RESEARCH IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION/PUBLIC AFFAIRS: AN ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL REPORTS AT THE LBJ SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS 1988-1990

BY

Carl Than Nall, Jr.

AN APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT (POLITICAL SCIENCE 5397) SUBMITTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

(Spring 1994)

FACULTY APPROVAL:

Pat Shields

Charles Garofalo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF CHARTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Chapter Purpose.

This chapter outlines the purpose and scope of this applied research project. It provides a brief review of the context of the research, the basis for the conceptual framework, the organization of the report and a listing of the research questions.

Research Purpose.

Public administration research is under fire. The research issue remains an unresolved question, relating directly to what persists as one of the major themes in public administration, the separation of theory and practice. Both scholars and practitioners question whether public administration research findings can be made available in an appropriate form to practitioners and whether the structure of knowledge acquisition affects the congruence of theory and practice (Denhardt, 1989:117).

Current meta-level research in public administration cites a lack of theory building and a paucity of research which adds to the core knowledge of the field.[1] From another perspective, critics claim that the field is dominated by mainstream social science and positivism which devalues critical and interpretive studies and fails to add

---

1 See for example McCurdy and Cleary, 1984; Perry and Kraemer, 1986; Houston and Delevan, 1990.

meaningful findings for the practitioner.[2] Challenges to public administration also include the growth of public affairs/policy schools with their emphasis on policy science and quantitative analysis.

The objective of this research was a content analysis of the research reports from one such policy-oriented master's program, i.e., a description of the professional reports at the LBJ School of Public Affairs during the period 1988-1990. This period was chosen because the reports were relatively recently completed and they were fully cataloqued, allowing for a complete sampling frame that was readily available on the shelf. The research entailed an examination of public administration literature to identify conceptual categories and criteria that could be employed in a systematic content analysis. A representative sample of the research reports was coded with respect to the criteria developed and the results were compiled and reported in narrative and tabular form. The resulting description and assessment of LBJ School professional reports provides a basis for comparison with similar studies that address the nature and quality of research in the field.

Conceptual Framework.

A review of important writings on the research question, viewed through the theory-practice dichotomy, reveals a

2 See for example Catron and Harmon, 1981; Hummel, 1991; Denhardt, 1989; and White, 1986.

conceptual basis for understanding both the positivist and the alternative perspectives. In addition to a general overview of the research issue, a goal of this study was to develop a theoretical framework informed by concepts drawn from the current meta-level research in the field. The analysis uses three broad categories to describe the professional reports: 1) general characteristics and information; 2) research methods and techniques; and 3) research quality. Under these categories, the literature provides models which describe policy areas and topics, research focus, research relevance to theory and practice, research design, and research purpose and statistical techniques. Variables based on these criteria were operationalized and the resulting codebook was employed in an analysis of a representative sample of the reports.

Research Questions.

Major research questions include the following:

1) To what extent do LBJ School professional reports (PRs) focus on theoretical, practical, or other issues?

2) Do LBJ PRs reflect research designs and statistical techniques of mainstream social science?

3) To what extent do LBJ PRs utilize alternative research methodologies?

4) Are research findings relevant to public administration theory and practice?

Report Structure.

Chapter 2 of this report reviews some of the pertinent literature relating to the research issue and introduces the components of the conceptual framework; Chapter 3 is a discussion of the research setting; Chapter 4 is a discussion of the research methodology employed; Chapter 5 is an analysis of the research results; and Chapter 6 summarizes the findings and discusses conclusions.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Purpose

The literature reveals a persistent debate over the nature of research in public administration. When viewed in terms of the distinction between theory and practice, the research issue influences assessments of the status of public administration as an academic discipline and as a profession. This chapter highlights some early and contemporary scholarship on the issue with the goal of providing a general overview. It also reviews a recent series of meta-analyses that are used to construct the conceptual framework used in this study.

OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH ISSUE

Classical Science of Administration.

Early attempts by scholars and practitioners of American public administration to separate public administration from politics were intended to retain democratic representation while gaining organizational efficiency (Wilson, 1887). The issue of the relationship between politics and administration was, and remains, a central theme underlying the theory of public administration, one of the problems that has generated sometimes contradictory generalizations. Wilson's call for efficiency over 100 years ago marked the beginning of the separate study of administration, leading to the development of a scientific approach to public administration. The aim was to develop "principles on which to base a science of administration for America" (Wilson, 1887:220). Thus, the implications of the politics-administration issue are critical to public administration theory and practice. The separation was thought a necessary condition of accomplishing the scientific aspirations of the field (Wilson, 1887:210). However, current studies demonstrate that questions persist concerning the possibility and appropriateness of a science of public administration, as do questions about the impact of theory on public administration practice.

Early writers in the field often moved back and forth between administrative posts in government and research positions in universities (Denhardt, 1989:117). This active involvement by practitioners, in translating and implementing theories in applied settings, limited the negative effects of a disjuncture between theory and practice. Most of the differences between practitioners and theoreticians were over normative issues rather than questions of relevance of theory for practice (Denhardt, 1989:118). It was only with the development of a "scientific" approach to public administration that the theory-practice issue arose. Early writers sought a more scientific basis for their efforts. Frederick Taylor is associated with the scientific management school and Willoughby (1927) and White (1936) argued for an administrative science that provided guides to actions and increased efficiency of public organizations. The task was to "discover the principles and laws which govern men through the same techniques that we have used to discover the laws which govern atoms" (Gulick, 1928:102). These principles were defined as immutable laws which are to be extracted from experience and distilled into a simple form for practical application (Fry, 1989:1047).

Prominent critics of this "classical science" of public administration include Dwight Waldo and Robert Dahl. Waldo (1949) and Dahl (1966) decried the lack of theoretical guidance and viewed classical science as an inappropriate application of a mechanistic and deterministic model to human beings. They also believed this model failed to deal adequately with values. Robert Dahl essentially viewed the difficulties involved in creating a science of public administration as insuperable (Dahl, 1947:281).

The work of Herbert Simon in the late 1940's was the most significant move in the direction of developing a science of public administration (Denhardt, 1989:118). Simon rejected the "principles" or "proverbs" of classical science as naive and contradictory and sought to lay the groundwork for a truly scientific study of administrative behavior (Simon, 1957). His approach was that of logical-positivism, which argued that facts and values could be separated and that science is properly concerned only with facts, not values (Simon, 1957).

Again, the question of efficiency was central. Simon espoused the scientific study of organizations to increase the efficient accomplishment of its work (Simon, 1957:38). He actually called for the development of two sciences. A pure science would focus on observable behavior and test empirical theory and propositions about human behavior in organizations. The practical science would focus on improving efficient performance in the organization, public or private (Simon, 1957:248-253).

The Fact-Value Dichotomy.

Waldo's criticism of Simon's behavioralism centers around the fact-value dichotomy. The fact-value dichotomy and the distinction between pure and applied science are, according to Waldo, assertions of the doctrine that public administration can be reduced to an instrumental role in governmental affairs. Waldo claims that while the classical approach disguised its values under the mantle of scientific analysis, logical-positivism, as the foundation of behavioralism, simply ignores values. Even though values inevitably enter research in the selection of research topics, positivism would reduce the field of study to empirically verifiable human experience and exclude all questions of values. Waldo maintained that theory should embrace ethical theory, and that values should be studied consciously and carefully (Waldo, 1954:86).

New Public Administration.

The criticism of Simon's approach affords a transition into what has been variously characterized as the "new public administration" or the "post-behavioral" period of public administration. A broader conceptualization of the scientific approach was envisioned, to include qualitative aspects and methods more dependent on observation and experience than strict analyses of cause and effect. This approach attempts to incorporate values as an important part of the research.

Two prominent examples of this new approach to social science are Denhardt's "critical theory" and Catron and Harmon's "action theory." Denhardt (1989) claims that the empirical-analytic approaches concentrate on discovering the most efficient means of accomplishing ends, particularly the prediction and control of social phenomena. The approach is more concerned with means than the ends themselves. His critical theory would go beyond simply understanding existing patterns of meaning to suggest modes of reflection and critique aimed specifically toward social action.

Action theory seeks to strip away presuppositions that might bias observation of behavior "from the outside" and focus on the world as it is experienced "from the inside." It is through actions and intentions that we give meaning to the world. Thus the distinction between behavior and intended action allows the theorist to assist in clarifying the meanings and intentions of various actors, presumably resulting in consensual decision making (Catron and Harmon, 1981).

Action theory and critical theory envision a much closer relationship between theory and practice than mainstream social science. The action theorist seeks an understanding of the subjective world of the practitioner to "increase the interpretive ability of practitioners by clarifying tacit assumptions, cause-effect beliefs, and values that enable, constrain or deter administrative action or decision" (Catron and Harmon, 1981:537). Critical theory, on the other hand, should lead to an examination of the technical basis of bureaucratic domination and the ideological justifications for that domination. Also, it should lead to an understanding of the limitations placed on individual action by administrative procedures in order to develop a new administrative "praxis" less oppressive in nature (Fry, 1989:1051).

Challenges to Public Administration.

The question of whether public administration is a science remains a focus of debate to this day. Some scholars have suggested it is more an art or craft than a science, and scholars and practitioners are again searching for a new synthesis--an agreed-upon intellectual foundation for the field. One challenge that public administration faces is from schools of public policy that claim that the academic field of public administration (and the programs where it is taught) is obsolete. Their solution is to create a "new" field, grounded in economics, taking the perspective of the public manager as actor in the political environment and attempting to equip the manager with analytical tools to deal with contemporary governmental problems (Burke, 1989:47).

Waldo's famous presentation in 1967 proposed a professional emphasis as a way of countering public administration's "crisis of identity":

> What I propose is that we try to act as a profession without actually being one, and perhaps even without the hope or intention of becoming one... My favorite analogy is to medicine. By common consent, this is a profession; but it is also a congeries of professions, subprofessions, and occupational specializations... It is science, art, theory and practice, study and application (Waldo, 1968:10).

Apparently the call for "professionalism" was heard, at least in some quarters, because new practices and techniques were brought to the fore in the 1960s (Gargan, 1989:996). New modes of policy analysis and new means of imparting rationality to the public sector were seen. But the conceptual and analytical bases of the practices and techniques were more economics than public administration (Gargan, 1989:996). Professional knowledge and technical skills in quantitative analysis, operations research, and cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness calculations were highly rewarded and received much attention from the public administration community (Gargan, 1989:997).

But the problem with the policy analysis or policy science approach was its limited application to traditional public administration:

> ...many of the traditional concerns of public administration are thrown out the window. The policy analysis school had little to say about personnel administration, nonpolicy-related (internal) management, and normative issues of public administration (Bozeman, 1979:46).

<u>Summary of the Research Issue.</u>

We have seen that the debate over proper research and theory development in public administration has been carried on from the earliest times by writers in the field. Beyond the classical science period, the field has been influenced by the development of a positivist based behavioralism as well as alternative perspectives such as post-empiricist phenomenology. Along with such important philosophical issues, factors such as the growth of government have spurred new academic and policy approaches, as evidenced by the increasing popularity of alternative public affairs/policy programs such as the LBJ School.

Implicit in the debate over the nature of research in public administration is the controversy centering around the positivist versus alternative views of appropriate research methodologies. The positivist orientation toward social science created a distance between the researcher and the practitioner. The emphasis of this approach on the observation of behavior "from the outside" conflicted with the administrator's view of organizational life "from the inside" (Denhardt, 1989:119). Also, the role of researcher as simply that of a theory builder left all the details of application, and the responsibility for using research results, to the practitioner (Denhardt, 1989:119).

This tension between practitioner and theoretician has produced searches for new approaches and critical analyses of current research. The next section reports on attempts to bridge the theory-practice gap and to develop new paradigms. An overview is provided of current meta-analyses from the literature.

CURRENT STATE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH

Usefulness of Theory for Practice.

Because of the orientation of public administration toward applications, attempts to base administration on research findings have been met with distrust from practitioners. Often, research results are viewed as overly complex and lacking in practical relevance (Denhardt, 1989:118). However, contemporary positivist researchers continue to argue that research problems should not be determined by the experience of practice and the "content" of specific events but rather the analytic "form" of knowing. The methods of research rather than the techniques of management provide the analytic skills necessary for theoretically significant inquiry (Stallings, 1986:235). Stallings fears that some findings based on alternative research are so individualistic that they fail to meet minimal criteria of replicability and falsifiability, implying that they will never contribute to the accumulation of knowledge of the public sector. Firsthand experience alone cannot be the primary method of knowing (Stallings, 1986:237). What is called for is a "three way relationship between practice, theory, and method where method refers to techniques of theory elaboration and clarification rather than the techniques of everyday management" (Stallings, 1986:239). However, other critics of contemporary research have called for a combination of the quantitative data of the positivist tradition with the qualitative data of the phenomenological tradition to bridge the gap between theory and practice (Denhardt, 1989). Dick Olufs (1982:163) states:

> The urge to resolve the theory-practice dichotomy is a well founded and widely heralded theme of contemporary public administration. The discipline has failed thus far to provide a practical link between knowledge and action.

Gregory A. Daneke (1990:389) longs for an Agathon Agenda, which, after Plato's "praxis," strives toward a reintegration of the realms of theory and practice by means of a re-invigorated systems theory paradigm. Robert Denhardt wonders how research findings can be transmitted and how receptivity to theory might be increased:

> Practitioners must recognize that whether they consciously construct theories of public administration or not, such theories implicitly guide their every action. To the extent that such theories can be articulated, discussed and clarified, they will provide a sounder basis for effective and responsible human action--theory and practice are tied together through a process of learning (Denhardt, 1989:119).

Hummel (1991) agrees with Denhardt that scientific research is too narrow; that we need multiple sources: technical, scientific, rationalist, interpersonal, psychological, political, ideological, cultural, etc. He maintains that the test of the value of theory should be its help in both understanding and shaping real world action. He believes the first hand experience of the manager is the basis of administrative action and the proper sphere of research in the field.

Most critics of the positivist or mainstream social science research model have sought to study ways of knowing used by applied disciplines in which a strong theory-practice link is essential and a variety of methodologies are accepted as valid ways of perceiving reality (Box, 1992:64). But the extent of the divide is illustrated by some researchers of the positivist vein that call for more complex statistical techniques and state that the theory-practice gap may be explained by the dearth of empirical research. (Houston and Delevan, 1990:678).

Search for New Paradigms.

The gap between theory and practice, academic and practitioner is clear. Also, writers decry the lack of a long term research agenda, the lack of interdisciplinary cooperation, the lack of cross-cultural and international research, and believe that we are not any closer to the resolution of Waldo's "identity crisis" in the field (Brown, 1989:215).

The identity crisis has generated a search for new paradigms, an attempt to unify the fragmented field of public administration. Shields (1993), recommends pragmatism as a paradigm for unification of theory and practice:

> The theory-practice debate can be examined using James' hotel corridor metaphor. Unity is achieved because the pragmatic administrator owns the corridor. She walks from room to room using the theories that address on-going problems. Ownership of the corridor joins theory and practice...in this context, the pragmatic administrator appreciates logical positivist theories for their usefulness (truth).

Also, as a complete philosophy, pragmatism embraces all the branches of philosophy: metaphysics, epistemology, logic, ethics and aesthetics. Therefore, pragmatism is better equipped to deal with action, change and ethics than the reductionistic and unidimensional positivist paradigm (Shields, 1993).

Another approach attempts to revive the general systems theory paradigm. Driven by the frustrations with the prevailing positivism of applied research, Daneke (1990), labels his prospective paradigm *Advanced Systems Theory*. This approach proposes a revised systems theory and would utilize its alternative view of the scientific enterprise, its ability to embrace emerging conceptual advances from other domains (such as chaos theory and applied quantum logic), and its usefulness as a basis for purposeful action (Daneke, 1990:383).

Meta-research in Public Administration.

The current period has produced several examples of meta-analysis examining the state of public administration research. Studies have examined the state of research at the doctoral and masters level and have analyzed research published in public administration related journals. Much of this research shares an explicit or implicit criticism of research in the field, concluding that public administration research is largely atheoretical, applied, and that it adds little to the knowledge base of the field. The next section reports the findings of this research.

Contemporary Analyses of Dissertation Research.

Several articles in the *Public Administration Review* have taken up the debate over the state of public administration research, concentrating on content analyses of doctoral dissertations in the field. These articles represent criticism from the perspectives of mainstream social science or the positivist tradition and from advocates of alternative research methodologies. Most of the research reported in this series was pessimistic in its assessment of research in the field.[3] On the whole, these researchers found public administration research to be lacking in the rigor characteristic of mainstream social

---

3 See for example Box, 1992; McCurdy and Cleary, 1984; Perry and Kraemer, 1986; White, 1986; Stallings, 1986; and Houston and Delevan, 1990.

science research and too concerned with problems or issues relating to practice.

Using dissertation abstracts, McCurdy and Cleary (1984), found that few doctoral programs in public administration are producing research which makes significant contributions to the field of study. The conceptual framework used to assess the dissertations included the 'impact,' 'validity' and 'importance' of dissertations. The impact variable included the testing of theory and testing of causal relationships. The validity variable measured internal and external validity and assessed research design. The importance variable measured topic importance, i.e., whether the study dealt with "cutting edge" research topics (McCurdy and Cleary, 1984:50).

Jay White (1986) used the criteria of 1) 'Purpose:' could the purpose of the dissertation be inferred from its title? 2) 'Validity:' could validity be inferred from statements about research design, sampling techniques, sample size, experimental or quasi-experimental methods, or statistical controls? 3) 'Theory Testing:' could theory testing be inferred from statements about testing theories? 4) 'Hypothesis Testing:' was there any mention of hypotheses or hypothesis testing or model development and testing? 5) 'Causality:' was there discussion of causal relationships or key words such as correlations, independent and dependent variables, etc.

The assessments of doctoral dissertations in the field were consistently pessimistic. However, Frederick Thayer (1984:553) and Richard Box (1992:63) were less critical of dissertation research and criticized some of these studies, citing an inordinately narrow view of what constitutes valid research. But the prevailing sentiment appears to seriously discount the methodological rigor and therefore the overall value of dissertation research in public administration.

Analysis of Research in Scholarly Journals.

Perry and Kraemer (1986) did a content analysis of articles in *Public Administration Review* from 1975-1984 using five analytic categories. These were 'Research stage,' reflecting the purpose of the research, consisting of six stages: 1) problem delineation, 2) variable identification, 3) determination of relationships among variables, 4) establishing causality, 5) manipulation of causal variables for policy formation purposes and 6) evaluation of alternative programs and policies (Perry and Kramer, 1986:216). 'Research Methodology' reflects the general methods of inquiry used in the social sciences. 'Method of Empirical Analysis' was applied to studies using empirical research and was based on a variable used in an earlier study by Gordon, Rogers, and Agarwala-Rogers. 'Focus' was a dichotomous variable measuring whether the study was oriented toward theory building or problem resolution (Perry and Kraemer, 1986: 216-217).

While most studies of public administration research are directed at research designs or methodologies, Watson and Montjoy classified articles in *Public Administration Review* according to subject matter content. Classifying articles as to substantive categories, they began with a tentative list and modified it as the content of the articles dictated. The findings echoed those from other studies; that public administration research is not focusing on major social issues but predominantly managerial and intergovernmental questions (Watson and Montjoy, 1991:166).

Houston and Delevan (1990) expanded the review of public administration research reported in *Public Administration Review* to include six additional public administration related journals: *Administration and Society, Public Administration Quarterly, International Journal of Public Administration, Public Budgeting and Finance, Review of Public Personnel Administration and Policy Studies Review.* Articles from 1984-1989 were coded according to general characteristics pertaining to the author, level of funding support, the purpose of the research and the empirical methodology employed. Borrowing from Stallings and Ferris (1988), they used a coding scheme classifying articles as 'conceptual,' research which identifies or conceptualizes a researchable issue; 'relation,' research which examines relationships among variables; and 'evaluate,' research which analyzes a policy or program (Houston and Delevan, 1990:676). Research purpose, research design, and statistical techniques were measured in articles coded as 'relation' type research. Findings were consistent with previous research, citing a lack of empirical-analytic research in journal articles.

Content Analysis of Masters Level Research.

A content analysis of masters level research in public administration at Southwest Texas State University coded topical areas, methodologies, statistical methods and levels of government (Beck, 1993). Findings indicated that applied research projects were predominantly focused on management issues relevant to state and local government. Most of the research projects were descriptive in purpose, although a trend toward increased empirical analysis was noted for the period 1987-1991 (Beck, 1993).

DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Research Concepts.

From this review of the literature, a general theoretical basis emerges for describing research in the field. Most of the analyses described and assessed research utilizing mainstream social science criteria and standards. Some acknowledged that alternative research approaches may be important. A conceptual framework which incorporates important assessment criteria informed by both perspectives should enhance descriptive detail and allow an assessment of the alternative theoretical perspectives in terms of their relevance to theory and practice. Richard Box has argued that the *PAR* series of analyses has produced an unduly pessimistic view of public administration research and that this view is the result of questionable assumptions about what is acceptable research in an applied field. (Box, 1992:63). However, the literature identifies very few published research articles that explicitly use alternative methodologies (Houston and Delevan, 1990:679).

The following concepts and categories were derived from the literature as relevant to a content analysis of research:

General Characteristics.

All of the meta-level studies measured the surface, or manifest content of the units of analysis, whether it was masters level applied research, doctoral dissertation research or research reported in scholarly journals. For example, Perry and Kraemer (1986) coded the year, title, author. Houston and Delevan (1990) also coded for number of authors, academic affiliation and level of funding support. Beck (1993) coded for gender, length of the report, and level of government.

Focus.

The literature which reports the nature of research in the field reflects a consistent interest in the research focus and purpose. Perry and Kraemer (1986) use the 'focus' concept as a method of describing whether the research is primarily a theoretical or practice-oriented investigation. This concept serves to classify the research along the lines of the theory-practice dichotomy. It also allows a clear determination of the level of emphasis placed on theory development versus problem resolution.

Topic.

Some of the literature which assessed public administration research used the concept of research topic to derive information. White (1986) used the research topic and title to infer research purpose. Perry and Kraemer (1986) used the concept of topic to classify the research according to administrative theory, policy analysis or evaluation, level of government, or several categories within public administration such as personnel, planning, finance, etc. However, the topical categories were not mutually exclusive, i.e., level of government could denote the setting for a number of research topics.

Research Purpose.

A determination of research purpose was found in several analyses. Babbie (1992) describes the categories of research purpose as descriptive, exploratory and explanatory. Many negative or critical conclusions concerning the state of public administration research have to do with the predominance of descriptive and exploratory research over explanatory research. Jay White (1986) used a related but more specific concept in describing research purpose as positive, interpretive and critical. This conception closely maps the broad categories of research previously described in this paper. The positivist or mainstream social science approach is contrasted with the alternative methodologies utilized by the post-positivist or post-behavioral theorists such as Denhardt and Harmon. Certainly any assessment of the degree to which researchers employ alternatives to the positivist approach necessarily entails an elaboration of this type.

Relevance to Theory.

The preponderance of the literature is highly critical of research which is found to be conceptual, atheoretical and noncumulative. This critique is found in both the positivist perspective and, to a lesser degree, in the critiques from the proponents of alternative methods of theory building (Box, 1992). Stallings and Ferris (1988) cited several variations in criteria which are used to assess theoretical rigor but all included a description of whether the research goes beyond a conceptual level to the empirical testing of theory and an examination of relationships between variables.

Within the theory relevance category, the concept of research design is seen as a means of assessing methodological rigor through the lens of mainstream social science. Houston and Delevan were interested in describing methodologies employed in research that explicitly tested hypotheses and relations among variables. This concept utilizes "generally accepted social science designs" such as experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, case study and pre-experimental in a scale of progressive sophistication

(Houston and Delevan, 1990:677).

In addition, research is viewed as relevant to theory building if it uses statistical analysis. The literature reveals coding criteria that scale statistical techniques from univariate and multivariate through non-linear analyses (Houston and Delevan, 1990:678). Also, under this definition, research which reflects an explicit or implicit conceptual framework and tests hypotheses using mainstream statistical techniques meets the relevance to theory test.

Theory relevance from the alternative perspective would see interpretive research producing findings which *describe* the social reality of individuals; that concentrate on the meanings, interpretations and values of organizational actors. In addition, critical theory is represented by research which builds on the body of critical analysis of bureaucracy and organizations, particularly concerning the limitations placed on individual action by structure and procedures. In contrast with the mainstream perspective, the alternative perspective would reflect a conscious attempt to not only add to the theoretical base of the field but also provide a link to the world of practice.

Relevance to Practice.

The concept of practical relevance is not a strictly exclusive category. Certainly the issue as to the practical relevance of theoretical research is at the heart of the theory-practice debate. The positivist perspective seems to hold that the gap between theory and practice cannot or should not be closed and assumes that the long term results of strictly theoretical research will be advantageous for knowledge *and* action. The phenomenologist and the pragmatist call for a much closer relationship in the theory-practice nexus with research focused on the practitioner as an organizational *actor* (Catron and Harmon, 1981).

Within this concept, identification of the use of explicitly identified action theory, interpretive theory or qualitative research relating to the context of practice is indicative of practical relevance. Research which draws a distinction between action and behavior or makes an explicit attempt to discover meanings, intentions and values also defines the relevance to practice test. Finally, research which is less abstract and technical and which appears to add to an implementation of policy or program meets the relevance test.

Other Critical Issues.

Topical areas such as management, program evaluation, personnel, planning, communications and other organizational functions and processes constitute subjects of practical relevance. Critical theoretical issues such as the politics-administration dichotomy, the private-public administration debate, fact and value should also inform the concept of relevance.

Research may also be identified that provides theoretical or practical findings that are generalizable beyond the specific setting of the study. The relevance and importance of this sort of research may be an indicator of research quality.

SUMMARY

This chapter has briefly reviewed the nature of the research debate in the field of public administration through the theory-practice distinction. The historical overview reveals the source of, and the persistent interest in, the theory-practice division. Current analyses, even though predominantly representative of the positivist perspective, decry the lack of theory development in the field and the inordinate concentration on practical or problem-related issues. Other theoreticians call for an expansion of the theoretical model in public administration to achieve a synthesis of theory and practice.

This brief review served only to highlight the different perspectives of the mainstream and alternative, post-positivist, *research* approaches. Additional sources in the literature deal with the problems associated with the *transfer* of theory and knowledge to practitioners.[4] Studies dealing with barriers to the effective flow of knowledge between research and practice, and problems in linking

---

4 See for example, Thompson, 1978; Bowman, 1978; and Adams, 1992.

theory to practice in the organizational context, constitute fertile ground for further research.

As previously mentioned, there is a lack of evidence that alternative theoretical approaches are well represented in dissertations or journals in the field. Nevertheless, these approaches and other factors such as the growth of government and new academic programs, represented by the public policy schools, present important challenges to the traditional public administration model.

From the literature, particularly the series of meta-analyses in *PAR*, concepts and definitions were drawn which form the basis of an analytic approach to describing research. From this foundation and through the further operationalization of these concepts in a subsequent chapter, a framework is constructed with which to describe the masters level research reports at a highly rated, public policy oriented program.

The next chapter discusses the setting in which this research took place. A description is provided of the LBJ School of Public Affairs, its research approach and policy orientation.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH SETTING

Chapter Purpose.

This chapter provides a brief look at the LBJ School of Public Affairs, the Masters of Public Affairs academic and research approach and what contemporary surveys have said about the prestige and productivity of the program. Information is also provided on the possible influence of academic setting on curriculum and research along with pertinent comments from the Associate Dean of the LBJ School. A look at other perceived differences between policy science and public administration concludes the chapter.

Academic and Research Orientation.

The LBJ School of Public Affairs offers an academic program aimed at preparing students for public service careers as policy analysts and managers. The stated aim at its inception was to offer a "program that integrated public policy theory and practice...oriented in an inter-disciplinary, problem solving way" (Duncan, 1993:2). Various masters level degree options are offered and, since 1992, a doctoral program in policy research and analysis. The Masters of Public Affairs (M.P.Aff) degree is conferred upon completion of one of three different options: A regular, full-time option, a mid-career option and a joint degree program which includes six interdisciplinary areas of study. The majority of students study under the regular program which requires completion of 53 semester hours, including two policy research projects and a professional research report or thesis (Duncan, 1993).

The academic approach of the LBJ School echos what Gargan (1989) cited as the tendency of public policy programs initiated in the 1960s, i.e., new practices, techniques and modes of analysis directed to the values of public administration. However, as Gargan stated, the approach is based more in economics than public administration. Core courses in political economy, econometrics and quantitative analysis reflect the emphasis of the curriculum. There is relatively little emphasis on traditional public administration courses such as management, budgeting or personnel. Importantly, the research *courses* stress practical, client-oriented projects based on real policy problems. This exposure to field research is intended to expose the student to practical and political realities.

The masters level professional research report involves independent research with a policy focus and, ostensibly, a specific research design. Five broad policy areas comprise the research topics: Human resources and social policy; international policy; urban and regional policy; environmental and regulatory policy; and strategic management and fiscal/economic policy. Given the policy emphasis in the curriculum, it seemed reasonable to expect that traditional public administration and management topics would be less represented in the professional reports.

Indeed, the academic approach appears to be a reaction to traditional, single discipline graduate programs and intends to impart a set of skills and theoretical knowledge that would be instrumental in improving policy analysis, if not policy implementation.

Reputation and Productivity Review of the LBJ School.

A 1981 survey of the principal representatives of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) asked the respondents to list the 10 best MPA programs in the United States (Morgan and Meier, 1981). In addition, a measure of productivity was created by counting the number of articles published in 10 public administration related journals from 1970-1980. Even though the LBJ School program was relatively new in 1981, the results showed a very high "reputational ranking" of 6th, behind such long established programs as Syracuse, Harvard, USC, Indiana and Berkeley (Morgan et al, 1981:669). The "productivity" ranking, based on the rate of publication by faculty, placed the LBJ School at 28th. In response to the possibility of bias in rating more favorably those schools that participate actively in NASPAA affairs, a supplementary prestige ranking was based on a survey of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). The top 50 programs ranked in terms of practitioner perceptions of prestige placed the LBJ School at 12th while academic respondents ranked the school at 7th (Morgan and Meier, 1981:172). Clearly, these surveys show that the LBJ School is prestigious from the viewpoints of both practitioners and scholars. It should be noted, however, that the surveys lacked specific or relative ratings of individual factors such as research quality.

Academic Setting of the Program.

The influence that academic setting may have on curriculum and research was the subject of a 1990 study of MPA programs (Cleary, 1990). This research looked at masters programs in 215 schools affiliated with NASPAA. Findings indicate that an inner core curriculum exists in MPA programs but that "free-standing" MPA programs require a more complete core. The majority of public affairs and public policy programs do not offer the full inner core, requiring fewer courses in personnel and finance (Cleary, 1990:666). In Table 3.1 below, Cleary compares masters curricula in different program settings:

Table 3.1 MPA Curriculum Core Areas and Program Organization.

	Pub Admin	Pol Sci	Pub Policy	Pub Affairs	Total
Program Offers Core Course In:					
Politics	42.2%	59.4%	66.7%	59.1%	57.2%
Pub Admin	96.8%	96.9%	91.7%	95.5%	96.6%
Personnel	67.7%	70.3%	16.7%	36.4%	58.4%
Finance	90.3%	85.9%	41.7%	75.0%	82.7%
Policy	80.6%	65.6%	91.7%	63.6%	71.7%
Research	100.0%	95.3%	91.7%	93.2%	95.4%
Economics	32.3%	10.9%	75.0%	47.7%	34.1%

N=173

Public policy and public affairs programs are clearly different from public administration programs. Policy programs, in particular, have different core courses and they are less likely to be accredited by NASPAA; only 25 percent of respondent public policy schools were accredited, which contrasted with 46.2 percent of all respondents (Cleary, 1990:672). Cleary reports that public policy schools strengthened their management offerings during the 1980s while public administration programs added more policy analysis. But differences still exist. Cleary attributes the difference in perspective of the public policy schools to their affiliation with the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) (Cleary, 1990:671). The LBJ School is a member of both NASPAA and APPAM (Cope, 1994).

Policy Research Issues.

Despite the curricula differences shown in Cleary's research, policy science seems to be subject to many of the criticisms familiar to public administration. The credibility of policy science, whether it is scientific, whether it produces objective, empirical truth as promised by its "scientific" status is currently being questioned (deLeon and Overman, 1989:430). Also, after the 1980's, explicitly normative research began to be seen in policy science giving rise to questions about its claims to scientific status (deLeon and Overman, 1989:430)

The promise of the public policy approach for bridging the theory-practice gap may be diminished insofar as a credibility problem persists with respect to research in the field. An interview with the Associate Dean of the LBJ School (see Appendix C for a complete transcript of the interview) revealed that the LBJ School's perspective on the research issue is far different from the academic approach that one might see in traditional public administration or other social science based programs. When asked to comment on the growth of policy based programs and as to whether they are a reaction to the academic model in public administration as being somehow obsolete, Dean Cope said:

> Yes. They (public administration programs) were seen as not rigorous enough. They did not take into consideration economic analysis and were not as quantitatively oriented. They emphasized too much the bureaucracy...personnel...and budgets as opposed to the content of the policy side (Cope, 1994).

But when questioned about how best to describe the professional reports of the masters candidates, Dean Cope said:

> There is no single research design. That is the problem. If you think of the report as being a policy analysis instead of a rigorous research design or project that will help some. Sometimes there will be data, there will be hypothesis testing, there will be quantitative analysis and in other cases, the issue...the research question will be 'what is the possibility that democratization will stick in Hungary?' It will clearly be a case study without a rigorous framework and without necessarily longitudinal data. It will be based on one year's data (Cope, 1994).

When asked about whether there was any intent of the research program to add to the theoretical basis of the discipline Dean Cope said:

> The masters program is intended to be an applied masters...training people to go out and work in the

> practical, real world. So, we are not training our masters students to be theoreticians (Cope, 1994).

As to the sort of real world work to which the masters students aspire:

> Policy types view themselves as being interested in economic analysis...and political analysis with a capital 'P.' They see themselves as analysts and advisors and politicians...they look to work for a congressional committee or a consulting firm or a research organization (Cope, 1994).

<u>Summary.</u>

The context of this research thus shows that the LBJ curricula, like most policy based programs, is somewhat different from traditional public administration programs. Given the *raison d'etre* for such public policy programs, the make-up of the curriculum, the reputation of the school and its expressed intention to bridge theory and practice in an analytic approach, a presumption existed that the PRs would be characterized by a relatively high level of rigor and a high degree of relevance to both theoretical and practical concerns. However, the cited credibility problems of the policy approach, the remarks of Dean Cope, and the debatable value of the prestige finding seemed to indicate a need for further inquiry before any such generalizations were made about the character or quality of the PRs.

The next chapter outlines the content analysis research methodology employed in this research. There is a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of content analysis, the sampling technique employed and the statistics that will be reported.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Chapter Purpose.

This chapter outlines the content analysis research methodology utilized in this project. It includes a review of the sampling and statistical techniques employed. The operationalization of certain variables is also discussed along with attempts to mitigate potential weaknesses in the research.

Content Analysis.

Content analysis is deemed to be an appropriate methodology in studying social artifacts such as written communications (Babbie, 1992:312). It is unobtrusive, using direct observation of documents and combining quantitative and qualitative techniques. The units of analysis in this study, the professional reports of LBJ School masters candidates, also meet the requirement of containing relevant information in a readily available form.

Manifest and Latent Content.

Coding of the reports under specific criteria allows a systematic description of the sample. Coding includes both manifest and latent content. Manifest content includes general characteristics and descriptive categories. Latent content includes factors that may not be as immediately evident. In this case, such factors include research purpose, research design, conceptual frameworks and practical and theoretical relevance.

Strengths, Weaknesses and Variable Refinement.

The reliability of content analysis is strengthened by the concrete nature of the documents studied (Babbie, 1992). Babbie also states that latent content analysis is better designed for getting at underlying meaning but may cause reliability problems because coder interpretation is necessarily involved (Babbie, 1992:318). The coding criteria must be clearly operationalized such that results could be repeated by a subsequent observer. Therefore, a pre-test of the coding scheme tested the indicators which comprised the research variables. The test involved assessing whether the attributes within the variable categories were clear and sufficiently comprehensive to aid the coding process and to accurately describe the reports. Because of the findings of this pre-test, some concepts and criteria were modified slightly. In addition, a second researcher was enlisted to code sample reports to allow comparison of coding results and test inter-rater reliability. This refining process appeared to increase reliability by expanding, for example, the research focus variable to include an 'issues' attribute in addition to the 'theory' and 'practice' categories. Further, test-retest reliability was tested by replicating coding on some reports 30 days after the initial analysis.

The pre-test and the test-retest process also revealed that assessments using the variable 'research purpose' were problematic. The effort to assess the degree of use of *alternative* research methodologies led to the original coding of research purpose as 'explanatory' or positive, 'interpretive' and 'critical.' While an attempt was made to assess the applicability of these attributes, they seemed an inexact fit in coding many of the LBJ reports. Accordingly, in an attempt to enhance analysis, an additional variable, used by Perry and Kraemer (1986), was borrowed and used for coding research purpose. Operationalization of research purpose included using the additional categories, 'conceptual', 'relation', or 'evaluation' where 'conceptual' research included problem delineation or identification of variables for research. 'Relation' research included studies which tested causality between variables, determined relationships between variables or manipulated variables for policy making. 'Evaluation' was used to describe studies which evaluated alternative policies or programs. The intent was to obtain a greater depth of analysis that would increase validity.

In another attempt to assist the validity of this content analysis and to provide an additional source of information and data, an interview was conducted with the Associate Dean of the LBJ School. Dean Cope was asked to provide additional, corroborating data regarding the research setting and the LBJ School's research approach, purpose and techniques relative to the professional reports.

Sampling Technique and Statistical Analysis.

A systematic sample of the research reports was drawn for the years 1988 through 1990 with selection of every third report in each of the years. The sampling frame contained 204 reports from which 70 reports were selected and coded. Because the research purpose was to describe the units of analysis, only simple statistics are reported in the form of absolute and relative frequencies on each variable. The coding sheet that was employed is found in Appendix A and statistical information from the data obtained is reported in Appendix B. Statistics from other content analyses in the literature, on doctoral dissertations, *PAR* articles, and another masters level research project, are used in a comparative analysis of findings.

Summary.

The content analysis methodology is viewed as an effective approach in an analysis of specific documents such as the professional reports. From a systematic sampling of the units of analysis both manifest and latent content was determined using criteria developed from meta-analyses in the field. Attempts to counter problems of reliability included pre-testing of the coding criteria and a test-retest over time, resulting in an elaboration of the research purpose and research focus variables.

The next chapter reports the findings of the analysis. Also, comments are provided as to whether findings are consistent with those from literature in the field.

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS

Chapter Purpose.

This chapter provides a narrative description of the professional reports and presents compiled statistics from the document analysis. A comparison is offered between the statistics from the professional reports and selected findings from meta-analyses from the literature. The analysis reports results in the form of frequency distributions on the several variables measured.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROFESSIONAL REPORTS

The professional reports are located in the Wasserman Library at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. They are bound and organized by year. A manual card catalog system indexes the reports by title, author and year. The reports are organized with an introductory section or chapter which states the purpose of the research, the topic and/or policy area. The reports also include a title page, table of contents, bibliography and autobiographical comments (vita). Table 5.1 below reports findings on several variables:

Table 5.1 General Characteristics and Information.

Number of Pages	Author Gender	Topical Areas	Policy Areas	Level of Government
<50 1%	M 51.4%	Policy 71.4%	Social 48.6%	Local 22.9%
<100 40%	F 48.6%	Other 28.6%	Economy 21.4%	State 38.6%
>100 59%			Environ. 15.7%	Fed'l 27.1%
			Other 14.3%	Other 11.4%
Total 100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

N=70

(Please see Appendix B for frequency distributions for each variable by year).

Report Length and Gender of Author.

The results of the content analysis reveal a virtual balance of reports by gender, with 51.4 percent male and 48.6 percent female authors. Essentially all, 98.6 percent, of the professional reports exceed 50 pages in length with 58.6 percent exceeding 100 pages. Four percent exceed 200 pages in length and the median report length is 105 pages. The longest report in the sample was 292 pages and the shortest, 49 pages.

Topical Areas.

As had been expected, the topical areas of the professional reports are heavily representative of policy analysis and evaluation. Fully 71.4 percent of the reports were deemed to be concerned with policy issues. Administrative theory or bureaucracy was the focus of only 4.3 percent of the reports. Traditional public administration topics such as management, planning, personnel, finance and intergovernmental relations were represented in a total of 26 percent of the reports with finance (10 percent) being the administrative topic most prevalent.

Policy Area Concentrations.

Within the policy area concentrations, the reports addressing human resource or social policies comprised the largest fraction of the sample with 48.6 percent. Strategic and fiscal/economic policy was the concern of 21.4 percent of the reports and another 15.7 percent addressed environmental and regulatory policy. One report (1.4 percent) dealt with international policy. Six reports (8.6 percent) addressed urban or regional policy and the remaining reports (4.3 percent) were classified as dealing with other policy or topical areas.

Level of Government.

The coding of reports for level of government classified 65.7 percent of the reports as dealing with state or federal government, 22.9 percent local government and 11.4 percent as not having an identifiable governmental focus. The levels of government most represented are state and federal, with 38.6 percent and 27.1 percent, respectively.

Research Focus.

The reports were coded for research focus relating to theoretical and practical concentrations. Table 5.2 reports frequency distributions on research focus:

Table 5.2 Research Focus of the Professional Reports.

Research Focus	Frequency	Percentage
Theory Building/Theoretical	6	8.6%
Practical/Problem Resolution	20	28.6%
Issues Orientation	44	62.8%
Total	*N* = *70*	100.0%

Rather than focus exclusively on theory building or practical problem resolution, many of the professional reports analyzed a policy issue and supported or argued for a particular policy alternative. Thus, many of the reports which dissected a particular issue were deemed to have neither a strictly theoretical nor a practical/problem resolution focus but rather, an issues orientation. Importantly, the issues orientation category is believed much closer to practice or problem resolution than theory building but sufficiently different to require a separate category. Only 8.6 percent of the reports focused on theoretical concerns or theory building, while 28.6 percent implicitly or explicitly addressed practical problems. The largest group of reports, 62.8 percent, had an issues orientation. Again, aggregation of the issues reports and the practical/problem resolution reports into a nominally practical category results in a finding that over 90 percent of the reports are oriented toward practical, applied issues. This is not to say, however, that the reports focus on the context of public management or practitioner issues relating to policy implementation.

RESEARCH METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

The second main purpose of this project was the classification of the professional reports in terms of research purpose, research methods and statistical techniques. Table 5.3 reports findings on two perspectives on research purpose:

Table 5.3 Research Purpose of the Professional Reports:

Research Purpose	Frequency	Percentage
Explanatory	9	12.8%
Interpretive	13	18.6%
Critical	13	18.6%
Other (Descriptive, Exploratory)	35	50.0%
Total	*N* = 70	100.0%

Results of Second Coding of Research Purpose

Research Purpose	Number of PRs	% of PRs
Conceptual:		
Problem Delineation	28	40.0%
Variable Identification	2	2.9%
Relation:		
Determining Relationships between Variables	2	2.9%
Establishing Causality among Variables	2	2.9%
Manipulation of Variables for Policy Making	3	4.2%
Evaluation:		
Evaluation of Alternative Policies/Programs	32	45.7%
Other	1	1.4%
Total	*N* = 70	100.0%

Research Purpose.

As reflected in the tables above, two variables were used to assess research purpose. The first variable measured the degree to which the reports reflected explanatory, interpretive, critical or other research. Explanatory research was found in 12.8 percent of the reports, with interpretive and critical each describing 18.6 percent of the sample reports. The reports that were coded as interpretive and critical research rarely reflected the use of a deductive or inductive method. Rather, their use of social criticism, case studies and historical analysis closely comport with White's view of interpretive and critical research (White, 1986:22). The largest fraction of reports, 50 percent, had a research purpose which overlapped the conceptual category, essentially exploring and reviewing specific policy problems.

The second variable found three categories of purpose, i.e., conceptual, relation and evaluation, to be efficacious in describing the reports. Most of the reports fell into either the conceptual category, specifically, problem delineation (40 percent); or the evaluation category, evaluation of alternative policies/programs, (45.7 percent). The relation category which included determining relationships between variables (2.9 percent), establishing causality (2.9 percent) and manipulation of variables for policy making (4.2 percent) was poorly represented in the professional reports.

Research Designs and Statistical Techniques.

Table 5.4 below reports percent distributions on research designs. Table 5.5 reports on statistics used.

Table 5.4 Research Designs in the Professional Reports.

Design	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Case Study	14	20.0%
Correlation	6	8.6%
Quasi-experimental	1	1.4%
Not Applicable	49	70.0%
Total	*N = 70*	100.0%

Table 5.5 Statistical Techniques in Professional Reports.

Techniques	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Univariate	2	2.9%
Bivariate	2	2.9%
Cross tabulations	3	4.2%
Chi square	2	2.9%
ANOVA	1	1.4%
Bivariate regression	2	2.9%
None	58	82.8%
Total	*N* = 70	100.0%

A surprisingly high portion of reports, 70 percent, had no discernible research design and very few used statistical techniques. Case studies were frequently used (20 percent) but rarely in terms of reporting original research. Rather, findings from other case study research were reported in the form of a literature review or as a foundation for policy analysis and advocacy. A smaller portion of the reports, a total of 10 percent, showed evidence of correlational or quasi-experimental design.

Statistical techniques were not well represented in the professional reports. Eighty-three percent of the reports showed no use of statistical analysis with the remainder of the reports largely reflecting cross tabulations or univariate and bivariate analysis.

RESEARCH QUALITY

Use of Conceptual Frameworks and Hypotheses Testing.

Coding of reports which utilized implicit or explicit conceptual frameworks revealed that most, 60 percent, of the reports, contained a conceptual framework but only a third of those *explicitly* outlined the framework.

Explicit testing of hypotheses was extremely rare. Only 4 reports (5.7 percent) outlined and/or stated an intention to test an hypothesis. Several others (17.1 percent) could be said to have implicit hypotheses which were "tested" albeit with other than traditional social science techniques. The largest portion of the reports, 77 percent, showed no testing of hypotheses. Table 5.6 below depicts the conceptual framework and hypothesis percent distributions.

Table 5.6 Two Research Quality Indicators.

Conceptual Frameworks			Hypothesis Testing		
Explicit	14	(20%)	Explicit	4	(6%)
Inferred	28	(40%)	Inferred	12	(17%)
None	28	(40%)	None	54	(77%)
Total *N* =	*70*	(100%)	Total *N* =	*70*	(100%)

Relevance to Theory and Practice.

The findings with respect to relevance showed that 76 percent of the reports had no discernible relevance to theory and that only 4 percent were clearly relevant to theory. In contrast, fully 90 percent of the reports were found to have a possible (64 percent) or clear (26 percent) relevance to practice. Most of the reports showing a relevance to practice were not considered to be relevant beyond the immediate research setting. Table 5.7 below reports findings on relevance:

Table 5.7 Research Relevance to Theory/Practice.

Relevance:	PA Theory	PA Practice	Beyond Setting
Yes	3 (4%)	18 (26%)	1 (2%)
Possibly	14 (20%)	45 (64%)	24 (34%)
No	53 (76%)	7 (10%)	45 (64%)
Total	*N=70* (100%)	*70* (100%)	*70* (100%)

When considering these research quality findings viewed in terms of research focus it was apparent, for example, that essentially all the reports with a theoretical research focus reflected a conceptual framework and showed significant relevance to both theory and practice. In contrast, the issue-focused reports did not reflect explicit conceptual frameworks, hypothesis testing or clear relevance to theory or practice. Importantly, the preponderance of the reports which discuss policy issues were judged to have possible, if only indirect, relevance to practice.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Comparing the findings from the professional reports with the results from similar studies in the field reveals certain similarities and differences. The reports are better balanced as to author gender than, for example, doctoral dissertations in the field. The PRs reflect 51 percent male authors as opposed to 72 percent male in dissertations in the field of public administration (Adams and White, 1993). Obviously, size and scope differences are to be expected between masters and doctoral level research. Page length comparisons reveal that only 5 percent of dissertations in the field are under 150 pages (Adams and White, 1993). The median length of the LBJ reports is 105 pages. Terry Beck, in looking at applied research projects (ARPs) at Southwest Texas State University, found 53 percent of the research reports to be authored by males. Page length of the masters reports at Southwest Texas averaged 91 pages (Beck, 1993:25). Table 5.8 below reports comparative percent distributions on the gender and page length categories:

Table 5.8 Gender and Page Length Comparison.

	Percentages		
	PA Dissertations[5]	SWT ARPs[6]	LBJ PRs
Gender:	*(N)* *(201)*	*(110)*	*(70)*
Male	72	53	51
Female	24	40	49
Undetermined	5	7	0
Total	100	100	100
Page Length (mean):	>200	91	111

A significant difference in research focus was found. Table 5.9 reports a comparison with a study on *PAR* articles:

Table 5.9 Comparison of Research Focus.

	Percentages	
Research	*PAR* Articles[7]	LBJ PRs
Focus:	*(N)* *(230)*	*(70)*
Theory	16	9
Practice	67	28
Issues	17	63
Total	100	100

5 Adams and White (1993).
6 Beck (1993).
7 Box (1992).

In terms of topical concentration, Beck found 58 percent of the applied research reports concentrated on management or practice issues with settings in local (39 percent) and state (24 percent) government (Beck, 1993:26-27). In contrast, the PRs tend not to focus on practice or policy implementation (only 25.7 percent were explicitly focused on practice-related topics). Also, the level of government orientation of the LBJ reports tends to be state and federal (38.7 percent state and 27.1 percent federal) with relatively less emphasis on local government when compared with the orientation of the Southwest Texas State applied research projects. Table 5.10 compares levels of government found:

Table 5.10 Level of Government Comparison.

	Percentages	
Level of Government:	SWT ARPs *(N) (110)*	LBJ PRs *(N) (70)*
Local	39	23
State	22	39
Federal	6	27
Other	32	11
Total	100	100

In terms of research designs, the professional reports appear to differ substantially from most research in the field. There was little evidence of a research design that could be identified as mainstream social science research. The research model, as verified by Dean Cope of the LBJ School, is "all over the map," but within a general framework of informing and advising an agency head or policy maker on specific policy problems or options. As seen in the data on research purpose, a significant fraction, though a minority, of the reports were classified as interpretive or critical inasmuch as they more closely resembled an alternative mixture of qualitative and phenomenological research than rigorous, empirical inquiry following the positivist or natural science model. Fully 70 percent of the reports could not be classified as having an identifiable, mainstream social science research design. Interestingly, this compares with the findings on dissertation research in the fields of planning (72 percent) and women's studies (66 percent) and contrasts with public administration (56 percent) and especially, criminology dissertations (30 percent) (Adams and White, 1993). Table 5.11 compares PRs with dissertations in the field:

Table 5.11 Comparison of Research Designs.

Mainstream Social Science Research:		Percentages: Dissertations[8] PA	CR	WS	PL	Masters LBJ PRs
	(N)	*(201)*	*(88)*	*(62)*	*(126)*	*(70)*
Yes		33	66	26	14	10
Possibly		11	4	8	14	20
No		56	30	66	72	70
Total		100	100	100	100	100

PA: Public Administration.
CR: Criminology.
WS: Women's Studies.
PL: Planning.

The lack of statistical techniques was remarkable, given the expected emphasis of the policy approach. Over 80 percent of the PRs reported no use of statistical analysis.

8 Adams and White (1993).

In contrast, the masters research projects at Southwest Texas State University reflected a trend toward an increased use of empirical methods and statistical techniques (Beck, 1993:40). The table below compares findings on statistics usage:

Table 5.12 Comparison of the Use of Statistics.

Statistical Technique	SWT APRs	LBJ PRs
None	58 (54%)	58 (83%)
Univariate	12 (11%)	2 (3%)
Bivariate	4 (4%)	2 (3%)
Other*	34 (31%)	8 (11%)
Total	*N = 108* (100%)	*70* (100%)

* Multivariate, regression, etc.

The percent of projects at Southwest Texas showing no use of statistics declined from 67 percent in 1987 to 29 percent in 1991 and the use of multivariate statistics increased from 21 percent in 1987 to 57 percent in 1991 (Beck, 1993).

The LBJ reports are clearly not as rigorous as generic public administration dissertation research which itself tends not to be rigorous. For example, Adams and White (1993) found that 76 percent of public administration dissertations (versus 60 percent of the PRs) have an explicit or inferred conceptual framework. They also reported that 22 percent of dissertations show clear relevance to theory (only 4 percent of the PRs) and 66 percent show a clear (10 percent) or possible (56 percent) relevance to practice (26 and 54 percent respectively for the PRs). Table 5.13 reports comparative statistics on the use of conceptual frameworks:

Table 5.13 Comparison of the Use of Conceptual Frameworks.

Conceptual Framework		Percentages			
		Dissertations[9]			Masters
		PA	CR	WS	LBJ PRs
	(N)	*(201)*	*(88)*	*(62)*	*(70)*
Explicit		27	40	16	20
Inferred		49	50	65	40
None		24	10	19	40
Total		100	100	100	100

PA: Public Administration.
CR: Criminology.
WS: Women's Studies.

Table 5.14 below depicts comparative statistics on the question of research relevance to theory:

Table 5.14 Relevance to Theory Comparisons.

Relevance To Theory	Percentages		
	All US Dissertations[9]	PA Dissertations[9]	LBJ PRs
(N)	*(713)*	*(201)*	*(70)*
Yes	18	22	4
Possibly	34	32	20
No	48	46	76
Total	100	100	100

Table 5.15 compares findings on practical relevance of the PRs to findings on dissertations in three different fields:

Table 5.15 Relevance to Practice Comparisons.

Relevance To Practice		Percentages			
		Dissertations[9]			Masters
		PA	PL	WS	LBJ PRs
	(N)	*(201)*	*(126)*	*(62)*	*(70)*
Yes		10	18	2	26
Possibly		56	66	29	64
No		33	17	69	10
Total		100	100	100	100

PA: Public Administration.
PL: Planning.
WS: Women's Studies.

---

9 Adams and White (1993).

SUMMARY

The results of the analysis show scant evidence that the professional report is actually representative of original and rigorous research envisioned by the traditional model. But the analysis also tends to confirm that the professional reports are not that different from research in the field. In comparing the PRs to masters level research, the size and scope of many of the reports indicate that a high level of effort is expended in their preparation. However, the level of scholarship and research quality, as confirmed in the conversation with Dean Cope, is uneven. The findings indicate that the majority of the reports deal with policy issues, most frequently social policies, with a view toward an analysis and recommendation of a particular policy alternative. Many of the reports review and evaluate major policy alternatives from a clearly normative perspective and do not cover policy implementation or topics of immediate concern to practitioners and public managers.

The next chapter summarizes the research and formally addresses each of the research questions. The chapter provides comments on possible implications of the research and indicates where further study might be indicated.

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Purpose.

This chapter provides a response to each of the original research questions. A summary assessment is offered of the research reports in the context of the theory-practice distinction. A discussion of the implications of the project concludes the report.

Research Questions.

From the findings, answers to the original research questions are suggested. As to the first question, the extent of research focus of the LBJ professional reports between theory and practice, the analysis revealed that the PRs have relatively little theoretical intent or impact. They review alternative policy options and make arguments for, or advocate, particular policies and programs, premised on existing research findings, mostly case studies. Consistent with the applied orientation of the LBJ School, much of the research was found to be issue- and problem-oriented rather than strictly theoretical. This finding comports with the literature which analyzed *PAR* articles except that even a smaller degree of theoretical research is found here. Only 8.6 percent of the reports appeared to build, extend or modify a theory or hypothesis while 16-20 percent of published research in public administration has been deemed to be theoretical. Another difference from the literature is evident in the concentration of LBJ reports on policy issues. While this was not unexpected given the setting, the fact that only 28.6 percent of the reports focused on questions relating to professional practice or problem resolution while 62.8 percent were oriented toward policy issues is indicative of an approach which directly targets neither scholars nor line administrators in the field. Rather, the policy reports appear to attempt to provide rational interpretations and opinions which might be considered in political decision making.

The result of analysis with respect to the question of research designs and methodologies was somewhat surprising. The ostensible emphasis on economics and quantitative analysis that marks the course work of the LBJ School is not reflected in the professional reports. Economics can certainly be described as positivist in its approach, yet evidence of traditional research techniques, following econometrics or the mainstream social science model, was extremely limited. Rather, the reports were fairly evenly divided between conceptual, i.e., problem delineation, and policy/program evaluation. Only 10 percent of the reports could be described as dealing with causality, determining relationships between variables or testing hypotheses. This finding may be partially attributable to the fact that no formal methods course prepares students for their research.

The question as to the extent of utilization of alternative methodologies was more difficult to definitively assess and therefore the findings must be somewhat tentative. Over 36 percent of the reports appear to meet criteria applicable to alternative, critical and/or interpretive research. Many of the reports openly advocate policy positions based on effectiveness or contain explicit references to normative and individual values and criticize existing policies and programs. As policy argumentation, this research was viewed as alternative insofar as it justifies its methods and criteria through practical reasoning (White, 1986:22). Also, the ideological nature of some of this research was deemed to comport with a nominally critical approach. And several of the reports adopt an implicitly interpretive stance, for example, in reporting on interpretive case studies, but none explicitly identified the research as alternative. However, there was a conspicuous absence of reports with research settings in administrative contexts where actions, behaviors and intentions of actors were observed or otherwise accounted for. While citations from other research, again, mostly case studies, served to support arguments for specific policy alternatives, there was little evidence of actual original research conducted and reported by the authors.

When questioned as to whether the LBJ School has produced a logic of inquiry, a distinct methodology, Glen Cope, Associate Dean of the LBJ School said:

> The school's trademark, since it was founded in 1970, has been...a hands-on approach which means we

> have been less academic than a lot of other places... If you looked at the numbers, my guess is that maybe a quarter of them would be heavily quantitative and some other proportion would be in the middle and maybe more than half, maybe two-thirds, would be on some continuum, some very mushy, some very legalistic and not econometric at all (Cope, 1994).

The Dean's assessment is largely confirmed by the data. However, it appears that she has over-estimated the extent of quantitative analysis in the professional reports.

The findings on the question of the relevance of the professional reports to theory and practice confirmed expectations but were also mixed. Again, the reports do not deal with theoretical or with practical, management issues affecting a specific program or agency. But when viewed in terms of relevance, the concentration of topics on social issues and human resource matters lends support for an inference that the reports are more relevant to broadly defined practical concerns than the testing, building or extending of a theory. Again, research on policy <u>implementation</u> was not found to be a significant interest of the professional reports.

The "new public administration" encouraged public administrators to be advocates of social equity while utilizing new quantitative tools. Clearly, many of the professional reports examined in this research reflect such advocacy. What is somewhat surprising is the preponderance of advocacy and the lack of sophisticated technique. After all, policy science is widely held as a positive alternative to a less rigorous research model. Also, the concerns for the administrator and policy implementation seem to be missing. This echos what Denhardt said was the true theory-practice gap, the leaving of such practical questions to the harried administrator.

CONCLUSION

The field of public administration is beleaquered from both sides of the theory-practice division because critics claim both academics and practitioners are not scientific enough. Further, the natural tension between theory and practice has caused critics from both perspectives to question the value of research in the field and to question whether public administration is a scientific discipline, a practical art, or perhaps an obsolete enterprise. This tension is represented in several dichotomies in the field, politics-administration, public-private, fact-value, etc. One prominent critic has even pronounced public administration a dying discipline (McCurdy, undated:1). The growth of the policy schools is one of the reactions to these complaints. As suggested by the findings here, the policy analysis exemplified in the professional reports does not appear to answer the call for a more rigorous research model, nor does it appear to represent a wholly successful alternative which might hold promise for a synthesis of theory and practice. As suggested by the comments of Dean Cope, both the academic purpose of the professional report exercise and the absence of a formal methods course in the LBJ School curriculum may contribute to these findings. Further study is indicated to assess whether the LBJ School's *group research projects* might reveal increased methodological rigor and produce research results more clearly relevant to theory and the context of practice. It also would be interesting to do a similar content analysis of the first doctoral dissertations which will be appearing next year.

Finally, this research has utilized a conceptual framework borrowed largely from the mainstream social science model which places an emphasis on an analysis of methods. An effort was made to broaden the analysis to assess alternative methods and research focus and relevance but these areas were sometimes difficult to categorize with precision. Therefore, some of the results in this area should be termed only preliminary to further research.

While the results do confirm the lack of theoretical and rigorous applied research in the professional reports, when viewed through a framework of practical and theoretical relevance, the findings do not seem entirely negative. A substantial minority of the reports, some of which were coded as critical or interpretive, constitute reasoned, systematic criticism and evaluation, which may contribute useful findings to policy makers. In this context, any critique of research which concentrates exclusively on a methods analysis seems to this author as excessively narrow. We should remain sensitive to the fact that the natural science model is changing and we should be wary of too rigid a view of what constitutes science. Obviously it is important that scholarly research, even at the masters level, be intellectually defensible. There must be accepted research criteria and standards to combat charges of relativism or nonrationality. Ideally, it also should include some notions of the implications for both policy choice and policy implementation by the actors in public organizations.

Public administration theory and practice is undergoing a paradigm reexamination. Thomas Kuhn's familiar analysis of paradigm shift is criticized for not providing criteria for judging new paradigms. He implies that certain values, e.g., accuracy, consistency, simplicity and fruitfulness, etc., should serve as the criteria for paradigm choice but admits that these criteria may be too ambiguous or subjective (Kuhn, 1977:377). Some in the field seem to agree that the enterprise itself, the practical activity of theory building, is necessarily interpretive and critical as well as deductive and inductive and that theory is necessarily grounded in practice. Thus, theorists and practitioners must share the goal of *constructing* a meaningful, effective reality through a synthesis of theory and practice. This entails viewing both positive and alternative inquiry as legitimate parts of a research framework which attempts to answer the call for a new theoretical, practical and ethical public administration paradigm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Guy B. "Enthralled with Modernity: The Historical Context of Knowledge and Theory Development in Public Administration" *Public Administration Review.* vol. 52 no. 4 (1992): 363-371.

Adams, Guy B. and Jay D. White. "Dissertation Research in Public Administration and Cognate Fields: An Assessment of Methods and Quality." Paper Delivered at the *Berkeley Symposium on Public Management Research.* University of California at Berkeley. 1993.

Babbie, Earl. *The Practice of Social Research.* 6th Edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. 1992.

Beck, Terry. Applied Research Project (Content Analysis of Applied Research Projects 1987-1991). Southwest Texas State University. 1993.

Blunt, Barrie E. "Developments in Public Administration Pedagogy: 1880 to the Present" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W.Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 609-632.

Box, Richard C. "An Examination of the Debate Over Research in Public Administration" *Public Administration Review.* vol. 52 no. 1 (1992): 62-69.

Bowman, James. "Managerial Theory and Practice: The Transfer of Knowledge in Public Administration" *Public Administration Review.* vol. 38 no. 6 (1978): 563-570.

Bozeman, B. *Public Management and Policy Analysis.* New York: St. Martin's Press. 1979.

Brown, Brack. "The Search for Public Administration: Roads Not Followed" *Public Administration Review.* vol. 49 no.2 (1989): 215-216.

Burke, Catherine G. "Themes from the History of American Public Administration: Rethinking Our Past" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 43-103.

Catron, Bayard L. and Michael M. Harmon. "Action Theory in Practice: Toward a theory without a conspiracy." *Public Administration Review.* vol. 41 no. 5 (1981): 535-541.

Cleary, Robert E. "What Do Public Administration Masters

Programs Look Like? Do They Do What is Needed?" *Public Administration Review*. vol. 50 no. 6 (1990): 663-673.

Cleary, Robert E. "Revisiting the Doctoral Dissertation in Public Administration: An Examination of the Dissertations of 1990." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 52 no. 1 (1992): 55-61.

Cope, Glen Hahn. Associate Dean, LBJ School of Public Affairs. Interview with the Author. March 7, 1994.

Dahl, Robert A. "Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 7 no.4 (1947): 281-283.

Dahl, Robert A. "The Science of Administration: Three Problems." In *Administrative Questions and Political Answers* (C.E. Hawleyand R. Weintraub, eds.) Van Nostrand, New York. (1966): 23-33. From PAR, 41: 535-541.

Daneke, Gregory A. "A Science of Public Administration?" *Public Administration Review*. vol. 50 no. 3 (1990): 383-391.

deLeon, Peter and E. Sam Overman. "History of the Policy Sciences." In *Handbook of Public Administration Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 405-442.

Denhardt, Robert B. "Public Administration Theory: The State of the Discipline." In Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky, eds., *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House. 1990.

Denhardt, Robert B. "Five Great Issues in Organization Theory" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 105-127.

Duncan, Marilyn. Director, LBJ School Office of Publications: *Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs 1993-1995*. University of Texas at Austin. 1993.

Fry, Brian R. "Five Great Issues in the Profession of Public Administration" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 1027-1075.

Gargan, John J. "The Public Administration Community and the Search for Professionalism" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989): 965-1026.

Gulick, Luther. *The National Institute of Public Administration*. The National Institute of Public Administration, New York. 1928.

Gulick, Luther. "The Scientific Approach to the Problems of Society and Government." *University of Buffalo Studies,* 15 (1938): 27-34.

Harmon, Michael M. *Action Theory for Public Administration*. New York: Longman. 1981.

Houston, David J. and Sybil M. Delevan. "Public Administration Research: An Assessment of Journal Publications." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 50 no. 6 (1990):674-681.

Hummel, Ralph P. "Stories Managers Tell: Why They Are as Valid as Science." *Public Administration Review*. vol.51 no.1 (1991):31-41.

Kaplan, Abraham. *The Conduct of Inquiry*. San Francisco: Chandler. 1964.

Kerlinger, Fred N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1986.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1977.

McCurdy, Howard E. "The Dismal Quality of Public Administration Research." Discussion Pieces of the Barnard Society, U.S.A., No. 4 (undated).

McCurdy, Howard E. and Robert E. Cleary. "Why Can't We Resolve the Research Issue in Public Administration?" *Public Administration Review*. vol. 44 no. 1 (1984): 49-55.

McCurdy, Howard E. and Robert E. Cleary. "A Call for 'Appropriate Methods.'" *Public Administration Review*. vol. 44 no. 6. (1984):553-554.

Merson, R. "Public Administration: A science?" *Public Administration*. vol. 1 (1923):220-227.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press. 1959.

Morgan, David R., Kenneth J. Meier, Richard C. Kearney, Steven W. Hays and Harold B. Birch. "Reputation and Productivity Among U.S. Public Administration and Public Affairs Programs." *Public Administration Review*. vol.

41 no. 6 (1981):666-673.

Morgan, David R. and Kenneth J. Meier. "Reputation and Productivity of Public Administration/Affairs Programs: Additional Data." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 42 no. 2 (1982):171-173.

Olufs, Dick W. "Improving Reasoned Choice Through Education in Public Administration" *Southern Review of Public Administration* 6 (Summer 1982):63.

Perry, James L. and Kenneth L. Kraemer. "Research Methodology in the Public Administration Review, 1975-1984." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 46 no. 3 (1986):215-226.

Popper, Karl. *Objective Knowledge*. Oxford, England: University Press. 1972.

Schutz, A. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Translated by G. Walsh and F. Lehnert. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Illinois. 1967.

Shields, Patricia M. "Role of Pragmatism in Shaping Administrative Behavior." Paper Delivered at the *Berkeley Symposium on Public Management Research*. University of California at Berkeley. 1993.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Process in Administrative Organization*, 2nd ed. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Stallings, Robert A. "Doctoral Programs in Public Administration: An Outsider's Perspective." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 46 no. 3 (1986):235-240.

Stallings, Robert A., and James M. Ferris, 1988. "Public Administration Research: Work in PAR, 1940-1984." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 48 no. 1 (1988): 580-586.

Thayer, Frederick C. "Understanding Research." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 44 no. 6 (1984):552-553.

Thompson, Frank J. "Is University Training Practical? Perceptions of Public Personnel Officials" *Public Administration Review*. vol. 38 no. 1 (1978): 82-89.

Waldo, Dwight. *The Administrative State*. New York: Ronald Press. 1949.

Waldo, Dwight. "Administrative Theory in the United States: A Survey and Prospect." *Political Studies*, 2 (1954):70-86.

Waldo, Dwight. *Perspectives on Public Administration*.

University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama. 1956.

Waldo, Dwight. "Organization Theory: An Elephantine Problem," *Public Administration Review*. 21 (1961):210-255.

Waldo, Dwight. "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration" In *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods* (J.C. Charlesworth, ed.) Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. (1968):1-26.

Waldo, Dwight. "Political Science: Tradition, Discipline, Profession, Science, Enterprise." In *Handbook of Political Science* 1 (F.I.Greenstein and N.W. Polsby, eds.). Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachesetts. (1975): 1-130.

Waldo, Dwight, *The Enterprise of Public Administration: A Summary View*. Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp. 1980.

Watson, Donald J. and Montjoy, Robert J. "Research on Local Government in *Public Administration Review*." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 51 no. 2 (1991) 166-170.

Whelan, Robert K. "Data Administration and Research Methods in Public Administration" In *Handbook of Public Administration* (Rabin, Jack, Hildreth, W. Bartley, Miller, Gerald J., eds.) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1989):657-682.

White, L.D. "The Meaning of Principles in Public Administration." In *The Frontiers of Public Administration* (J.M. Gaus, L.D. White, and M.E. Dimock, eds.), Chicago:University of Chicago Press (1936):13-25.

White, Jay D. "Public Policy Analysis: Reason, Method, and Praxis." Doctoral Dissertation: George Washington University. 1982.

White, Jay D. "On the Growth of Knowledge in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 46 no.1 (1986):15-24.

White, Jay D. "Dissertations and Publications in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*. vol. 46 no.3 (1986):227-234.

Willoughby, W.F. *Principles of Public Administration*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore Maryland. 1927.

Wilson, Woodrow. "The Study of Administration." *Political Science Quarterly* 2 (1887):197-222.

Appendix A: Codesheet for Content Analysis.

______Variable I Year
1 1988
2 1989
3 1990

______Variable II Number of Pages
1 < 50
2 < 100
3 > 100

______Variable III Title______________________________

______Variable IV Author______________________________

______Variable V Topic
1 Administrative Theory
2 Management
3 Policy making/analysis/evaluation
4 Planning
5 Personnel
6 Finance/budgeting
7 Intergovernmental Relations
8 Other

______Variable VI Policy Area
1 Human resources/Social Policy
2 International Policy
3 Urban/Regional Policy
4 Environmental/Regulatory Policy
5 Strategic Management/Fiscal & Economic Policy
8 Other

______Variable VII Level of Government
1 Local
2 State
3 Federal
8 Other

______Variable VIII Research Purpose 1
Conceptual
1 - Problem delineation
2 - Variable identification
Relational
3 - Determining relationships between variables
4 - Establishing causality among variables
5 - Manipulation of variables for policy making
Evaluation
6 - Evaluation of alternative policies/programs
8 - Other

______Variable IX Research Purpose 2
1 Explanatory
2 Interpretive
3 Critical
8 Other

______Variable X Research Design
1 Preexperimental
2 Case study
3 Correlational
4 Quasi-experimental

5 Experimental
8 Other

______Variable XI Statistical Techniques
1 Univariate
2 Bivariate
3 Cross tabulations
4 Chi square
5 ANOVA
6 Bivariate regression
7 MANOVA
8 Other
9 Multiple regression
10 Path Analysis
11 Non-linear analysis
12 Non-empirical

______Variable XII Focus
1 Theory building or theoretical
2 Issues orientation
3 Problem resolution or mostly practical
8 Not determined

______Variable XIII Gender
1 Male
2 Female
8 Not determined

______Variable XIV Conceptual Framework
1 Explicit
2 Implicit
8 None

______Variable XV Test Hypotheses
1 Explicit
2 Implicit
8 None

______Variable XVI Research relevant to Theory
1 yes
2 possibly
8 no

______Variable XVII Practical relevance within setting
1 yes
2 possibly
8 no

______Variable XVIII Practical relevance beyond setting
1 yes
2 possibly
8 no

Appendix B. Frequency Distributions.

Chart B.1. Page Lengths of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

PAGE LENGTHS	1988	1989	1990	Total
Less than 50 pages	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (1.4%)
51 - 100 pages	7 (37%)	11 (52%)	10 (34%)	28 (40%)
Greater than 100 pages	12 (63%)	10 (48%)	19 (63%)	41 (59%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)
Mean	119.1	107.5	109.5	111.5
Median	106	93	105	105

Chart B.2 Gender of Authors: Professional Reports 1988-1990.

GENDER	1988	1989	1990	Total
Male	8 (42%)	12 (57%)	16 (53%)	36 (51%)
Female	11 (58%)	9 (43%)	14 (47%)	34 (49%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.3 Topical Areas of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

TOPICS	1988	1989	1990	Total
Administrative Theory	0 (0%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (2.9%)
Management	0 (0%)	1 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)
Policy Analysis/Eval.	9 (47%)	16 (76%)	25 (83%)	50 (71%)
Planning	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.3%)
Personnel	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.9%)
Finance	5 (26%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.3%)	7 (10%)
Intergovt'l Relations	0 (0%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (4.3%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.6%)	2 (2.9%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.4 Policy Areas of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

POLICY AREAS	1988	1989	1990	Total
Human Resources/Social	10 (53%)	7 (33%)	17 (57%)	34 (49%)
International Policy	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (1.4%)
Urban/Regional Policy	1 (5.2%)	3 (14%)	2 (6.7%)	6 (8.6%)
Environment/Regulatory	2 (11%)	4 (19%)	5 (17%)	11 (16%)
Strategies/Fiscal Pol.	6 (32%)	5 (24%)	4 (13%)	15 (21%)
Other	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (4.3%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.5 Research Purpose of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

RESEARCH PURPOSE	1988	1989	1990	Total
Problem Delineation	9 (47%)	6 (28%)	13 (43%)	28 (40%)
Identify Variables	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (2.9%)
Variable Relationships	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (2.9%)
Establishing Causality	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (2.9%)
Variable Manipulation	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.3%)
Evaluation: policy/prg	6 (32%)	12 (57%)	14 (47%)	32 (46%)
Other	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)
*** Explanatory	4 (21%)	2 (9.5%)	3 (10%)	9 (13%)
Interpretive	4 (21%)	3 (14%)	6 (20%)	13 (19%)
Critical	3 (16%)	3 (14%)	7 (23%)	13 (19%)
Other	8 (42%)	13 (62%)	14 (47%)	35 (50%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.6 Research Design of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

DESIGN	1988	1989	1990	Total
Preexperimental	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0 %)
Case Study	3 (16%)	4 (19%)	7 (23%)	14 (20%)
Correlation	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (13%)	6 (8.6%)
Quasi-experimental	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)
Not Applicable	15 (79%)	15 (71%)	19 (63%)	49 (70%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.7 Statistical Techniques: Professional Reports 1988-1990.

TECHNIQUES	1988	1989	1990	Total
Univariate	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.8%)
Bi-variate	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (2.8%)
Cross-tabulation	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.6%)	3 (4.3%)
Chi-square	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.8%)
ANOVA	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)
Regression	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.6%)	2 (2.8%)
None	13 (68%)	20 (95%)	25 (84%)	58 (83%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.8 Conceptual Frameworks: Professional Reports 1988-1990.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	1988	1989	1990	Total
Explicit	5 (26%)	2 (10%)	7 (23%)	14 (20%)
Inferred	9 (47%)	7 (33%)	12 (40%)	28 (40%)
None	5 (26%)	12 (57%)	11 (37%)	28 (40%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.9 Testing of Hypotheses: Professional Reports 1988-1990.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES	1988	1989	1990	Total
Explicit	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (6%)	4 (6%)
Inferred	4 (21%)	3 (14%)	5 (17%)	12 (17%)
None	14 (74%)	17 (81%)	23 (77%)	54 (77%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.10 Relevance to Theory/Practice: PRs 1988-1990.

RELEVANCE TO THEORY	1988	1989	1990	Total
YES	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)	3 (4%)
POSSIBLY	4 (21%)	5 (24%)	5 (17%)	14 (20%)
NO	14 (74%)	15 (71%)	24 (80%)	53 (76%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

RELEVANCE TO PRACTICE	1988	1989	1990	Total
YES	8 (42%)	2 (9%)	8 (27%)	18 (26%)
POSSIBLY	7 (37%)	18 (86%)	20 (67%)	45 (64%)
NO	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	2 (6%)	7 (10%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

RELEVANT BEYOND SETTING	1988	1989	1990	Total
YES	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)
POSSIBLY	3 (16%)	5 (24%)	16 (53%)	24 (34%)
NO	15 (79%)	16 (76%)	14 (47%)	45 (64%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.11 Level of Government Focus: PRs 1988-1990.

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	1988	1989	1990	Total
Local/County	9 (47%)	3 (14%)	4 (13%)	16 (23%)
State	6 (31%)	10 (48%)	11 (37%)	27 (39%)
Federal	2 (11%)	7 (33%)	10 (33%)	19 (27%)
Other	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	5 (17%)	8 (11%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.12 Research Focus of Professional Reports 1988-1990.

FOCUS	1988	1989	1990	Total
Theoretical	2 (11%)	2 (9.5%)	2 (7%)	6 (8.6%)
Practical	5 (26%)	2 (9.5%)	13 (43%)	20 (28%)
Issues Orientation	12 (63%)	17 (81%)	15 (50%)	44 (63%)
N	*19* (100%)	*21* (100%)	*30* (100%)	*70* (100%)

Chart B.13 Percent Distributions on All Variables.

Size of Professional Reports

Report Size	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 50 pages	1	1.4%
51-100 pages	28	40.0%
More than 100 pages	41	58.6%
Total	70	100.0%
***		
Mean 111 pages		
Median 105 pages		
Mode 107 pages		

N=70

Gender of Authors

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	36	51.4%
Female	34	48.6%
Total	70	100.0%

N=70

Topical Areas of PRs

Topic Area	Number of PRs	% of PRs
Administrative Theory	2	2.86%
Management	1	1.42%
Policy Making/Analysis/Evaluation	50	71.43%
Planning	3	4.28%
Personnel	2	2.86%
Finance	7	10.00%
Intergovernmental Relations	3	4.28%
Other	2	2.86%
Total	70	100.00%

N=70

Appendix C: Transcript of an Interview with Glen Cope, Associate Dean of the LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin. March 7, 1994.

Q: What are your thoughts on the theory-practice distinction in public administration?

A: You cannot have theory without practice nor practice without theory although practice does not always actively engage theory and theory sometimes ignores practice. I think public administration and public policy are applied fields so practice has to be part of it. Certainly some of us are more in tuned to it than others. I say "us" meaning everybody in the country or the world that is doing it. Some people are more theoreticians and some people are more practically oriented. There are very few pure, basic researchers in the field broadly, because it is not a basic research field. It is an applied field.

Q: So, would you say that the LBJ School has an interest in adding to the theoretical basis of the field or is it essentially an applied curriculum?

A: Well, it depends on what you're talking about. The faculty members in the LBJ School clearly do theory in their writings and their own research. We have a Ph.D. program and that is clearly intended to look at theory and to train people in the theories in the field. The masters program is an applied program so, although we teach various theories that relate to public policy, it is intended to be an applied masters...training people to go out and work in the practical, real world. So, we are not training our masters students to be theoreticians, we are training our Ph.D. students to be researchers and theorists. So, when you say the LBJ School, it depends on whether you are talking about one of the masters programs, the Ph.D. program, one of our other non-degree programs or the faculty research. There are clearly some theoretical people on the faculty, there are some that don't do theory on the faculty...that do applied research.

Q: So, if one were to look at LBJ doctoral dissertations there would be a clear difference in research design between the doctoral and the masters level research?

A: Yes, because no dissertations have been produced yet! The Ph.D. program started in 1992 and has produced no dissertations yet. I would think that some of them will be much more theoretically oriented, some of them will not be so theoretically oriented, just because that is the nature of a policy research area. They will all be original research, they will all be rigorous in some fashion, whether statistically so or otherwise. Our faculty are from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds and our Ph.D. students study with various members of our faculty. The same is true of the masters students.

Q: After some discussion with Dr. Shields, I came to this research with a presumption that research at LBJ stresses economics, econometric models and a positivist approach. I was slightly surprised after looking at the professional reports that they generally do not reflect that approach.

A: Well, you have to remember that our faculty has about 25 regular or full-time faculty members, about 30 or 31 if you count part-timers and visitors and all that. Some of those people are very econometrically inclined and the dissertations and professional reports that come out from those people are econometric, they have lots of numbers, charts and graphs and those students play on the computer. We also have some political scientists, a few lawyers, a sociologist or two, some of whom are quantitative and some are not. So if you figure a 1000, 1500 graduates that have all written these things...the first few years they did something called an independent research project with three options...one was a sort of practicum where the student was to go out and do good things and write us a journal about it. But after the first three or four years, they began to standardize on the professional report. So through those years we have had a lot of very rigorous reports and a lot of them that aren't. Probably the number that aren't outnumber the ones that are because the number of faculty who aren't outnumber the number of faculty who are. Pat Shield's view comes partially because she interacted a significant amount with the economics faculty and they are the ones that are more rigorous; those are the people she got to know here, they're the ones who she knew best. I think some of the students who took her courses which were all economics oriented were skewed in a particular way. But there are other faculty members, who she knows, that if you mentioned their names, she would say, "yeah, their reports won't come out that way." So, if you looked at the numbers, my guess is that maybe a quarter of them would be heavily quantitative and some other proportion would be in the middle and maybe more than half, maybe two-thirds, would be on some continuum, some very mushy, some very legalistic and not econometric at all.

Q: In looking at the first year, 1988, less than 10% of the reports tested hypotheses or had an explicit or inferred conceptual framework. The reports appear to be policy review and policy argumentation or advocacy. So, essentially, is that the research design?

A: That tends to be the model. It is intended to be a report such as one would do on an issue for a consulting job or for a boss in an agency or something like that. In some cases it is appropriate to do very theoretical, rigorous, quantitative approach and in some cases it is not. That is the intention of the report. It is a little different from the way you do it at Southwest Texas because you have a methods course, there is a very clear research design, everybody fits into a particular research design, mostly taught by Pat Shields, and it all fits a particular model. In our case, it doesn't. There is no course like that and the idea is that this is supposed to be a simulation, but a real world simulation of what someone would do in policy analysis on the job. So it's a very different model. Pat and I have not really talked about that. There also is a difference in who the readers are. You can look at who signed the report....if I were to look at a report and see that this one has econometrics in it, I could almost tell you who signed it versus something that is legal research or very policy oriented and very argumentative but not necessarily very rigorous. The students tend to gravitate toward faculty like themselves. The professional reports that I read must have a research topic. They do not have to test a hypothesis but they have to have an issue, they have to have a strong analysis of an issue in it. There are other people that are not that strong on such things, and argumentation is fine. We try to get away from them being purely descriptive. I think that if you looked at any university, at Southwest Texas or anywhere else, there will be a few that you may or may not have pulled in your sample, that we say, "this is the best we'll ever get out of this student...sign this sucker!"

Q: The reports appear to involve extensive analysis, most are over 100 pages in length and seem to concentrate on social policy with respect to local and state governments. There do not seem to be reports on policy implementation.

A: Yes, margins requirements have a lot to do with the page lengths! Topics are mostly social policy and environmental policy...policy implementation is not our strong suit...presumably that comes up in other parts of the curriculum.

Q: Isn't there also a required research course? Does it generate a research report?

A: Yes, there is a required course. It generally produces a research report which is generally published by the school. It is a group research project as opposed to the professional, individual report. Some of the projects are implementation, some analysis, some developmental. It depends on who the client is. They are all done for a client agency. Almost all are consulting jobs for which the agency pays but only the specific out of pocket expenses. These are group projects and some are very rigorous, lots of econometric analysis. Almost all of them have that quantitative base to them. But not all. There was one on Native American policy that didn't necessarily come up with reports or do rigorous research but it found grant money for the Native American tribes, helped economic development and put on conferences. A different kind of product. More of an implementation project. That's okay too, we try to let a dozen or so flowers bloom every year.

Q: Your Ph.D. is in Public Administration? What is the difference between public administration and policy science?

A: My Ph.D. (and Pat's) is from Ohio State. They now call the school Public Policy Management. So we can call ourselves whatever we choose. My personal orientation is toward public administration. Interestingly, were Pat at LBJ, her orientation would be more toward policy because of her strong economics background, which I also have. Both of us have undergraduate degrees in economics. We are a lot alike in many ways, but we won't get into that.

The difference depends on which side you look at it from. Public administration is seen by public policy types as being soft, muddled around the edges, interested in management and personnel and things that are sort of mundane. Policy types view themselves as being interested in economic analysis, as policy started from the economics side. And political analysis with a capital 'P.' And they see themselves as analysts and advisors and politicians. So they look to work for a congressional committee or a consulting firm or a research organization. And they sort of look down on public administration because they are just the implementers, the flunkies who do what is said to do. Sometimes when they get into the real world, they develop a healthy respect for those people who try to get things done. But the academics, especially, are not as respected. From the public administration side, people see themselves as professionals, administering, implementing, managing organizations...Getting things done, making government be a better place. And they are concerned about real live issues in personnel and budget and much more with a management scope, going back to the 1920's or 1890's, the neutral competence idea..."you tell us what the policy is and we'll make it work." There has been a little graying of that area now that maybe we should try to influence it to be the right policy in the first place, but still there is the sense of "whatever you've got, we'll make it work." There is a real philosophical difference there, between the political influencers on one side and the implementers on the other. My personal orientation is more toward the public administration side, that's been my background which is not the majority of the faculty here at the LBJ School.

Q: I detected in the professional reports a blurring of the distinction between fact and values. Is there an explicitly normative slant to the professional reports?

A: On the policy side there is clearly much more of a willingness to blur the fact/value lines. The policy approach is not to make that distinction. You want to be of influence, you want to have your values come out and be influential, so a policy researcher would have no qualms at all about crossing those lines, back and forth, all the time. You better have the facts and they better be persuasive and have the value side too. Whereas, the administration side, as you know, is less likely to make those blurs. But, it never was a strict dichotomy, it never can be.

Q: But social values, for example, social equity, are inherent in your policy analyses?

A: Yes, and representativeness, and all those kind of social values of the polity or the bureaucracy that serves it.

Q: I have read one of your articles, on diffusion of innovations. It shows a clear conceptual framework, tests hypotheses and has an elegant sort of variable grid. I am sure Dr. Shields chose this research to illustrate that case studies can be used in explanatory work. Are case studies a major part of the professional report?

A: Yes, and by the way, if I don't get that grid updated and we don't get that published some place, Vivian's going to kill me. My co-author, Vivian Davis is another Ohio State Ph.D. now at Ohio State, specializing in innovation in utility regulation.

Case studies are very popular in the professional reports. Often, the student has gone off in the summer to do an internship. Many of the professional reports will come out of an issue that came up during their internship. They may have gotten data from the case study there... they may not have, they may go out and do it elsewhere. But, doing a case study is something that is more manageable. Some students do surveys. There was a period of time when surveys were very popular, early to mid-1980s. Lately, some of us have been discouraging them, simply because of the time frame is so short. If you don't get the survey done in the Fall, you are not going to graduate on time. The time to get them in and analysed...so, it's hard. Some students do structured interviews instead of surveys. If the data are available, some students do more quantitative analysis. And we have some that go on internships, say, to Hungary or Poland and bring data from there. We had some that were there the first Summer that things started to open up and that was exciting. They were faxing us back: "I'm working with the committee that's rewriting the local government code. Send us everything you've got on local government!" They were asking how we did it in Texas... we said, "how 'bout we tell what's good?" So, some of the professional reports that came out of that were not the most rigorous, but they were sort of... right there at the edge, they reported something that was important. It would be interesting to go back and see if the predictions turned out.

Q: I notice that you serve on both NASPAA and APPAM committees. What influence do these organizations have on curriculum?

A: Yeah, I'm weird, and actually Brent Milward, who is also an Ohio State grad and head of the program at the University of Arizona, serves on both these...I'm chair of the institutional representatives on APPAM. APPAM has a caucus of all the institutional representatives and I'm chair of that caucus. I'm also on the executive committee of NASPAA this year, not representing the school, that's the Dean. So, its sort of schizophrenic.

We are an accredited program under NASPAA, so clearly NASPAA standards for accreditation influence our curriculum...we make sure that we fit into those. NASPAA standards are flexible, there's no requirement that you must have a course in this, it says you have to cover these things. So, we may put less emphasis on some things and more on others and some other school the other way. But we do meet their standards. In order to be accredited you do a self-study and then they come and do a site visit and look you over and write a report on that and then from that the accreditation commission actually makes the decision. I've actually sat on the accreditation commission and I've done some site visits and I've written, or co-written the self-study for this place.

Q: Are those self-studies published or placed on the library shelf here?

A: I don't know whether our self-studies are in the library or not.

Q: I think I saw an old report that Emmette Redford did years ago, at the outset, I think, of the program.

A: That's probably the study that created the program and there was a consultant study done in the early years by a guy named Peter Bell...and some changes in the curriculum were made as a result of that. We periodically review the curriculum. Frankly, the self-study would give you some statistics and some other information but the catalog is going to be much more helpful to you in terms of the curriculum and what's in it than the self-study because the self-study is focused on...checking to see...tell us how you meet the standards. Having written them and read them and I was on a site visit last week...you are going to get a much better picture of things if you read our catalog.

Q: Is there a credibility problem in the policy sciences? Is there a controversy analogous to the debate in public administration over research quality?

A: The people who really push it being policy science are most of the economists, so if you buy that economics is a science then policy science is the applied side of economics. They don't seem to have any credibility problem if you're coming from that perspective. I don't particularly like the term policy science. I think 'policy analysis' is a much better term. The LBJ School is considered to be a policy school by most of the people who work here and by the field. But I think 'analysis' is a better word than science but the economists like 'science.' If you can say political science is a science, you can say anything...or...you can say sociology is a social science.

Q: Surveys of NASPAA and ASPA usually rank the school high. What accounts for the prestige of the school?

A: The school always does well but those surveys are so hoaky. It depends on where the polls choose to look. In terms of publications from the school, if one looks in public administration publications, we don't come out well because that is not where a lot of our people publish. But if they look more in policy and economics side, then we come out okay. If they survey alumni, we have enough, so we come out fine. Usually Harvard, the Maxwell School and USC come out in some relationship of one, two and three in surveys of alumni because they have more and the rest of us fall somewhere down the line.

Q: Are there any attempts through core courses in the curriculum to prepare future managers and administrators?

A: Some graduates do go on to public management. There is a required core course called public administration and management and that course covers personnel and management techniques and issues and is intended to prepare them...some of them will not end up managing people...but most of them will as they rise in their career. It is not the emphasis of the curriculum but we recognize that it needs to be there. And then there is another quantitative course called analytic methods for decision making. That course includes PERT charting and project management and those sort of things.

Q: Are you aware of whether anyone has previously done an analysis of PRs?

A: People had talked about doing one but I don't know, I couldn't put my hands on it. I have this vague recollection that somebody was going to do that and I don't have any idea who did it, or if it got done or where it is. If I come up with anything, I'll let you know.

Q: I have a concern here...clearly my framework for analysis is focused on evaluation of research. I am concerned that it not be too rigid and narrow to apply to the professional reports as it borrows heavily from mainstream meta-analyses in terms of the criteria for legitimate and quality research. I may need a hint as to a more comprehensive elaboration of variables....to better analyze the reports. Is there a uniform research design that sort of underlies these reports?

A: There is no single research design, that is the problem. Because, if you think of it as being a policy analysis instead of a...instead of a rigorous research design...project, that will help some. The problem is, sometimes if you look at them there will be data, there will be hypothesis testing, there will be quantitative analysis and in other cases, the issue, the research question, will be something like..."what's the possibility that democratization will stick in Hungary?" And it will clearly be a case study kind of analysis without a real rigorous framework and without necessarily longitudinal data or anything like that. It will be based on one year's worth of data. And that's the problem when you analyze something like professional reports, they are all over the map. Some of it is based on the faculty person involved. The ones that I read, I insist that they be analytical, at least qualitatively if not quantitatively analytical. But I couldn't guarantee you that every faculty member says that.

We do have a competition for the best paper and usually it's a professional report every year and the committee varies from year to year, it rotates. And I've been on that committee and therefore read a lot of them that I had read, that I was the supervisor of.

Q: Are there objective criteria for that prize?

A: Well, the criteria are...that it be...legitimate policy analysis and that it be the best one...that you get nominated...You know, it kind of...there aren't a set of.... It's named after Emmette Redford who is one of the founding faculty members and...it's for the best piece of work. It doesn't have to be a PR, it could be a paper for a class, too. In practice, mostly it's the reports that win. We do have an option, for a master's thesis too, those do have to follow a thesis design. You won't find many in the library, we are trying to gather them all in, they are over with the rest of the theses in PCL. There are very few of them that have been done. The option has only been available for the last couple of years and some of us actually discourage students from doing it because it's ridiculous, it's not...this isn't a scholarly degree. A few students do them and do them well, but it doesn't have that same kind of rigorous...this is the way it has to look.

So I think if you think of it as a policy analysis...they are supposed to have an analytical bent to them and there will be some you'll find that don't. They will be just descriptive. But for the most part, they should. We are not as structured as you are at SWT...we have not had, per se, a research methods course. We have the analytic methods for decision making course and an econometrics or statistics course. The primary tools have been statistics and econometric analysis. We don't teach research methods because the students are supposed to learn it on the job in the policy research projects. They are required to take one and encouraged to take two. So if they take one of those each year, and it's different, they are supposed to get exposed to a variety of research methods and research designs. They actually design the project, we have a client, we have a charge, we have a need, and then students are supposed to participate during the design and actually figuring out what to do, and carrying it out, and doing it in groups and going through and writing the report at the end. So, we pick it up in a less structured way and a more hands-on, applied way. The school's trademark, since it was founded in 1970, has been this policy research project and all of the hands-on approach which means we have been less academic in our approach than a lot of other places.

Q: Is this the approach of public policy schools starting in the 1960s and 1970s....a reaction to the academic public administration model as being somehow obsolete?

A: Yes, they were not rigorous enough, they did not take into consideration economic analysis enough, and they weren't as quantitatively oriented. And that they emphasized too much the bureaucracy and the personnel, maybe the budget stuff as opposed to the content, really of the policy side. I think policy science is a bit of a misnomer, but of course, you know why it's used, it sounds more exciting and rigorous.

Q: So, the faculty is not really interested in generating a new paradigm for public administration/public affairs?

A: Probably not. Much more interested in policy. There are a few faculty members here who are strongly management oriented. Each has a particular policy area they're interested in. Environmental policy, economic policy, health policy, etc. And they want to be influential personally through their own research, their own testimony before congress... you see Jamie Galbraith, on our faculty, all the time on CNN, C-SPAN, McNeil-Lehrer...actually on McNeil-Lehrer more than anywhere else. They have an interest in influencing policy in the particular policy area that they work in, in addition to whatever their disciplinary background is. Very few people are more interested in a management area like personnel or budget. Most of them have some policy area that they're really interested in. And it is a distinct disadvantage not to have such a policy area because that is really the focus of the school.

Q: Finally, I do want to get your views on the future of our field. We are beleaquered these days from all sides...both academics and practitioners are accused of not knowing what they're doing because they are not scientific enough...

A: Yeah, we do get sort of attacked by lots of places. And honestly policy schools attack PA schools, saying they're not rigorous enough...I don't know...I think the field clearly has a future. What direction it is going to go I find hard to predict. I think you can't have just policy analysis because somebody has got to go out there and implement the policy, manage the agencies and make government be better. The movement right now toward performance reviews and re-engineering government and all those kinds of things is a movement toward public administration as opposed to public policy, very clearly. And to the extent that it is not captured by the policy people it will probably cause a resurgence toward a picture of the need for better management. The Volker (?) report, several years ago, focused on personnel and bureaucracy issues. The Winter Commission reports in the last year on state and local government...which by the way the Dean of the LBJ School and Ray Marshall, who is also on our faculty were on that commission and several of our faculty submitted research papers to it. Those reports, again, have come out looking at management kinds of issues though they were also on health policy which were how we make sense of the health system.

Q: Is this an overreaction, this move to reinvent government?

A: Well, reinventing government made a splash. It did...and I think...the book itself is not all that helpful. It has parts in it that are good and parts in it that are..."that's nice, here's an anecdote, I can give you a different one." There's some very good stuff in that book but there's also some very shallow stuff in there. I think that is true of a lot of what is coming out right now from the performance review. If you look at John Sharp's performance review...if you look at the national performance review...some of the stuff they are coming out with are policy issues..."we shouldn't do this, we'll save a billion dollars"...well, that is a policy question. It's not a management question. Some of what is coming out of it are management issues. I think the problem is that what gets emphasized or what gets play are the policy issues because that is where the big bucks are...and that's what everybody gets up in arms about. The real needs are some of those management and personnel kinds of issues that come out...what makes sense in the federal bureaucracy, what makes it work or not work. I don't know how much you have looked into the federal bureaucracy but if you reformed the civil service structure and changed things along those lines so that the incentives were all in the right direction instead of being all over the map now...that might make a big difference in how our government actually operates, not what congress does, but what Health and Human Services does. And, I think the same thing is true at the state level. A lot of what came out was very good. It came out from the people in those agencies, what people like you had been saying for all those years and somebody listened for once, which is often what comes out of those things. The other stuff that came out was John Sharp's version of what the policy ought to be.

Q: All this talk about just running government like a business, do you think that's overdone?

A: Yeah, I can set my clock by that. About every 15 years you have some commission come in and run around the country and talk about running government like a business. You get all these business people to come in, like in John Sharp's case, they were state employees and borrowed people from national thing...in the late 1970s there was a movement and they had commissions, called King commissions because some guy named King was pushing them nationwide. And probably 25 states had these commissions, called different things in different states. They brought in people, on loan, for 3 months or 6 months, from big corporations in the state. They came in and looked at all the agencies and tried to figure out how they could do things more efficiently. Well...I haven't looked at all the state reports, I know the one from the state I was in at the time pretty well. Ninety percent of what they said was stuff that the employees of the agencies had been saying for years. You wouldn't have needed these guys to come in if someone had listened to the people, if you had had TQM that really worked, or something. And TQM is another thing, all that stuff that's sweeping the country and is going to save us all. I think the whole movement is good if it recognizes that government can be improved and that government can do well and do good things. I think that is an image booster for government and helps the public see that government is not all bad. On the other hand, it goes the other way, if they say well, this is so horrible, we have to fix it...I don't know. But I think in some ways, some of this is good because it puts people's attention on some of these questions and they're beginning to see that some things are done well. One thing that *Reinventing Government*, the book, did was, on the one side it said "here are some things that are going well" and on the other side, "boy, why isn't everybody doing that." Everybody's not a small town in California...

Q: The whole privatization issue is another example?

A: Oh, privatization is the biggest...you're going to have this on tape...I don't know whether I should say...it's the biggest boondoggle. You save money in privatization. How do you save money? You don't do things you did before. You pay the employees less, you don't give them benefits. There are some things that are better privatized, should have been all along and were, in some cases, all along. There are some things that you ought not privatize. I have real qualms about private prisons. You know, you're depriving people of liberty. Should that be done by a for-profit organization? I don't know. Private police? I don't know. On the other hand, I don't see any problem with having cafeterias in state buildings run by some contractor. It's probably better. Force them to make a profit. Charge them rent. Whatever. There are laws in all the states. In Texas, all the cafeterias are run by the blind. In Michigan they used to have stands that sold candy, sandwiches, etc. run by the blind. I don't know, maybe it's good that they use the blind so they make more money or something, but I think privatization should be looked at very carefully. It ought to be used where it works. There are some things that can be done better by the private sector and government shouldn't do those things. When you look at things like social services, children's youth services, foster care. Foster care is all privatized. You give a stipend to a foster parent but they are not an employee of the state, they're a contractor. Adoption services are done in some states by a state agency while some states have contracted out that function to adoption agencies that say we'll pay this amount of money and give you thirty days to place every baby you get and anybody they can't place in thirty days, the state takes over. So the state specializes in high risk and the adoption agencies do the thing they've always done best, which is place the blonde, blue-eyed kids that don't have problems. Well, it's much cheaper for the state to do that because of all the state workers required to do all the easy placements and the hard ones are more expensive. Things like that work very well privatized.

I teach about the difference between production and provision of public services. Government provides certain services. Whether they produce them or not ought to be a decision of what is the best way to get that thing done. Then you decide whether to pay for it, contract it out or do it ourselves. That ought to be both a value question as well as the efficiency side. Sort of...I don't care if privatization is more efficient or not, it shouldn't be privatized...that's the value side.

So, I don't know about the future of government. I know we're going to have government and people studying government. I do see in the curriculum a clear movement toward the center. Policy schools are recognizing they have got to teach management. They have to pay attention to those things, they can't turn out people that are only prepared to be deputy assistant secretaries. Which was always the criticism of the Kennedy School. On the other hand, the public administration programs have seen the need to have a little more economic analysis, a little more sense of policy analysis as part of the bag of tricks that their graduates have. So I see us moving toward the center, never quite reaching it.

Q: Is it true that the setting of the school, whether it is a stand alone program seems to significantly affect the curricula?

A: It does. Stand alone programs can go strongly toward policy or public administration, either way. The programs attached to political science schools are going to more public administration, more the subfield idea. If they're attached to a business school, sometimes it makes them more management and sometimes more policy oriented. It depends on whether there is a strong economics versus political science orientation.

Q: I see that several of your faculty have doctorates in public administration...

A: Yeah, let's see. Dick Schott has a Ph.D. from the Maxwell School in either Public Administration or political science, I think public administration. Ed Warner has a Ph.D. from the Maxwell School but it's the economics department. I've got a Ph.D. in public administration from Ohio State. Chandler Stolp has a Ph.D. from Carnegie-Mellon which is really more public policy. Pat Wong has a Ph.D. from Wisconsin in social welfare....

Q: The question concerning prestige of your school may turn on the number of stars on your faculty...

A: Oh yeah, we have Ray Marshall, he has a Ph.D. in economics. Barbara Jordan is a lawyer. Dagmar Hamilton who was, she's not as famous, on the Watergate staff with Hillary Clinton, she's a lawyer. The Dean's a lawyer. The Dean says he's a lawyer by training, a politician by choice and an academic by accident. Ken Tolo is a mathematician. Lodis Rhodes is a Ph.D. in social psychology. Weintraub and Warner are economics. Redford is political science. Galbraith is economics. Boske is economics. Bill Hobby is a journalist...politician really. Xinming Mu and Bob Wilson have community and regional planning backgrounds. Elspeth Rostow is a historian. Lynn Anderson is public administration. Terrel Blodgett is public administration. Jorge Chapa is a demographer, sociologist. Chrys Dougherty is an economist, Ph.D. from Harvard. Susan Hadden has a Ph.D. in political science but not PA, comparative. Bill

Spelman has a Ph.D. from Harvard, Kennedy School so that's more policy than public administration. Tom Keel is business administration. Victoria Rodriquez is a political scientist and PA is one of her fields. Peter Ward is a sociologist.

Q: These are impressive backgrounds, do these individuals represent the full spectrum in terms of ideologies?

A: We have a majority of faculty members who are Democrats. I don't know how they all will vote tomorrow but I would guess that the vast majority will vote in the Democratic primary, but not all. The majority of faculty members would say that they are liberals. Some of them are very far to the left. Some of them are just left slightly of center but most of them would say that they're liberals. There are two or three Republicans or an independent or two on the faculty but very few Republican conservatives, much more of the conservative Democrat ilk. We have been called a bunch of commie, pinkos at the LBJ School, although there really aren't any communists anymore. We are trying to get more Republicans...we have Tom Luce visiting... Like any such school, interested in social values, I'm sure it is similar at SWT, the field tends to be represented by more liberal individuals.

END OF TAPE.