hall 1991)
 - *Resource interdependence*: A situation in which two or more organizations are dependent upon one another for the resources each has access to or control. Three forms of interdependence
 - *Horizontal*: A members of an organization set compete with each other in obtaining resources and disposing of goods and services
 - *Vertical*: Interact at different stages of the production of goods and services (e.g., police, courts, probation, half-way houses)
 - *Symbiotic*: Organizations complement each other in rendering services to individual clients
 - *Intensity*: The level of resource investment required of organizations in IORs
 - Implicit is the consideration of the relative proportion of an organization's resources that are invested into the relationship
 - *Joint programs*: A particular type of resource flow where the emphasis is not on resource flows, but interdependency and an intense relationship
- Transaction forms (Hall 1991)
 - *Interaction formalization*: Can have formalized agreements which govern their interrelationships
 - *Interaction standardization*: Two aspects of standardization
 - Degree to which the resources interchanged are standardized
 - Degree to which the procedures used in transactions are standardized
 - *Importance*: Vary in terms of the importance to the interacting organizations
 - Importance of interaction is a strong predictor of the frequency of interactions
 - *Frequency*: How often interactions occur. This is different than intensity.
 - *Reciprocity*: The symmetry of transactions. Resources can flow to both parties equally in an unbalanced fashion
 - *Power*: The ability to get one party to do what it otherwise would not do. Sources of power are similar to those in an intraorganizational context
 - *Cooperation*: A process in which organizations pursue their own goals and thus retain autonomy while at the same time orienting their actions toward a common issue or outcome
 - *Conflict*: Oppositional process in which one party attempts to block or thwart the activities of another party
 - *Conflict resolution*: Four conflict resolution techniques can take place
 - Issues can be ignored or avoided
 - Issues can be smoothed over by playing down differences and emphasizing common interests

- Issues can be openly confronted and differences worked through
- Issues can be submitted to some form of higher authority with the power to resolve the dispute
- *Coordination*: It involves a process of concerted decision making or action in which two or more organizations participate with some form of deliberate adjustment to one another. Key factor is the idea that the transactions are deliberate and involve a goal, which is collective. This is the major point of departure from cooperation. Assumption is usually that coordination is a good thing, will cut costs, and is good in its own right. That thinking is now changing.
- Several of the modern organizational theories have intergovernmental components (e.g., transaction cost, principle agent, resource dependency theories, networks) see that section of the notes

Collaboration and Turf

- Collaboration is a common form of interorganizational relationship
 - *Collaboration* can be defined as two or more organizations working together in some manner that creates public value.
 - It is important that some form of *public value is added* that offsets increased start-up and transaction costs (e.g., costs of organizing the activities) associated with implementing these activities
 - Important to remember that start-up costs are often more visible than benefits, which often occur at some later point in time
 - Collaborative activities can involve many different types of costs and benefits (See Table 1 in Bardach (1996, 172) as an example
 - While some such as James Q. Wilson (1989) suggest that interagency coordination and collaboration is highly unlikely, there are countless examples in many policy areas such as human services, health care, and environmental management.
- Many technical, bureaucratic, and political barriers can stand in the way of collaboration
 - One of the big obstacles to collaboration involves protecting “turf”
- *Turf* is the exclusive domain of activities and resources over which an organization has the right, or prerogative, to exercise operational and/or policy responsibility
 - All else being equal, more turf is better. Expansion of turf can bring budgetary resources, new responsibilities and powers, prestige, etc.
 - Organizations, including collaboratives, have turf while individuals have stake in turf, both old and new turf
 - It is common for individuals to want to protect their turf since it is capable of being used in many different ways
 - Turf barriers to collaboration show up in individual’s failures to communicate and develop trust and in organization’s reluctance to contribute needed resources
 - The means to overcome turf barriers involve organizations or their leaders creating situations in which individuals are motivated or empowered to augment interorganizational collaborative capacity
 - There are many sources of threats to an organization’s turf such as:
 - Fiscal retrenchment, changes in technology, demographic shifts, and even collaboration itself.

- *Note*: many of the changes in environmental conditions noted earlier can lead to demands for collaboration or challenges to an organization's turf
- Bardach (1996) suggests the following concerns related to struggles over turf:
 - *Threats to job security and/or advancement*: Some individuals may be threatened by collaborative activities. Conversely, the activities may provide a rationale for advancement or created added job security.
 - *Challenges to professional expertise*: Collaborative activity may introduce new people or organizations whose professional expertise is valued. It could also legitimize "rival experts". This could reduce one individual or organization's power while raising that of another (see sources of power in leadership notes). Conversely, collaboration could allow individuals to develop new skills and contacts that allow them to work across the "seams of government" noted by Elmore (1986).
 - *Conflict concerning the use of facilities*: Facilities are a form of turf as due intangible things like phone numbers, letterhead, grants management systems, etc. Conflicts over which facilities will be contributed to an effort is a common problem. Conversely, collaboration can provide access to much needed facilities.
 - *Loss of policy direction*: Collaboration may result in some other organization being viewed as the proper entity for setting policy direction. Conversely, joining with other like-minded individuals and organizations can increase one's influence over policy direction.
 - *Undermining an agency's traditional priorities*: Collaborative activities may result, directly or indirectly in changes in an organization's policies in favor of something different. Conversely, collaboration may provide a way for an organization to justify changes in its traditional priorities that it prefers.
 - *Anxiety over accountability*: some may resist engaging in collaborative activities because they are afraid of being held accountable for results that they no longer have exclusive control over since the results cannot be achieved by working alone. Conversely, if upper level management and legislators support collaborative activities then accountability systems may work to encourage additional forms of collaboration.
 - *Requirements for building and maintaining consensus*: collaboration not only requires reaching consensus but also maintaining it over time. This can be difficult when the partners share different values and perspectives. Conversely, maintaining consensus can help the organization gain access to resources and other forms of power and turf.
 - *Self-worth*: institutions are some measure of the individuals that work within them and protecting an organization's turf will for some mean protecting one's self worth – personalities and egos as a source of conflict would be an example. Conversely, others may welcome the opportunity to work with like-minded individuals and to break down bureaucratic barriers.
- Collaboration also requires some capacity to work together. Bardach (1996) suggests that three interrelated capacities are important
 - *Operational capacity*: capacity to produce some sort of synergistic benefits as a result of working together
 - *Resource-raising capacity*: the collective capacity to leverage resources for individual operational purposes either from one another or from outside the system

- *Constituent capacity* is the ability of systems managers and other interested parties to constitute the operational and resource raising capacities and to act on them (constructively or destructively) and presumably to improve them over time