

---

Further Dissecting the Black Box of Citizen Participation: When Does Citizen Involvement Lead to Good Outcomes?

Author(s): Kaifeng Yang and Sanjay K. Pandey

Source: *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 71, No. 6 (November / December 2011), pp. 880-892

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Society for Public Administration

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41317387>

Accessed: 29-05-2017 02:04 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*American Society for Public Administration, Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Public Administration Review*

## New Thinking about Motivating Public Employees

**Kaifeng Yang** is an associate professor and the doctoral program director in the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy at Florida State University. He is the managing editor of *Public Performance and Management Review*. His research interests include citizen participation and public management.

**E-mail:** kyang@fsu.edu

**Sanjay K. Pandey** is an associate professor in the School of Public Affairs and Administration at Rutgers University–Newark. He conducts research on public management and health policy.

**E-mail:** skpandey@andromeda.rutgers.edu

**Kaifeng Yang**

Florida State University

**Sanjay K. Pandey**

Rutgers University–Newark

## Further Dissecting the Black Box of Citizen Participation: When Does Citizen Involvement Lead to Good Outcomes?

*While various descriptive and prescriptive citizen participation models suggest ways to improve citizen participation, none has been subjected to large-scale empirical tests. This article develops and tests an organizational theory model that explores the conditions under which citizen involvement as a general strategy can improve administrative decision making. The new model focuses on organizational variables that are more directly subject to managerial influence, such as political support, leadership, red tape, and hierarchical authority, as well as variables related to participant competence and representativeness. Hypotheses are tested with data collected from a national survey of local government managers. The results suggest that public management matters for citizen participation. The conclusion calls for integrating quantitative designs with normative and qualitative citizen participation research.*

Citizen involvement, defined in much of the public administration literature as citizen participation in administrative decision-making and management processes, increasingly has been emphasized (Cooper, Bryer, and Meek 2006; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Thomas 1995; Yang and Callahan 2005). Unlike political participation (e.g., presidential voting and campaign) or individual volunteerism in civic affairs, citizen involvement occurs primarily at the administrator–citizen interface. Advocates see great value in citizen involvement—from both normative and instrumental perspectives—such as fostering citizenship values, enhancing accountability, improving trust in government, maintaining legitimacy, achieving better decisions, and building consensus (Barber 1984; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Thomas 1995).

Most scholars recognize that citizen involvement is embedded in current institutional arrangements and constrained by many political, social, economic, and individual factors (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Kweit and Kweit 1981; Thomas 1995). If not carefully designed or implemented, it may delay decisions, increase conflict, disappoint participants, and lead to more distrust. This is why citizen involvement sometimes is considered shallow—it occurs after the issues have been framed or the decisions have been made. This is also why managers sometimes believe in its normative value but question its practical benefits (Moynihan 2003; Thomas 1995). As a result, scholars have tried to integrate normative and instrumental concerns in order to develop better theory and practice (e.g., Irvin and Stansbury 2004; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Yang and Callahan 2007). In Thomas's words, our understanding of citizen involvement should be "practical," "balanced," and "realistic" so that we can build "a theory that has much more practical value for public managers than either the pure enthusiasm of the proponents of public involvement or the skepticism of its critics" (1995, 30). Thus, the central question is when or how citizen involvement makes a difference.

---

It remains untested how citizen involvement as a general strategy can improve decision making.

It is particularly unclear how organizational characteristics affect participation outcomes. This article addresses these issues by focusing on variables such as leadership, political support, red tape, and hierarchical authority and by testing a model that explains their effects on citizen involvement, controlling for community characteristics.

---

While scholars have proposed compelling prescriptive models (Ebdon and Franklin 2006; Kweit and Kweit 1981; Thomas 1995; Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller 2000), these models rarely have been tested with large-scale data. Scholars also have used case studies to illustrate how citizen involvement can work in a particular government, with a particular mechanism (e.g., Adams 2004), or in a particular policy area (e.g., Kweit and Kweit 2004). However valuable these studies are, they are not able to show a general pattern with high external validity. It remains untested how citizen

involvement as a general strategy can improve decision making. It is particularly unclear how organizational characteristics affect participation outcomes. This article addresses these issues by focusing on variables such as leadership, political support, red tape, and hierarchical authority and by testing a model that explains their effects on citizen involvement, controlling for community characteristics. As the managerial variables frequently are used in public management research but not in citizen involvement research, we advance a public management perspective on citizen involvement.

## Literature Review

How to make citizen involvement work is not a new question. Toward the end of the 1970s, Checkoway and Van Til identified five unanswered questions, one of which was, "in what ways does participation make a difference in the decisions and policy outcomes of government, and what kind of difference?" (1978, 35). In the same book, Langton (1978) writes that the quality of citizen participation is determined by citizenship education, elitism, technological complexity, financing, government agency behavior, and representativeness. Perlman (1978) emphasizes the organizational characteristics of grassroots or citizen groups, while Rosener (1978b) highlights the importance of planning and matching participation methods to participation purposes. The directions pointed to by these authors are still correct, but they were largely descriptive and prescriptive.

Kweit and Kweit (1981) identify three types of determinants of participation success: (1) the characteristics of the structures of participation mechanisms and organizations; (2) the characteristics of the target organization, particularly its resource base, structure, and member attitude; and (3) environmental characteristics such as environment stability, forms of government, and community size. These variables have different impacts on three outcomes—policy outcome, power redistribution, and citizen attitudes. These variables are still relevant, but how they relate to participation outcomes needs an updated assessment based on large-scale quantitative data.

Thomas (1990) suggests that in order to achieve effective participation, participation mechanisms should be matched with four styles of decision making: modified autonomous/managerial, segmented public consultation, unitary public consultation, and public decision. The four decision styles were further determined by a flow chart that considered seven factors.<sup>1</sup> The flow chart is useful for public managers in deciding whether and how much to use citizen involvement for a decision, but it does not address how other factors affect the impact of public involvement once it is adopted.

Studying effective participation, King, Feltey, and Susel (1998) argue that we have to adjust the relationship among the issue, administrative systems, administrators, and citizens. They point to three categories of barriers to effective participation: the nature of life in contemporary society, administrative processes, and techniques of participation. They recommend overcoming the barriers by educating citizens/administrators and enabling facilitative systems/processes. King, Feltey, and Susel's work is based on interviews with experts and focus group discussions in northeastern Ohio. It is not clear how practical some recommendations are or whether they are generalizable, but the attention to citizen life, participation mechanism, and administrative structure is consistent with previous work.

Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller (2000) propose that participation techniques should be tied to participation purposes and the nature of the issue. There are five purposes for participation: discovery or searching for definitions, alternatives, or criteria; educating the public about the issue and proposed alternative; measuring public opinion about the options; persuading the public toward an alternative; and legitimizing government decisions. The nature of the issue is determined by six attributes: the degree of conflict over the issue, the number of stakeholders, the level of confidence in the information on the issue, the number of alternatives, the knowledge of outcomes, and the probability of the outcomes. The authors illustrate their ideas with two cases from Utah. Similar to Thomas' (1990) flow chart and Rosener's (1978b) methods-purpose matrix, this framework is useful, but again, it is a decision-specific tool.

Considering a broad range of factors, Ebdon and Franklin (2006) propose a model of participation impact on budgeting. They argue that the impact depends on the likelihood of use of citizen input, which is further influenced by four types of variables: (1) environment variables such as forms of government, political culture, legal requirements, population, and diversity; (2) process design variables such as timing, budget type, selection method, and representativeness; (3) mechanisms or techniques such as public meetings and focus groups; and (4) goals and expected outcomes such as reducing cynicism and educating citizens. This model contributes greatly to the literature, but again, it has not been fully tested, and some propositions are still a matter of debate, such as the impact of government forms and population size (Wang 2001; Yang and Calahan 2005).

In general, the literature includes varied but consistent theories about effective citizen involvement, offering a solid foundation for our inquiry. We advance these theories by addressing three issues. First, the literature is based more on qualitative or context-specific evidence; the explanatory factors identified rarely are operationalized and tested with quantitative data.<sup>2</sup> This is understandable to the extent that qualitative studies are good for theory generating and quantitative designs are difficult to do on this topic—the impact of participation is contingent on specific situations, issues, and mechanisms. However, as a step forward, it is important to test theories across situations and mechanisms. The impact may be context and issue specific, but there is reason to expect general patterns across contexts and issues. For example, leadership is important regardless of context. As Creighton emphasizes, "there is no such thing as a one-size-fits-all public participation . . . But there are critical [general] issues that can make the difference between a successful and an unsuccessful program" (2005, 2).

Second, we deliberately use mainstream organizational theories to enrich the citizen involvement literature. Although the literature acknowledges that administrative systems are a major concern, how organizational variables affect participation outcomes in a multivariate model remains unexplored. Ultimately, adopting citizen involvement is an organizational decision, and its implementation reflects an organizational adaptation process with organizational consequences. Although citizen participation occurs largely at the citizen-administrator interface, its outcome depends on factors beyond the interface. For example, after citizens give their voice, how that voice

affects bureaucratic management depends on characteristics of the organization. Organizations are a processor of information (Arrow 1974). Organizational arrangements determine what information they seek, how they process the signals, and how they act on their perceived reality. Analogously, marketing scholars find that whether market orientation produces better organizational performance depends on organization characteristics such as learning ability, strategic flexibility, innovativeness, and industry type (Kirca, Jayachandran, and Bearden 2005; Slater and Narver 1995).<sup>1</sup>

Third, an uncritical reader of the literature is likely to have an impression that all success factors are equally important, without differentiating their relative importance or recognizing their potential tensions. But is it always necessary for all good conditions to be in place before we initiate citizen involvement? We use multivariate testing to show the relative importance of the factors contributing to participation outcomes. The results help public managers prioritize their actions when they are usually constrained by resources, mandates, and situations, shedding light on questions such as, can strong leadership and commitment overcome the limitations on resources and techniques? Should we simultaneously push for participant competency and representativeness to the greatest extent possible?

### Framework and Hypotheses

In line with the literature, we use four types of variables to explain involvement outcomes: involvement mechanisms/tools, characteristics of participants, characteristics of target organizations, and environment. However, we develop hypotheses only with variables that help extend the literature: (1) variables that are important in public management, such as red tape, elected official support, hierarchical authority, and transformational leadership; and (2) variables that are linked in an interactive way, such as citizen competency and citizen representativeness. Other variables are treated as controls.<sup>1</sup>

#### Environment

A defining difference between government and business organizations is that government organizations are heavily influenced by multiple, and many times competing, political principals such as elected officials, the courts, and the chief executive (Pandey and Wright 2006; Rainey 2003). As a result, the extent to which an agency has political support greatly affects its behavior. Strong elected official support brings funding, agency stability, and agency autonomy (Yang and Pandey 2009). Elected official support is found to affect the innovation, performance, and effectiveness of public organizations (Moynihan and Pandey 2005). It is also a major reason why local governments adopt citizen involvement (Yang and Callahan 2007).

Elected official support affects participation outcomes. First, it is positively associated with administrators' trust in citizens (Yang 2005). With trust, public managers are more likely to involve citizens and take their input seriously. Second, it enables public managers to change bureaucratic structures that often are mandated by political authorities (Moe 1991). Third, it facilitates internal communication in an agency (Yang and Pandey 2009). With

effective communication, citizen input is more likely to be shared appropriately within the agency and discussions about changes are more likely to occur. Fourth, in a hostile environment, the bureaucratic tendency is to avoid risk and to stick to the old way of doing things, so managers are less likely to open up their decision making and invite potential threats. Fifth, elected official support leads to organizational stability (Yang and Pandey 2009), which facilitates better participation outcomes. Finally, citizen input in local politics is not always perceived as neutral or standing for public interest; rather, it may be perceived as coming from a particular political perspective or benefiting a particular political coalition. When local agencies do not have wide elected official support or when elected officials have conflicts about the agency and its policy, managers may adopt involvement mechanisms in order to "show" that their decisions are based on public input, but they are less likely to actually use citizen inputs in their decisions.

$H_1$ : Elected official support is positively associated with better participation outcomes.

#### Target Organization Characteristics

Bureaucratic structures are a major barrier to effective citizen participation (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998). Kweit and Kweit (1981) conclude that organic organizations are more likely to experience better participation outcomes than mechanistic organizations because of their flexibility and willingness to change. However, such effects rarely are tested statistically. We use red tape and hierarchical authority to capture bureaucratic structures.

Red tape, or burdensome administrative rules and requirements, has several negative effects on citizen participation. It creates barriers that prevent citizens from getting timely and accurate government information. Without knowing the issues, the policies, or the problems, citizens are less likely to participate or to participate well. Some potential participants may shy away from participation because of the red tape relating to participation. Managers who are trapped by more red tape are less tolerant of risk taking and change (Bozeman and Kingsley 1998), which are necessary if effective participation outcomes are expected. Moreover, government red tape often is created and mandated by external political authorities, so managers must conform to the rules even when citizen input says otherwise. Although definite rules and procedures may facilitate citizen participation by making it easier for citizens to understand the workings of government, rigidity and inflexibility imply a resistance to change, which is hard to reconcile with citizen participation (Kweit and Kweit 1980). In general, Greenstone and Peterson (1973) observe that bureaucratic routine is antithetical to citizen participation.

$H_2$ : Bureaucratic red tape is negatively associated with better participation outcomes.

Hierarchical authority that emphasizes the chain of command is another bureaucratic characteristic that reflects many government agencies' preference for stability, consistency, control, and risk

---

In line with the literature, we use four types of variables to explain involvement outcomes: involvement mechanisms/tools, characteristics of participants, characteristics of target organizations, and environment.

---

aversion (Rainey 2003), an emphasis that is antithetical to effective citizen participation. Although hierarchy and clear lines of authority may "make it easier for citizens to pinpoint responsibility for various actions or programs" (Kweit and Kweit 1980, 653), this also makes it difficult to change. Hierarchical authority is closely related to centralization (Hellriegel and Slocum 2004), which is negatively associated with responsiveness, intelligence dissemination, and market orientation (Jaworski and Kohli 1993). Yang and Pandey (2007) find that decentralization is positively associated with public responsiveness, as empowered employees are more likely to respond to citizen preferences. Hierarchical authority also relates to multiple management levels and centralized communication channels, which impede information sharing and learning that are important for participation outcomes (Hellriegel and Slocum 2004).

**H<sub>3</sub>:** Hierarchical authority is negatively associated with better participation outcomes.

An organizational characteristic that might overcome the constraints of bureaucratic structures is transformational leadership. Meta-analyses consistently have found that transformational leadership is at least as common and effective in public organizations as in private ones (Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio 2002). Transformational leaders motivate behavior by changing their followers' attitudes and assumptions (Burns 1978), which seems crucial in citizen participation because participatory governance often means doing things much differently from the bureaucratic tradition. Transformational leaders typically are seen as catalysts of change, and their charisma and inspirational motivation help employees see the potential benefits of citizen participation and embrace change resulting from participation (Bass 1985). Particularly, transformational leadership in the public sector often emphasizes the role of citizens and citizenship in formulating and realizing shared goals (Denhardt and Campbell 2006).

**H<sub>4</sub>:** Transformational leadership is positively associated with better participation outcomes.

### ***Involvement Mechanisms***

Participation is impossible without mechanisms. The literature in this regard largely has focused on the match between mechanisms and participation purposes or decision stages (Rosener 1978b; Thomas 1990; Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller 2000). Because "match" is case specific, we pay attention to the variety of mechanisms or the use of multiple mechanisms, assuming that match is more likely when multiple mechanisms are used. In reality, there are often multiple participation mechanisms for one decision. When Ebdon and Franklin (2006) discuss involvement mechanisms, they place "multiple types" at one extreme of a continuum leading to long-term and deepest impacts. Yang and Callahan (2005) find that the use of multiple mechanisms is positively associated with rationales such as building trust in government and enhancing service quality. Berman (1997) finds that using multiple participation methods reduces citizen cynicism toward government. Wang (2002) finds that using multiple mechanisms is positively associated with stakeholder consensus, responsiveness, and trust in government.

**H<sub>5</sub>:** Using multiple involvement mechanisms is positively associated with better participation outcomes.

The literature emphasizes that each of the mechanisms can work well if it is well designed and implemented. For example, Ebdon and Franklin (2006) point out the importance of process design variables such as timing and participant selection method. Baker, Addams, and Davis (2005) identify critical factors for enhancing public hearings. Instead of measuring all critical design factors in one study, we argue that strong leadership and commitment can lead to good process designs. That is, leadership affects how participation mechanisms are designed and implemented. Indeed, Steward (2007) illustrates that the choice of participation mechanisms depends on leadership quality: better leadership facilitates the use of mechanisms offering more citizen control and leading to greater decision impact. We argue that when multiple mechanisms are adopted, transformational leadership can strengthen their impact on decision outcomes.

**H<sub>6</sub>:** There is an interactive effect between transformational leadership and variety of involvement mechanisms so that the latter's impact on participation outcomes is likely to be enhanced by the former.

### ***Participant Characteristics***

Participant characteristics, particularly citizen competence and representativeness, are critical to participation outcome (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Kweit and Kweit 1981). Educating citizens and improving their knowledge and participation skills are typical recommendations in the literature, and many public managers do not trust that citizens have the competence to participate effectively. A 1998 survey by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press reports that 77 percent of presidential appointees and 81 percent of senior civil servants do not believe that Americans know enough about issues to form wise opinions (Bok 2001). Public managers are less likely to involve citizens if they do not have such trust (Yang 2005). If citizens do not know about the issues, taking time to educate them delays the decision-making process. If citizens cannot communicate well, not only will decision processes be delayed, but also consensus will be more difficult to achieve and quality solutions less likely to emerge.

Representativeness is a fundamental concern, and many managers are frustrated by the fact that only the same handful of people participate most of the time, and they question whether the small group represents the community at large (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998). Even when citizens are competent, they are not equally willing to participate. Thus, unequal representation is likely to occur and further decrease equality given the uneven distribution of power and resources among citizens (Arnstein 1969; Kweit and Kweit 1981; Thomas 1995). The requirement for competence and representativeness may vary depending on the type of issues and involvement purposes, but it generally is believed that stronger citizen competence produces better citizen input, and citizen input coming from a representative group is more likely to be valued by government officials.

**H<sub>7</sub>:** High levels of participant competence are positively associated with better participation outcomes.

**H<sub>8</sub>:** High levels of participant representativeness are positively associated with better participation outcomes.

There might be an interactive effect between competence and representativeness such that when representativeness is high, the effect of competence is reduced. There are three logics for this. One is that the two factors may be difficult to optimize simultaneously in practice. If one wants to only involve citizens who are highly competent, then one is unlikely to get a representative group because highly competent citizens tend to be more educated and wealthier (Verba and Nie 1972; Verba et al. 1993). If one tries to include all types of citizens, then one may get people who are not competent. That is, one would wish for great competence and representativeness, but they often do not come together.

The second logic assumes that high competence and representativeness can come together, but that may not be a good thing in local decision making. Local residents often fall within different and even competing groups based on political party lines, political connections, or interests. If all of them are equally competent and come together and fight, it is not necessarily beneficial for governments who need to make timely decisions. This logic indicates that we may see negative effects from the two variables, which can be tested in the model.

The third logic is based on what is normally required in local involvement efforts, which often are not the type of direct democracy envisioned by Barber (1984) but are used to collect citizen input as an additional source of information for elected officials and managers. What governments seek are not an absolute representative group of "all" residents, but a representative group of "relevant" publics: those who "(a) could provide information . . . useful in resolving the issue, or (b) could affect the ability to implement a decision by accepting or facilitating implementation" (Thomas 1995, 55–56; see also Creighton 2005; Crosby and Bryson 2005). When the situation is such that the absolute representativeness (of all publics) is a not a big concern (e.g., expert panel), the requirement for competence tends to be greater. In situations in which absolute representativeness is a big concern (e.g., town hall meetings for community visioning), competence is still an issue—otherwise people with better participation skills may dominate the process (Young 2000)—but its importance may be relatively lower (though not negative).

H<sub>3</sub>: There is an interactive effect between participant competence and participant representativeness so that higher levels of representativeness reduce the impact of competence.

## Methodology

### Data Collection

The data for this study were collected in phase IV of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP-IV), a key part of which is a survey administered to a nationwide sample in 2007. The theoretical population of interest comprised senior managers (both general and functional) in U.S. local government jurisdictions with populations of more than 50,000. The general managers included the city manager and assistant/deputy city managers. Functional managers included in the study headed key departments, namely, finance/budgeting, public works, personnel/hr, economic development, parks and recreation, planning, and community development. The sample design and construction were aided by the International City/County Management Association. The NASP-IV team used publicly available information to gather additional information.

These efforts resulted in 3,316 individuals in the sample. Each was sent an initial letter that introduced the study. They were directed to the study Web site and provided with a secure participation code. After the initial letter, multiple methods were used in follow-up efforts—e-mail, fax, and phone calls. When the study concluded, 1,538 of the 3,316 had responded, for a response rate of 46.4 percent. As a key explanatory variable was transformational leadership of the chief administrative officer, it was a concern whether chief administrative officers' self-report would be reliable. Thus, we focused on city departments and excluded city managers and deputy/assistant city managers. Therefore, our observations came from 1,097 functional managers. We compared the sampling frame with the respondents and found the profiles to be comparable. The mean age was 50, and, on average, the respondents had been in their present position for 7.6 years. As expected, a sizable majority were male (67.8 percent), white (86.3 percent), highly educated (more than 57 percent with graduate degrees), and well compensated (58 percent with salaries over \$100,000).

### Measurement

Wherever possible, the study variables were measured using multiple items that have been tested and validated in earlier studies (see the appendix), such as those for transformational leadership (House 1998), hierarchical authority (Bozeman 2000), red tape (Bozeman 2000; Pandey and Scott 2002), elected official support (Gianakis and Wang 2000), and population diversity (Marlowe and Portillo 2006). Measures of participation variables were written specifically for this study, but their development relied on recent scholarship on citizen participation (e.g., Ebdon and Franklin 2006; Moynihan 2003; Wang 2001; Yang and Callahan 2005), and they were approved by a number of expert reviewers.

**Measuring participation outcomes.** The difficulty of measuring participation outcomes has long been recognized (Kweit and Kweit 1981). Different stakeholders have different objectives, expectations, and evaluations (Rosener 1978a). Some emphasize the process criteria—as long as the process is fair, it is good participation—while others prefer outcome criteria—it is not good unless the decisions reflect my expectation (Creighton 2005). Moreover, the outcome has many dimensions, some of which are intangible or observable only after a long period of time has passed by (e.g., social restructuring). Kweit and Kweit (1981) suggest three levels of impacts: administrative (service delivery improvement), societal (social restructuring or redistribution of power), and individual (trust in government and citizenship).

This study relies on managers' evaluations of outcomes, capturing whether citizen participation increases department influence, facilitates decision making, helps develop consensus, and brings new ideas. The index ( $\alpha = .75$ ) is a reflective measure, assuming that the latent construct, effective participation, causes the variation of the indicator items. That is, the four items reflect an effective or ideal participation process. For example, effective participation should lead to increased department influence because the benefits or purposes of participation include avoiding worst-case confrontations, maintaining credibility/legitimacy, building strategic alliances, and increasing trust in government (Irvin and Stansbury 2004; Yang and Callahan 2005), all of which contribute to higher levels of department influence.

The second item assumes that well-designed and well-implemented involvement efforts do not create excessive delays. Admittedly, opening up to citizens takes more time than managers deciding unilaterally, but unilateral decisions may alienate external stakeholders and become tied up in controversies, delays, or litigations (Creighton 2005). Decisions with public participation are easier to implement and lead to citizen goodwill, which facilitates the agency's future decisions (Irvin and Stansbury 2004; Thomas 1995). Thus, minimizing cost and delay could be a benefit of public participation (Creighton 2005). In a similar vein, effective involvement efforts should help build consensus rather than delay it because they develop "a solid, long term agreement and commitment between otherwise divergent parties" (Creighton 2005, 19). Irvin and Stansbury (2004) also point out that effective participation breaks gridlock. Finally, bringing new ideas on service delivery is a benefit that is widely recognized in the literature (Creighton 2005; Kweit and Kweit 1981; Thomas 1995).

One may suspect that managers' perceptions are biased, as managers represent technocratic rationality and may only see the negative side of participation. One also may suspect the negative wording of the first three items strengthens this tendency of seeing only the negative side. Theoretically, however, public managers are not necessarily opposed to participation: they make judgments about what is best for the community (Selden, Brewer, and Brudney 1999), and, on average, they are motivated by the desire to achieve the public interest (DeSantis, Glass, and Newell 1992). Empirically, many of them do have high levels of support for community building and citizen participation (Yang and Callahan 2007), and our respondents' evaluation on average is quite positive. Table 1 shows that only 15 percent respondents agreed (somewhat to strongly) that participation reduces departmental influence, 26 percent agreed that participation creates excessive delays, and 27 percent agreed that participation makes it hard to reach consensus. In contrast, 68 percent agreed that participation improves decision by bringing new ideas.

**Measuring other participation variables.** A variety of involvement mechanisms have been measured in the literature, and we assess the importance of six methods to the organization: town hall meetings, budget hearings, citizen/customer surveys, feedback via the Web, direct contact, and indirect contact through elected officials (Berman 1997; Wang 2001; Yang and Callahan 2005). Three items measuring competence ask whether citizens who participate have the people skills, the expertise or technical knowledge, or the civic knowledge, respectively, to make a value contribution (Creighton 2005). Representativeness is measured with two items: the extent to which participants accurately represent the concerns of the community as a whole, and the extent to which citizen attendance in participation programs is generally large enough to reflect community attitudes.

Among the control variables, jurisdictions' financial health was measured by total outstanding debt per capita from the 2004 U.S. Census Historical Database on Individual Local Government Finances. Organization size was measured by the number of employees (log transformed). Education level was measured by the percentage of population over age 25 with bachelor's degree or higher in 2000 U.S. Census.

### Analysis Procedure

Given that our responses came from seven functional areas, we reclassified them into three categories: (1) parks/recreation, planning, and community development; (2) finance/budgeting and public works; and (3) personnel/human resource and economic development. Parks/recreation and planning, according to Yang and Callahan (2005), are the two areas that have the highest levels of citizen involvement efforts (see also Kweit and Kweit 1981). Community development agencies are in the first category because they often are charged with citizen participation. In contrast, personnel and economic development are areas in which participation is less common and managers are less receptive to citizen participation (Wang 2001; Yang and Callahan 2005). Finance/budgeting and public works are in between—on average, they have moderate levels of involvement efforts (Wang 2001; Yang and Callahan 2005). We ran a one-way ANOVA with participation outcomes as the dependent variable, and the results supported the classification: better participation outcomes are more likely in the first category than in the third category, while the second category is in between. Thus, we included in the model one dummy variable—whether it is in the first category.

Hypotheses were tested with ordinary least squares regression. Because interaction terms were included, we used the mean centering method to avoid multicollinearity (Aiken and West 1991).<sup>5</sup> Three models are tested: model 1 includes only control variables, model 2 adds the independent variables, and model 3 adds the two interaction terms.

### Results

Table 2 provides the univariate statistics. On average, respondents reported positive participation outcomes in decision making, the existence of transformation leadership in their chief executive officials, elected official support, and the use of various participation mechanisms. However, they also reported the existence of red tape and concerns about the lack of participant competence and representativeness.

Table 3 summarizes bivariate correlations and index reliability. All multiple-item measures achieved an acceptable level of reliability (standardized alphas ranging from .70 to .92). The correlations suggest that the measures are largely distinct and yet related in expected ways. All correlation coefficients were below .45, except

**Table 1** Frequency Distribution of the Responses to the Questions about Participation Outcomes

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Participation reduces department influence	20%	33%	18%	14%	8%	5%	2%
Participation creates excessive delays	13%	26%	17%	18%	14%	9%	3%
Participation makes it hard to reach consensus	13%	24%	20%	17%	14%	10%	3%
Participation brings new ideas	3%	5%	7%	17%	26%	29%	12%

Note: Totals do not necessarily sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 2** Univariate Statistics

	Items in Scale	Potential Scale Range	Scale Midpoint	Mean	Standard Deviation
Participation outcome	4	4–28	16	19.45	4.78
Transformational leadership	5	5–25	15	19.69	4.68
Hierarchical authority structure	—	0–10	5	4.70	2.38
Red tape	—	0–10	5	5.31	2.18
Variety of involvement mechanisms	6	6–42	24	29.32	6.51
Participant competence	3	3–21	12	11.03	3.88
Participant representativeness	2	2–14	8	6.65	2.92
Political support	2	2–14	8	10.13	3.14
Budget flexibility	2	2–12	7	9.18	2.01
Population diversity	—	0–1	0.5	0.57	0.22
Form of government	—	—	—	0.72	0.45
Education level of the jurisdiction	—	—	—	0.27	0.13
Debt per capita of the jurisdiction	—	—	—	1992.26	2437.97
Organization size	—	—	—	1747.22	3201.34

for a moderate correlation between competence and representativeness (.64). Red tape and hierarchical authority are only moderately correlated ( $r = .44$ ), suggesting that they are distinct dimensions of bureaucratic structure. None of the community demographics, financial health, or form of government was correlated with the managerial variables, nor were they correlated with the dependent variable.

Regression results in table 4 show that all three models were significant at .0001 level ( $F = 8.85, 18.67, 17.43$ , respectively) with adjusted  $R^2$  at .05, .20, and .22, respectively. Consistent with the

correlation results, most control variables were not significant in the model. For the nine hypothesized relationships, eight were statistically significant at least at the .05 level and one was significant at the .10 level.<sup>6</sup> Based on the standardized coefficients (and Type II sums of squares, not reported here), participant competence is the most important variable in the model, followed by functional area and the interaction term between competence and representativeness. Budget flexibility is significant in model 1, but not in models 2 and 3, indicating that its effect may be mediated by some of the independent variables. Functional area, as expected, is statistically significant. All other control variables were not significant at the .05 level.

## Discussion

This article aims to develop and test a multivariate model that helps advance an organizational perspective of citizen participation impact and recognizes the complex relationships among the factors. Our results support this overall purpose.

## Environment

It is recognized that the local political environment affects departments' involvement efforts (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Kweit and Kweit 1981). For this article, we selected a particular dimension of the environment—elected official support. The results show that such support is positively associated with effective participation, extending previous studies that have shown that support is important for the adoption of involvement efforts (Yang and Callahan 2007). Although many public administration scholars conceptualize citizen involvement as occurring in the administrative process, it is crucial to note that any administrative decisions are political, and therefore so are any involvement efforts. Indeed, there is no pure administration–politics dichotomy in local governments, but more often a partnership between the two sides (Nalbandian 2005; Svava 2001). Building a trusting relationship between elected officials and public managers is important for making positive changes through citizen participation. Without trust and support from elected officials, decisions based on citizen input are likely to be delayed, and consensus and changes are less likely to occur.

**Table 3** Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Participation outcome	(.75)												
2 Transform. Leadership	.20***	(.92)											
3 Hierarchical authority	-.13***	-.15***	—										
4 Red tape	-.17***	-.19***	.44***	—									
5 Mechanisms	.26***	.23***	.01	-.00	(.75)								
6 Competence	.39***	.18***	-.05	-.12***	.38***	(.89)							
7 Representativeness	.32***	.21***	-.04	-.14***	.36***	.64***	(.82)						
8 Political support	.23***	.30***	-.17***	-.20***	.24***	.23***	.25***	(.94)					
9 Budget flexibility	.16***	.23***	-.21***	-.19***	.16***	.17***	.19***	.23***	(.70)				
10 Diversity	-.00	.06	.04	.00	.03	-.02	-.02	-.01	.00	—			
11 Form of government	.05	.10**	-.03	-.08*	.06	.04	-.01	.07*	.11***	.08*	—		
12 Education	-.01	.04	.02	-.00	-.05	.10**	.03	.04	-.01	-.22***	.05	—	
13 Debt per capita	.00	.02	.03	.03	.02	-.00	.04	-.02	.02	.12***	-.07*	-.00	—
14 Organization size	.02	.03	.07*	.09**	.02	.04	.05	-.05	-.04	.23***	-.18***	-.01	.25***

Note: Inside the parentheses are standardized Cronbach alpha values.



**Table 4** Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results Explaining Participation Outcomes

	Model 1 $\beta$	Model 2 $\beta$	Model 3 $\beta$
Perceived elected official support		0.08*	0.08*
Red tape		-0.07*	-0.06*
Hierarchical authority		-0.07*	-0.08*
Transformational leadership		0.05 <sup>†</sup>	0.05 <sup>†</sup>
Variety of involvement mechanisms		0.07*	0.07*
Participant competence		0.26***	0.26***
Participant representativeness		0.07*	0.08*
Leadership * variety of mechanisms			0.06*
Competence * representativeness			-0.10**
Budget flexibility	0.16***	0.03	0.02
Organizational size (log)	0.07	0.07	0.06
Form of government	0.05	0.05	0.05
Debt per capital of the jurisdiction	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00
Education level of the jurisdiction	-0.01	-0.04	-0.04
Population diversity of the jurisdiction	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
Function area	0.16***	0.11***	0.10***
N	1020	968	968
F-value	8.85***	18.67***	17.43***
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.05	.20	.21

Note: For two-tail tests: \*\*\* significant at .001; \*\* significant at .01; \* significant at .05; <sup>†</sup> significant at .10.

### Target Organization Characteristics

While the literature discusses the importance of target organization characteristics (Ebdon and Franklin 2006; Kweit and Kweit 1981), few scholars have tested the constructs developed in recent public management literature in explaining participation outcomes. Our results show that both red tape and hierarchical authority are negatively associated with good participation outcomes, confirming the argument that bureaucratic structures are a major hurdle for effective participation (e.g., King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Kweit and Kweit 1981). Note that red tape and hierarchical authority are significant when organization size is controlled, and organization size is not significant in the model, which suggests that even small organizations can face burdensome circumstances that are not conducive to citizen participation, and even large organizations can be flexible, “flat,” and ready for change resulting from citizen participation.

The results should not be used as a rationale for eliminating all red tape and hierarchical structure because bureaucratic organizations should be subject to statutes, mandates, and the chain of command from elected officials. The results do suggest, however, that public managers should remove administrative rules that no longer serve their purpose but rather prevent citizens from participating effectively, consider designing alternative rules or structures that help facilitate participation and its impact, or develop methods to offset the negative effects that might come from red tape and hierarchical authority. The literature has shown that even with high levels of red tape and hierarchical control, public administrators can mobilize informal networks and execute procedural entrepreneurship in order to serve the public interest (Brower and Abolafia 1996).

Our results and additional analysis (see note 6) suggest that transformational leadership of the chief executive official is positively associated with good participation outcomes, supporting the belief that the call for city managers to be more concerned with citizen participation is timely and appropriate (Nalbandian 1999, 2005). Chief executive officers play a key role in local government operations, and their leadership style affects how departments are run and how citizen participation is handled. Transformational leadership is likely to embrace new ideas and changes brought by citizen participation. The results do not directly confirm, but are consistent with, the idea that transformational leadership in government settings is necessarily associated with democratic norms and citizenship values (Denhardt and Campbell 2006). This connection warrants future inquiry.

### Involvement Mechanisms

The literature has long argued that no involvement mechanism is suitable for all situations and that its choice has to be contingency based: it should fit participation purposes, participant characteristics, issue characteristics, and organizational resources (Thomas 1990; Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller 2000). Our results show that using multiple mechanisms is more likely to lead to good participation outcomes, consistent with previous studies that have found that using multiple mechanisms enhances trust in government (Berman 1997) and public responsiveness (Wang 2002). This is in line with the contingency argument: for each individual situation, a particular type of mechanism may be chosen, so in the aggregate, a variety of mechanisms should be in place. In addition, a mechanism may not be used for all situations, but it can be built as part of the participation infrastructure and utilized when necessary. As Thomas comments, “[I]n most cases, managers must decide what combination of two or more approaches to use and at what stage to use each approach” (1995, 13).

The mechanisms are not standardized menus, but are practices enacted by managers. For example, public meetings are a common participation mechanism, but they can be designed rather differently and have dissimilar results (Adams 2004). In other words, mechanisms matter, but the people who design and use the mechanisms also matter. Our results support this observation, as the interactive term between transformational leadership and variety of mechanisms has a positive and significant coefficient. An alternative interpretation is that good participation tools enlarge the positive impact of transformational leaders. Regardless, there is a reinforcing relationship between mechanism variety and transformational leadership.

### Participant Characteristics

Some public administrators do not trust that citizens have the necessary competence to participate well, and it is probably true that citizens sometimes do not know enough about a particular government decision (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Thomas 1995; Yang 2005). Our results confirm that participant competence is positively associated with participation outcomes. In fact, it is the most important explanatory variable in the model, with the largest standardized coefficient, as well as Type I and II sums of squares. This finding does not mean that incompetent citizens should not be involved. For one thing, participation itself is a process through which competence can be improved, and this is why participation may be inherently

beneficial. Second, even though many citizens are not issue experts or do not have the same level of knowledge as public administrators, they still can use information shortcuts and make good decisions (Lupia 1994). After all, citizens have an equal right to express their preferences and opinions regardless of their competence level. Our results do support the importance of educating citizens: teaching citizens how to work with the system, strengthening civic education, building social capital, and holding participation workshops, among other things.

Our results also confirm the importance of another factor that is emphasized in the literature: participant representativeness. A big challenge for involvement efforts is that participation often is not representative (Ebdon and Franklin 2006; Verba and Nie 1972). The more nonrepresentative the participation is, the less likely change will occur in government decision making. The literature offers many strategies to increase participant representativeness, such as better participant selection method (Ebdon and Franklin 2006), assistance to citizens who cannot participate because of practical difficulties, or more flexible participation schedules (Creighton 2005; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998).

However, efforts to increase absolute representativeness may become costly, and there is tension between competence and representation. Our results show that the interaction term between competence and representativeness has a significant and negative coefficient, suggesting a potential trade-off between the two. In developing our hypothesis, we discussed three possible logics and our analysis supports the third one. The first logic assumes that great competence and representativeness are unlikely to come together, but the bivariate correlation between the two is positive (table 3,  $r = .64$ ). The second logic emphasizes the negative effects of competing interests in impeding administrative decisions, which indicate that the impact of competence can be negative, but this is not the case in our results.<sup>7</sup> The third logic, that many local involvement efforts are targeted at “relevant publics,” is consistent with the literature (Creighton 2005; Thomas 1995). This observation does not question the normative value of representation; rather, it means that in practice, situations often allow managers only to seek participation from a representative group of the relevant publics. As a result, a well-crafted stakeholder analysis would be very beneficial (Crosby and Bryson 2005).

### **Control Variables**

Not surprisingly, planning, community development, and parks/recreation are more “friendly” to or supportive of meaningful citizen participation than the other four areas (finance/budgeting, public works, personnel/human resources, and economic development). This is consistent with the literature (Kweit and Kweit 1981; Yang and Callahan 2005) and highlights the policy-contingent nature of citizen participation. In order to make better decisions about citizen participation, public managers need to think about the policy or functional area they are dealing with, and researchers should pay attention to how policy context constrains the validity of their results.

Most control variables are not significant at the .05 level, including budget flexibility, organization size, form of government, debt, population, and diversity. The nonsignificant results for budget flexibility and debt per capital suggest that resources are not a determinant of

participation outcomes. This finding is consistent with Yang and Callahan’s (2007) observation that although a lack of resources may force governments to open up, it is not associated with the use of citizen input in strategic decisions. Still, this finding is intriguing given that resources often are needed for effective participation. As mentioned in the results section, the impact of budget flexibility may drop off in the final model because it is mediated by some independent variables. Future studies may further address this issue.

The nonsignificance result for population diversity is consistent with previous studies, which find that more diverse communities may, on the one hand, have more needs to adopt participation mechanisms but, on the other hand, face more contested issues and tensions in making strategic decisions (Oliver 2000). The role of form of government is ambiguous in the empirical participation literature (Yang and Callahan 2007), and it does not achieve significance at the .05 level in our results. Education often is identified as the most powerful predictor of citizen willingness to participate, and Yang and Callahan (2007) find that education is positively associated with governments’ use of involvement mechanisms and use of citizen input for strategic decisions, but it is not significant in this study. More studies should be designed in the future to specifically address the impact of these variables.

### **Limitations and Future Questions**

This study has limitations that point to future research questions. Our focus was on applying organizational theory constructs, so some explanatory variables are not included. One such omitted factor is public managers’ values and attitudes about citizen participation, which has been found to be key to explaining involvement efforts (Yang and Callahan 2007). Other such factors may include social capital, political culture, a direct measure of the match between mechanisms and purposes, and decision type. To the extent that one wants to fully explain participation outcomes, future inquires need to include those omitted variables.

Another issue that deserves future attention is the potential of complex mediating relationships among the variables. As mentioned, the impact of transformational leadership is partially mediated by red tape and elected official support (see note 6). Budget flexibility also may have indirect effects. Given the space, this study primarily focuses on the direct and interactive effects without showing or testing all mediation effects. There are other potential mediating effects. For example, perceived elected official support is likely to affect the level of bureaucratic structures such as red tape and hierarchical authority (Yang and Pandey 2009). To fully address potential mediating effects, one needs to develop strong theories and use structural equation modeling for testing.

This study has the typical limitation associated with cross-sectional designs—the causality cannot be guaranteed. For example, good participation outcomes may lead to more elected official support, less red tape, and less hierarchical authority. We acknowledge this limitation and note that our results should be interpreted in conjunction with findings from other normative, qualitative, and quantitative research. Viewed this way, our findings have strong theoretical support and are consistent with other studies, but they require further validation using different methods such as case studies, interviews, and time series designs. In particular, while

functional areas are significant in the model, this article focuses on finding a general pattern across areas. Future studies may use more context-specific designs to enrich the discussion.

Finally, we relied on managers' perceptions to measure participation outcomes, but managers' judgments may be different from those of citizens. Managers know better the issue at hand, the participation process, and the bureaucratic decision process, so they are in a good position to judge the participation impact from a managerial perspective. Their judgment affects whether they will decide to involve citizens in the future (Yang 2005). But citizens know best what they want and what they feel about participation. In order to draw a full picture of citizen participation, we need to examine the outcomes from different stakeholders' perspectives.

## Conclusion

Effective citizen participation, in which government decisions and government–citizen relationships can be substantively improved, is important to democratic governance. Despite its importance and many prescriptive models proposed in the literature, it is unfortunate that many administrators and citizens are often frustrated about citizen involvement, with the road to effective participation remaining a black box. This article contributes to further dissecting the black box by integrating public organizational theories with the citizen participation literature, testing a multivariate model, and starting to address the complex relationships among some typical success factors.

The first conclusion we make is that public management matters in citizen participation. When it comes to explaining participation outcomes, community characteristics (racial diversity, education, financial health) and forms of government are not significant, although the literature often links them with government willingness to involve citizens or citizen willingness to participate. Instead, four important public management variables—elected official support, red tape, hierarchical authority, and transformational leadership—are found to be significant. These variables are important even when participant competence, representativeness, and involvement mechanisms are controlled for. The existing participation literature certainly has studied the importance of red tape and hierarchical authority, but it rarely assesses the role of elected official support and transformational leadership. Moreover, applying public organizational theories provides more updated and sophisticated description and explanation of the relationships. Bridging the citizen participation literature and the recent public management literature would offer great opportunities to advance theory development in both research domains.

Second, it is important to recognize the complex relationships among the typical success factors for improving participation outcomes. They may be not equally important, they may affect one other, and they may not affect outcomes in a straightforward way. This type of knowledge is relevant because public managers face many constraints and often have to make priority of things. Our results suggest that there is a trade-off between participant competence and representativeness in the short term, as well as a reinforcing relationship between involvement mechanisms and transformational leadership, relationships that have rarely been studied in the past.

Third, future citizen participation research will benefit from integrating normative, qualitative, and quantitative inquiries. Testing a multivariate model helps reveal the complex relationships among

---

When it comes to explaining participation outcomes, community characteristics (racial diversity, education, financial health) and forms of government are not significant, although the literature often links them with government willingness to involve citizens or citizen willingness to participate. Instead, four important public management variables—elected official support, red tape, hierarchical authority, and transformational leadership—are found to be significant.

---

Few tractable models currently exist in the field of citizen participation research. This article offers scholars and practitioners one such model that may contribute to the broader research agenda—mapping the terrain for a family of models on citizen participation.

---

the variables, despite the fact that quantitative designs, particularly survey research with cross-sectional data, have limitations. With such testing, it is straightforward to demonstrate the relative importance of the explanatory variables and the potential interactive effects. This is not to downplay the importance of normative inquiry or qualitative design. Indeed, the theory and hypothesis development of this article is grounded in the normative and qualitative literature, our results are largely consistent with the literature, and some of our intriguing findings may need qualitative inquiries for validation in future. We argue that combining normative, qualitative, and quantitative inquiries will greatly advance our understanding. Current citizen involvement studies, unlike the political science literature on electoral participation, have not fully taken advantage of quantitative designs.

This article is meant to be one contribution to an ongoing debate about the impact of citizen participation. Ostrom once stated that “if the social sciences are to be relevant for analyses of policy problems, the challenge will be to integrate efforts to map the broad terrain of human organizing and efforts to develop tractable models for particular niches in the terrain” (1990, 214–15). Few tractable models currently exist in the field of citizen participation research. This article offers scholars and practitioners one such model that may contribute to the broader research agenda—mapping the terrain for a family of models on citizen participation.

## Appendix: Study Measures

### *Transformational Leadership*

(Five-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree; adapted from House 1998)

The Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager clearly articulates his or her vision of the future.

The Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager leads by setting a good example.  
 The Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager challenges me to think about old problems in new ways.  
 The Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager says things that make employees proud to be part of the organization.  
 The Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager has a clear sense of where our organization should be in five years.

### **Hierarchical Authority Structure**

(Bozeman 2000)

Please assess the extent of hierarchical authority in your organization: (Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying few layers of authority and 10 signifying many layers of authority).

### **Red Tape**

(Bozeman 2000; Pandey and Scott 2002)

If red tape is defined as burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's performance, please assess the level of red tape in your organization: (Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying no red tape and 10 signifying the highest level of red tape).

### **Participation Outcome**

(Seven-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree)

Citizen participation in the decision process reduces our department's influence. (R)

Citizen participation slows the decision process by creating excessive delays. (R)

Citizen participation makes it hard to reach consensus and closure in decision process. (R)

Citizen participation improves the decision process by bringing new ideas on delivering city services.

### **Variety of Involvement Mechanisms**

(Seven-point scale, where 1 = not important at all and 7 = very important; Wang 2001; Yang and Callahan 2005)

How important are the following methods of gaining citizen feedback for your department?

Town hall meetings

Budget hearings

Citizen/customer surveys

Citizen feedback via the web

Direct contact via phone, mail, e-mail, office visit

Indirect contact via elected officials

### **Participant Competence**

(Seven-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree)

Most citizens who participate have the people skills needed to make a valuable contribution.

Most citizens who participate have the expertise or technical knowledge needed to make a valuable contribution.

Most citizens who participate have the civic knowledge (how government works) needed to make a valuable contribution.

### **Participant Representativeness**

(Seven-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree)

When considered as a group, the citizens who participate accurately represent the concerns of the community as a whole.

Citizen attendance in our citizen participation programs is generally large enough to legitimately reflect community attitudes.

### **Perceived Elected Official Support (Political Support)**

(Seven-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree; Gianakis and Wang 2000)

Most elected officials trust the organization.

Most elected officials believe that the organization is effective.

Budget Flexibility

(Six-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree)

My department is able to shift financial resources within its budget to accomplish its mission.

My department is able to shift nonfinancial resources within its budget to accomplish its mission.

### **Population Diversity**

(Logic of the Hirschman Index; see Marlowe and Portillo 2006)

$\{1 - [(white\ population\ percentage)^2 + (black\ population\ percentage)^2 + (other\ population\ percentage)^2]\} * 1.5$

### **Form of Government**

1 is coded as council-manager forms of government, and 0 represents other forms.

### **Notes**

1. The questions are as follows: Are there quality requirements? Does the manager have sufficient information? Is the problem structured? Is public acceptance critical to implementation? Is acceptance reasonably certain if the manager decides alone? Does the public share agency goals? And is conflict within the public likely?
2. Many quantitative studies include variables discussed in this article to examine political participation (e.g., Oliver 2000; Verba et al. 1993) or citizen involvement (e.g., Yang and Callahan 2007), but these studies aim to explain the adoption of involvement by governments or the decision to participate by citizens, not the impact of such involvement efforts.
3. In the public administration literature, Yang and Pandey (2007) borrow this line of thinking in examining public responsiveness of government organizations.
4. It is beyond the scope of this study to develop theories that address the debate regarding the impact of all control variables. For example, while many believe that council-manager governments are more likely to experience long-term participation effects (Ebdon and Franklin 2006), Kweit and Kweit (1981) suspect that they may have less citizen participation, but they are more likely to see better outcomes when citizen participation does occur. Yang and Callahan (2007) conclude otherwise, and empirical evidence is generally mixed. This issue is further complicated by the emergence of the "adapted city," in which council-manager and mayor-council forms of governments are beginning to adapt and adopt features of the other form of government.
5. We had many cases in which one jurisdiction had only one respondent, but we also had cases in which one jurisdiction had multiple respondents representing different departments. For the latter situation, the departments were nested in the jurisdictions. We used the SAS Proc Mixed procedure and tried several hierarchical models, but the null model likelihood ratio test suggested that it was not necessary to model the covariance structure of the data. The Proc Mixed results are similar to the ordinary least squares results.
6. We marked transformational leadership as significant at the .10 level because that means it is significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. This is reasonable given that we developed a directional hypothesis with strong theoretical support.

For similar treatment, see, for example, Moynihan and Pandey (2007). Even without considering this direct effect, transformational leadership plays a positive role in citizen participation because the interaction term between transformational leadership and variety of mechanisms is significant at the .05 level. The significance of the direct effect may be downplayed by the fact that transformational leadership is correlated with other managerial variables. For example, the correlation matrix in Table 3 shows that transformational leadership is negatively associated with red tape and positively associated with political support. Facing similar environment and pressures, transformational leaders are more likely to reduce red tape, create public value, and win political support (Moore 1995), which, in turn, facilitates good participation outcomes. Thus, we tested a model that excluded red tape and political support, and found that transformational leadership became significant at the .01 level. We also tried to regress red tape and political support on transformational leadership and found a significant relationship. In other words, transformational leadership's impact on participation outcome may be partially mediated by red tape and political support.

7. The relationship between the two variables (competence and representativeness) and participation outcomes (with their scores mean centered) can be expressed roughly as  $Y = (.26 * \text{competence}) + (.08 * \text{representativeness}) - (.10 * \text{competence} * \text{representativeness}) + C$ . The impact of competence cannot turn negative given the scale range of the measurement.

## References

- Adams, Brian. 2004. Public Meetings and the Democratic Process. *Public Administration Review* 64(1): 43–54.
- Aiken, Leona S., and Stephen G. West. 1991. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216–24.
- Arrow, Kenneth J. 1974. *The Limits of Organization*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Baker, William, Lon Addams, and Brian Davis. 2005. Critical Factors for Enhancing Municipal Public Hearings. *Public Administration Review* 65(4): 490–99.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bass, Bernard M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Berman, Evan M. 1997. Dealing with Cynical Citizens. *Public Administration Review* 57(2): 105–12.
- Bok, Derek. 2001. *The Trouble with Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bozeman, Barry. 2000. *Bureaucracy and Red Tape*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bozeman, Barry, and Gordon Kingsley. 1998. Risk Culture in Public and Private Organizations. *Public Administration Review* 58(2): 109–18.
- Brower, Ralph S., and Mitchel Y. Abolafia. 1996. Procedural Entrepreneurship: Enacting Alternative Channels to Administrative Effectiveness. *American Review of Public Administration* 26(3): 287–308.
- Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Checkoway, Barry, and Jon Van Til. 1978. What Do We Know about Citizen Participation? A Selective Review of Research. In *Citizen Participation in America*, edited by Stuart Langron, 25–42. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Cooper, Terry L., Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W. Meek. 2006. Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management. Special issue, *Public Administration Review* 66: 76–88.
- Creighton, James. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions through Citizen Involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crosby, Barbara C., and John M. Bryson. 2005. *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Denhardt, Janet V., and Kelly B. Campbell. 2006. The Role of Democratic Values in Transformational Leadership. *Administration & Society* 38(5): 556–72.
- DeSantis, Victor, James Glass, and Chardean Newell. 1992. City Managers, Job Satisfaction, and Community Problem Perceptions. *Public Administration Review* 52(5): 447–53.
- Dumdum, Uldarico R., Kevin B. Lowe, and Bruce J. Avolio. 2002. Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension. In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead*, edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 35–65. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Ebdon, Carol, and Aimee L. Franklin. 2006. Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory. *Public Administration Review* 66(3): 437–47.
- Gianakis, Gerasimos, and XiaoHu Wang. 2000. Decentralization of the Purchasing Function in Municipal Government: A National Study. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting, and Financial Management*. 12(3): 421–40.
- Greenstone, David, and Paul E. Peterson. 1973. *Race and Authority in Urban Politics: Community Participation and the War on Poverty*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hellriegel, Don, and John Slocum. 2004. *Organizational Behavior*. 10th ed. Mason, OH: South-Western.
- House, Robert. 1998. Appendix: Measures and Assessments for the Charismatic Leadership Approach: Scales, Latent Constructs, Loadings, Cronbach Alphas, Interclass Correlations. In *Leadership: The Multiple Level Approach—Contemporary and Alternative*, edited by Fred Dansereau and Francis J. Yammarino, 23–30. London: JAI Press.
- Irvin, Renée A., and John Stansbury. 2004. Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review* 64(1): 55–65.
- Jaworski, Bernard J., and Ajay K. Kohli. 1993. Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Marketing* 57(3): 53–70.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, Kathryn M. Feltey, and Bridget O'Neill Susel. 1998. The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 58(4): 317–26.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, and Camilla Strivers. 1998. *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kirca, Ahmer H., Satish Jayachandran, and William O. Bearden. 2005. Market Orientation: A Meta-Analytic Review and Assessment of Its Antecedents and Impact on Performance. *Journal of Marketing* 69(2): 24–41.
- Kweit, Mary Grisez, and Robert W. Kweit. 1981. *Implementing Citizen Participation in a Bureaucratic Society: A Contingency Approach*. New York: Praeger.
- . 2004. Citizen Participation and Citizen Evaluation in Disaster Recovery. *American Review of Public Administration* 34(4): 354–73.
- Kweit, Robert W., and Mary Grisez Kweit. 1980. Bureaucratic Decision-Making: Impediments to Citizen Participation. *Polity* 12(4): 647–66.
- Langron, Stuart. 1978. What Is Citizen Participation? In *Citizen Participation in America*, edited by Stuart Langron, 13–24. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Lupia, Arthur. 1994. Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections. *American Political Science Review* 88(1): 63–76.
- Marlowe, Justin, and Shanon Portillo. 2006. Citizen Engagement in Local Budgeting: Does Diversity Pay Dividends? *Public Performance and Management Review* 30(2): 179–202.
- Moe, Terry M. 1991. Politics and the Theory of Organization. Special issue, *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 7: 106–29.
- Moore, Mark. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moynihan, Donald P. 2003. Normative and Instrumental Perspectives on Public Participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 33(2): 164–88.
- Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2005. Testing How Management Matters in an Era of Government by Performance Management. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(3): 421–39.

- Nalbandian, John. 1999. Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers. *Public Administration Review* 59(3): 187–97.
- . 2005. Professionals and the Conflicting Forces of Administrative Modernization and Civic Engagement. *American Review of Public Administration* 35(4): 311–26.
- Oliver, Eric. 2000. City Size and Civic Involvement in Metropolitan America. *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 361–73.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pandey, Sanjay K., and Patrick G. Scott. 2002. Red Tape: A Review and Assessment of Concepts and Measures. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(4): 553–80.
- Pandey, Sanjay K., and Bradley E. Wright. 2006. Connecting the Dots in Public Management: Political Environment, Organizational Goal Ambiguity and the Public Manager's Role Ambiguity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(4): 511–32.
- Perlman, Janice. 1978. Grassroots Participation from Neighborhood to Nation. In *Citizen Participation in America*, edited by Stuart Langton, 65–80. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Rainey, Hal G. 2003. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosener, Judy. 1978a. Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness? *Public Administration Review* 38(5): 457–63.
- . 1978b. Matching Method to Purpose: The Challenges of Planning Citizen-Participation Activities. In *Citizen Participation in America*, edited by Stuart Langton, 109–21. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Selden, Sally Coleman, Gene A. Brewer, and Jeffrey L. Brudney. 1999. The Role of City Managers: Are They Principals, Agents, or Both? *American Review of Public Administration* 29(2): 124–48.
- Slater, Stanley F., and John C. Narver. 1995. Market Orientation and the Learning Organization. *Journal of Marketing* 59(3): 63–74.
- Steward, Kennedy. 2007. Write the Rules and Win: Understanding Citizen Participation Game Dynamics. *Public Administration Review* 67(6): 1067–76.
- Svara, James H. 2001. The Myth of the Dichotomy: Complementarity of Politics and Administration in the Past and Future of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 61(2): 164–71.
- Thomas, John Clayton. 1990. Public Involvement in Public Management: Adapting and Testing a Borrowed Theory. *Public Administration Review* 50(4): 435–45.
- . 1995. *Public Participation in Public Decisions: New Skills and Strategies for Public Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry Brady, and Norman H. Nie. 1993. Citizen Activity: Who Participate? What Do They Say? *American Political Science Review* 87(2): 303–18.
- Walters, Lawrence C., James Aydelotte, and Jessica Miller. 2000. Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review* 60(4): 349–59.
- Wang, XiaoHu. 2001. Assessing Public Participation in U.S. Cities. *Public Performance and Management Review* 24(4): 322–36.
- . 2002. Assessing Administrative Accountability. *American Review of Public Administration* 32(3): 350–70.
- Wang, XiaoHu, and Montgomery Van Wart. 2007. When Public Participation in Administration Leads to Trust: An Empirical Assessment of Managers' Perceptions. *Public Administration Review* 67(2): 265–78.
- Yang, Kaifeng. 2005. Public Administrators' Trust in Citizen: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review* 65(3): 273–85.
- Yang, Kaifeng, and Kathie Callahan. 2005. Assessing Citizen Involvement Efforts by Local Government. *Public Performance and Management Review* 29(2): 191–216.
- . 2007. Citizen Involvement Efforts and Bureaucratic Responsiveness. *Public Administration Review* 67(2): 249–64.
- Yang, Kaifeng, and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007. Public Responsiveness of Government Organizations: Testing a Preliminary Model. *Public Performance and Management Review* 31(2): 215–40.
- . 2009. How Do Perceived Political Environment and Administrative Reform Affect Employee Commitment? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(2): 335–60.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.



SCHOOL of PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY ★ WASHINGTON, D.C.

American University's School of Public Affairs  
is proud to co-sponsor this special issue.

[american.edu/spa](http://american.edu/spa)