

SERVING THE PUBLIC INTEREST? Federal Experiences With Participation in Strategic Planning

AIMEE L. FRANKLIN
University of Oklahoma

A clause in the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 instructs federal agencies to “consult with stakeholders during strategic plan development.” This requirement is a type of institutional control designed to ensure access to government operations and to keep government responsive to the public interest. Through structured interviews with representatives of the federal, cabinet-level departments, this research examined agency reactions to the Results Act in four areas: What process did agencies use to develop the strategic plan? Who participated? What mechanisms were used for participation? and What were the impacts of including stakeholders? The results suggest that despite minimal impact on the substantive content of federal agency strategic plans, the consultation requirement may have unintended benefits that, if institutionalized, will make government more responsive to the public interest.

The United States government is structured with the expectation that politicians and administrators are responsive to and serve the public interest rather than their own interests (Garvey, 1997). In this aspect, the American system has been designed to allow the election and appointment of leaders and public servants who are willing to represent the general population’s values and desires. The motto “government by the people and for the people” reflects the importance of a representative government.

When designing a governmental system, certain questions must be addressed: How is the public defined? How will the public interest be served, and by whom? Answering these questions is not easy. Consider the first one: In the American system, the public is simultaneously defined as (a) all citizens and residents of the United States; (b) a geographically defined group of individuals within a particular voting area; and (c) subpublics, or groups of people who share similar characteristics or have common needs or concerns, such as interest groups.

How will the public interest be served? Many different access points have been created to give the average person opportunities to interact with government. These access points are designed to ensure that politicians and administrators are responsive to individual citizens’ interests and also to the general will of the public and the subpublics they serve (Anderson, 1997). Access points also support the founders’

Initial Submission: August 30, 1999

Accepted: August 24, 2000

AMERICAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, Vol. 31 No. 2, June 2001 126-138
© 2001 Sage Publications, Inc.

belief in the necessity of including checks and balances to control dominance by any one set of actors in government (Gordon & Milakovich, 1998). A common example is the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946. Every government program that is subject to this act must follow a set procedure when considering new rules, regulations, or operational procedures. Part of this procedure is the requirement to provide opportunities for public input and comment on proposed changes. Recently, another access point was created through the passage of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which instructs federal agencies to “consult with stakeholders” when developing their strategic plans.

When considering who will serve the public interest, a bifurcation exists between the two main groups to which this task is assigned, that is, elected officials and public administrators (Stillman, 1996). Politicians have a responsibility to the constituents who elect them. Often, their decisions represent the opinions and views of the voters “back home” (geographically based representation). Public administrators, on the other hand, have a more wide-reaching responsibility to the general public as a whole population (societal or collective-based representation).

Laws mandating stakeholder access to public organizations, such as the Administrative Procedures Act and the Results Act, are examples of control mechanisms used to elicit certain types of performance (Etzioni, 1965, p. 650). As a group, these control mechanisms make administrative organizations responsive to the public interest by directing or constraining the behavior of the bureaucracy (Thompson, 1967). Control mechanisms are typically designed at the organizational level, but the target is the government employee. At their most fundamental level and when properly structured, control mechanisms deter employees from acting in their own self-interest in favor of society’s interests, thus furthering collective purposes (Stone, 1997). More specifically, external policy makers can use them to compel certain desired behaviors within the bureaucracy (Gortner, Mahler, & Nicholson, 1997).

Controls can be either formal (such as those written into law by Congress or in executive orders of the president) or informal (such as an ethical code, adopted by a professional organization, that describes certain types of undesirable behavior). Controls can be put in place before some behavior occurs to encourage or discourage certain types of action (such as a statement in a faculty handbook describing appropriate faculty-student relationships), or they can be used after the fact to see if behavior has complied with the law (such as an audit; Thompson, 1993, p. 304). In general, the most effective controls are formal, match responsibility, and are *ex ante* because they carry the authority of sanctions or incentives and are codified so that everyone knows what is expected. Examples of different controls can be found in the literatures of economics, political economics, sociology, management, evaluation, organization, regulation, and public policy (see Table 1).

When effectively structured, each of these different control mechanisms encourages specific behaviors thought to lead to desired outcomes and thus to accountability (Thompson, 1993). A legal requirement for agencies to consult with stakeholders, such as the Results Act, is a control mechanism designed to guide bureaucratic behavior to ensure that some end is met. Here, the desired end is a government

TABLE 1: Examples of Control Mechanisms

Laws and rules
Trust relationships
Existing program structures and operations
Coalition building activities
Oversight and monitoring authority
Professional values
Audit and evaluation activities
Organizational culture
Incentives and sanctions
Administrative discretion
Access to resources
Dialogue and feedback

organization that is responsive to the public interest. As a control mechanism, the requirement for consultation is a formal control to change an agency's operations so that they are more receptive and responsive to stakeholders. Because the Results Act is formalized in law and specifies ex ante behavior, it is judged to be one of the most effective types of control available.

This research examined how effective the requirement for consultation is as a control mechanism. In researching this question, it is reasonable to assume that federal organizations approach stakeholder participation differently, with varying impacts from agency to agency. This supposition formed the nexus for this research. By exploring and describing the federal experience in complying with the requirements of the Results Act, this research examined how stakeholder consultation promotes or reduces the ability of government to serve the public interest.

“CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS”: A DESCRIPTION

This research investigated federal agencies' interpretations of and compliance with the Results Act's requirement for consultation with stakeholders in the development of strategic plans. A multimethod approach for data collection was employed. First, content analysis of two sets of documents was conducted. The first group of documents contained the strategic plans that agencies submitted to Congress for the September 30, 1997, deadline. The second set of documents included the 1997 General Accounting Office (GAO) reviews for each of the 15 federal, department-level agencies. The content analysis was used to examine the manifest content of the strategic plans to determine what was done as part of their development and who was included. For each strategic plan, the section or series of paragraphs that described the plan development process was located. Then, each was reviewed to answer the following questions: (a) What were the major steps in the plan development process? (b) What actions were taken to include stakeholders? (c) What did the agency do with the information it received? (d) Whom did the

agency identify as stakeholders? (e) Are any ongoing participation mechanisms identified? and (f) What does the agency plan to do in the future? Based on the reviews of the strategic plans, the responses to the questions were then coded to identify the type of development approach used (top down or bottom up), the types and number of stakeholders included, the different methods of participation, the use of the information, and the benefits of the participation process.

Between 1997 and 1998, the GAO reviewed the strategic plans of each department-level agency and issued a report. These reports present results in six review areas. Conclusions regarding the plan development process used by each agency and the degree of stakeholder inclusion are included in the results. The GAO reviews were content analyzed and coded similarly to the strategic plans as described above.

The findings are also based on data gathered through 20 semistructured telephone interviews conducted with representatives of 14 of the departments and their component subagencies in February and March 1999. Subagency interviews were conducted with representatives of the United States Secret Service; the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (each of the Department of the Treasury); the Internal Revenue Service (of the Department of Justice); and the Mine Safety and Health Administration (of the Department of Labor). The interviewees from the departments were selected purposively based on their designations as the strategic planning contacts for their organizations. The employees contacted for the subagency interviews were selected from key informant descriptions of particularly strong participation efforts. In investigating the effectiveness of the control mechanism of stakeholder consultation as demonstrated through Results Act compliance, the interview questions emphasized four areas: What process was used to develop the strategic plan? Who participated? What mechanisms were used for participation? and What were the impacts of including stakeholders?

Plan Development

In support of what the strategic planning literature describes (Bryson, 1995; Nutt & Backoff, 1992), the strategic plan development process for the 15 federal agencies consisted of two main approaches: top down and bottom up. Based on the interviews and content analysis, of the 15 federal organizations included in this study, there was an even split between approaches except for 1 agency (the Department of Education, which employed a combination approach). Notably, no matter what approach was used, all agencies developed the plans internally before any consultation occurred with external parties.

For those agencies employing a top-down approach (the Departments of Energy, Housing and Urban Development, State, Transportation, and Veterans Affairs; and the Environmental Protection Agency), a typical process was for a group of high-level, senior department officials to meet and create a draft of the strategic plan reflecting policy issues and future directions of the organization. Often, in the

interest of time, the draft drew heavily on information contained in an existing document, as one planner described: “We were behind schedule. . . . We did not do as much up-front, top-level strategic thinking and planning as we should have but there were no changes in policies, and we had done some planning previously.” When completed, officials circulated the draft document downward through the organization for comment and to provide a framework for the component agencies to develop their own strategic or operating plans. In this approach, comments from the subagencies were returned to the upper echelons of the organization, and there was an iterative refinement process to incorporate these comments.

The second approach employed a bottom-up sequence. The Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health and Human Services, the Interior, Justice, Labor, and the Treasury used this approach. The component agencies were given the opportunity to develop their own plans, independent of the others, with little or no guidance from the departmental level. When this approach was favored, it was generally because the subagencies had many different missions, and the central staff of the department wanted to avoid fostering a one-size-fits-all approach. One planner explained it as follows:

The advantage of this way was that with a lot of leeway the bureaus were able to bubble things up that made sense in our organization’s culture Keeping with this approach, each bureau conducted their stakeholder consultations in ways that made sense given their customers and stakeholders.

These efforts at the subagency level were typically very inclusive of employees at different levels in the organizations.

The completed component plans were forwarded to a central staff office within the department. At this point, one of two things happened: The departmental staff attempted to integrate the component plans into a unified plan with overarching or crosscutting goals, or a summary departmental plan was created that reflected a “holding company” ideology with each of the individual strategic plans attached. This umbrella approach was common for very large agencies with components that have disparate functions. In this review, 3 departments used the holding company approach (Agriculture, the Interior, and Labor), and 12 created integrated plans.

For both the top-down and bottom-up approaches, all of the departments sent out drafts of the plans that were developed internally and asked for comments from external stakeholders. It was also common to have at least one meeting with external participants who were identified on the basis of past interactions with the agencies (described in the next section.) For some agencies, the requests for comments yielded an enormous response and created additional work, as described by one interviewee: “In total we received over 1,000 comments. We decided to respond to each one directly.” In some instances, the plans were revised after the comments were considered. Frequently, interviewees described changes made on the basis of external comments as minor, technical revisions that amounted to changes of wording rather than identifying substantive modifications. Part of the reason for the

limited nature of the changes was the surprisingly high degree of consensus when the agencies contacted their external stakeholders. One planner described it as follows:

We didn't have anyone that said no they would not participate. In fact I was surprised. People were very enthusiastic and they came with a positive spirit. I thought we would get those that would say we are wrong or way off base, but it wasn't like that.

Other interviewees described the process as fascinating because the comments revealed similarities between stakeholders who would normally be considered adversaries. Often, the nature of the discussion was more about how to "split the pie" when allocating resources to strategies rather than what strategies to employ.

The subagency interviews suggest a third approach to plan development that differs from the initially internal focus present at the departmental level. This approach features the involvement of external stakeholders from the outset. Organizations that fell into this category held conferences or large, multiday meetings to gather input from a wide range of stakeholders. At these meetings, planning often started from scratch, as one planner described: "It was really good input. . . . We started with a blank sheet and said here's the functions and the needs of our customers and stakeholders and then asked [the participants], 'How would you address these things?'" Other organizations provided mission statements in advance (which could be changed) and then worked with the external stakeholders to develop some or all of the following: goals, objectives, strategies, and performance indicators. These meetings were designed to gather people with diverse interests to discuss what could or should be included in the organizations' strategic plans, not to just get reactions to and suggestions for revising draft documents prepared internally. Subagency senior-level officials reviewed the strategic plan components proposed at these meetings before adoption. Once this occurred, the officials sent the plans forward to the departmental level.

Participants

The Results Act requires consultation with stakeholders. Before assessing consultation, defining stakeholders is appropriate. A textbook definition may be those individuals or groups that are affected by or can have an impact on the operations of a government organization. The working definitions of federal organizations in this study reveal a lot about how each organization approaches stakeholder consultation as required by the Results Act. Respondents gave a variety of labels to the different groups of actors whom agencies considered when developing their strategic plans. Labels are important because they suggest differing levels and types of consultation with different groups. Many labels similar to the textbook definition of stake-

TABLE 2: Stakeholders Included in Plan Development

<i>Number of Agencies Identifying</i>	<i>Type of Stakeholder</i>
11	Policy community representatives
10	Other federal agencies
	Congress (congresspersons or staff members)
9	Industry, private sector
8	State and local government
	Office of Management and Budget
7	Customers, clients, consumers (as individuals)
	Unions
	Constituents, citizens, the public (as a group)
5	Universities
4	Tribes
	Partners
	Staff, employees ^a
3	Grantees, contractors
	Labor-management partnerships
2	Grantees
	General Accounting Office
	Nongovernment organizations
1	Producers
	Media
	Investors

a. All agencies included their central staffs and some or all of their employees in the actual plan development process, but not all indicated that they were stakeholders for the agency. This is reflected in the statistic showing that only a few agencies mentioned these groups by name.

holders were found in the planning documents: *constituents* or *key constituencies*, *customers and clients*, *affected parties*, *key stakeholders*, *key interests*, *affected communities*, *partners*, *Congress*, and *central staff*.

A veritable laundry list of individuals and groups consulted by agencies was uncovered during the interviews and in the content analysis (see Table 2). The number of stakeholders explicitly identified ranged from 4 to 20, with an average of 10. In reviewing the stakeholders identified in Table 2, some explanation of the categories is necessary. Analysis of the interview transcripts and the strategic plans identified any and all references to stakeholders who participated in the plan development process.

From this list, overarching categories were formed to group stakeholders who were similar in terms of the type of individual included or the nature of their interaction with agencies but who were identified with differing labels. Examples of this type of group were found in the case of terms such as *special interest groups*, *lobbyists*, *professional associations*, and *subject matter experts*, which were consolidated under the label *policy community representatives*. This was done to reflect a primary concern with one specific policy area, such as the environment. Individuals in this group are external to agencies and tend to favor one general course of action in terms of agencies' operations in the policy domain.

Customers, clients, and consumers were included in a different group. Although they are also external to agencies, they are normally involved with agencies as individuals rather than representatives of a group of people with common interests. Also, such individuals are more likely to interact with agencies on a case-by-case basis rather than to advocate a general policy position. Constituents, citizens, and the public were put into their own group for just this reason: They do not interact with agencies on specific cases; however, representative views from these groups are important to avoid future hostile interactions. One could also argue that the list includes several different types of government organizations (such as other federal agencies, state and local governments, and partners) that could have been consolidated. In this case, the organizations are listed separately because the interviewees perceived and described these organizations as having differing needs, levels of influence, and interactions with and relationships to the respective federal agencies.

When questioned about how they decided which external participants to include in strategic plan development, nearly every interviewee described a process similar to what this interviewee suggested: "We [started with] a list and selected whom we would talk to. It was the usual suspects and covered most of our major stakeholders with whom the agency frequently interacts." For the purposes of Results Act compliance, interviewees very broadly defined stakeholders, like the textbook definition. One commonality across the agencies was that wider definitions of stakeholders led to the inclusion of more groups in the planning process. If an agency considered Congress and central staff to be its primary stakeholders, these were the only groups consulted. On the other hand, if an agency had multiple descriptors for its stakeholders, more types of stakeholder were involved.

Although there was no clear consensus on who should be involved, the results indicate a strong preference for (a) policy professionals in interest groups of all sorts; (b) other federal agencies with overlapping policy responsibilities; and (c) Congress, the political masters who imposed this specific control mechanism and the only group that has followed up with the agencies in reviewing their activities. What is surprising about the list in Table 2 is the large number of agencies that explicitly identified industry as an important stakeholder. This quotation represents the attitude of many agencies regarding the input of industry:

We needed to contact them [the affected industry] to see the impact of a change in the [product we provide]. We have learned that if we make certain changes, it will cost the industry so much in terms of dollars that it may not be worth it. Of course, they [industry] knew about the changes, but their systems gear up slowly. We are trying to find a way to do this [coordinate the product and industry changes] with the least trouble and cost.

Another surprising finding represented in Table 2 is the lack of attention paid to certain types of stakeholder. For example, service recipients (as individuals) and constituents (as a group) were identified by only one half of the agencies. The oversight of service recipients is troublesome because these are the people whom the

government agencies serve, and thus their interests, needs, and desires should be important. Another group whose absence is notable is the staff members and employees of the agencies. One management theory after another suggests that this group is perhaps the best source of information for suggestions on how to improve future operations. Its absence is troubling because planning theory suggests that without the support of these internal stakeholders, even the best laid plan has little chance of success. When one considers the relative ease of gathering feedback from this “captive audience,” its exclusion is even more surprising.

Participation Mechanisms

Organizations used a variety of participation mechanisms to consult with stakeholders. Although the preferred method was to have stakeholders review and comment on a draft, departments and subagencies were innovative in the methods they employed to acquire stakeholder feedback. Examples of participation mechanisms include summits, retreats, conferences, forums, workshops, listening sessions, advisory groups, focus groups, surveys, web page comments, and publication in the *Federal Register*. The average number of mechanisms for all agencies was 7; the Department of the Interior mentioned the highest number at 13.

The typical wisdom of the interviewees on the subject of consultation was that each organization used methods that made sense given its customers and stakeholders. There were frequently different consultation mechanisms for internal and external stakeholders. The advantage of this was the leeway given to perform consultation in a way that complemented the organization’s culture.

Impacts of Including Stakeholders

Just as there was a good variety of mechanisms employed to consult with stakeholders, there was also variation in the way the information was treated once it was collected. Many interviewees and strategic plans described making revisions based on the comments that were received. However, most suggested that the comments were not substantive and resulted in minor wording changes to the draft document.

Beyond just revising strategic plans, it was interesting to note the other reasons given for why organizations did what they did. These range from “checking the box” and complying with the current “flavor-of-the-month” reform to satisfying concerns or looking at things in a different way that captures outside views and avoids pet project mentalities. Overall, many thought consultation provided useful information that led to better knowledge of the requirements of the stakeholder community, as reflected in this quotation:

The collaborative process is important even though it may often result in a document that is watered down by too much consensus. But the important thing is that everyone knows what is in it and it gives us a chance to uncover any major problems and resolve them at the lower levels.

Other impacts of the information identified by the interviewees included the following: soliciting views or gaining insights on needs, communicating or talking with customers, linking planning and budgeting, reporting to Congress, improving internal management, validating operations, gaining consensus, scanning the environment and examining future requirements, checking the box or covering the bases, and improving the plan.

Differences in the plan development approach and the number of participating stakeholder groups can explain different impacts of the information. For example, agencies that used a bottom-up approach had more open attitudes, made greater attempts to gather stakeholder feedback, and anticipated impacts that would be beneficial to the organization in long-term operations. Another explanatory factor for different types of impacts can be found in the original purposes for doing consultation. As described by the interviewees, consultation was viewed as an opportunity for listening to stakeholders, educating others about programs and performance, confirming and discussing current and future directions, sharpening policies to be in line with customer needs, identifying emerging issues, providing a valuable sounding block, validating internally developed draft plans and looking for disjunctures, seeing how customers view the agency, introducing the agency or providing an overview of operations, and getting buy-in. This quotation represents benefits perceived by the interviewees: "This was extremely valuable. It let's us know if we are on the right track from their perspective [stakeholders] and it helped in getting buy-in that we are doing the right thing in certain areas."

In summary, as could be expected when studying 15 federal, departmental-level agencies with disparate missions and service delivery responsibilities, there was a correspondingly diverse combination of plan development approaches and consultation processes. However, the majority created drafts internally and then sent them out to the few stakeholder groups that they normally deal with (industry, other government agencies, and Congress) for comment. The comments received from these groups were mostly technical in nature and represented little substantive change to the draft strategic plans. One general conclusion that can be made is that the initial response to requirements for stakeholder consultation was minimal. In fact, in terms of meeting expectations, the GAO and Congress criticized agencies for their consultation efforts. A similar conclusion was reached by OMBWatch (1998), which found that implementation has been dominated primarily by internal federal agency staff with very little nonprofit stakeholder involvement. This is hardly an astounding conclusion, because there was no clear statement of congressional expectations, and federal support agencies such as the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, the GAO, and central staff agencies within the departments have provided little guidance. In addition, there were no new resources dedicated to supporting agency efforts.

Is it reasonable to expect agencies to respond with a huge outpouring of effort? No. It is more reasonable to predict that they will try to incorporate these activities into their existing organizational routines. In studying the organizational reaction to the Cuban missile crisis, Allison (1971) concluded that an organization will

change its established routines only marginally when confronted with new requirements. The directive for consultation with stakeholders as found in the Results Act can be understood as a new requirement that changes an existing procedure: strategic planning. Thus, the change was only marginal: Plans were still developed internally, as had been done in the past, but now, in response to the Results Act's requirements, external stakeholders were consulted for comments. Organizations favored existing consulting mechanisms and contacted those groups with which they already had the most frequent contact. However, this tendency to find ways to make the new responsibilities imposed by the Results Act part of organizational routines may be problematic because it reinforces the power of existing elite groups such as elected officials and interest groups in influencing agency operations (Dye & Zeigler, 1990).

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CONSULTATION AS CONTROL

The legal mandate for consultation with stakeholders during strategic plan development found in the Results Act represents a new type of control mechanism over bureaucracy. This formal, *ex ante* control is designed to foster greater access to government operations and make government more responsive to the public interest. However, this research suggests that it has elicited a minimal response in terms of encouraging consultation with a wide-ranging group of stakeholders. Thus, congressional intent may not be being met, because the "usual suspects" had the largest amount of representation, and some important groups of stakeholders who could have provided valuable input, such as customers and employees, had none.

One question that arises from this conclusion is how well do the usual suspects (i.e., the policy community, other federal agencies, and Congress) represent the public interest? Certainly, they represent the interests of those most likely to be active in policy affairs and agency operations, but they may not accurately reflect the general public interest in terms of shaping agencies to be responsive to future needs and desires, which is, after all, the intent of strategic planning. It must be noted, however, that many agency representatives were aware of the limits as to whom they included when developing the 1997 strategic plan and indicated their intentions for more wide-reaching efforts for the round of plan development that occurred in late 1999 and early 2000. New strategies mentioned by the interviewees include regional meetings and focus groups.

Despite the minimal response to mandates for consultation, concluding that this part of the government's reform efforts is ineffectual is premature, especially when considering what Congress may have been trying to accomplish by including this language in the Results Act. If requiring participation as a means of encouraging access to government operations is viewed as an additional control mechanism, the increased participation described by the interviewees is better than no participation. Many interviewees suggested that consultation such as that required by the Results Act is increasingly being incorporated into their daily operations in nonplanning

activities, such as monthly roundtables, the creation of standardized consultation processes when changes to daily operations or agency forms were being considered, ongoing interagency workgroups, and routine environmental scans and future forums. Interviewees also suggested that they will increase consultation and other forms of participation in future strategic plan development efforts.

Considering the finding that the impacts of strategic planning and stakeholder consultation come in many forms, is it possible to determine the net benefits of federal agency efforts? To fall back on a famous (but for some, frustrating) conclusion of Wilson (1989): It all depends. If the commonly held expectation is that organizations will become more responsive to and representative of the various needs of the publics they serve, then yes, strategic planning requirements as control mechanisms designed to guide bureaucratic behavior can be effective. Agency personnel provide evidence of success, such as the creation of trust relationships, coalition building activities, and open communication through dialogue and feedback, all positive outcomes of the consultation process.

These benefits notwithstanding, if one views this statutory requirement for participation as an additional symbol of efforts to bring wholesale change to government, the short-term outcomes are puny. This conclusion could have been predicted without doing any research. Consultation such as that described in the Results Act is a form of cultural change. As such, it will need more than a flavor-of-the-month mentality to become institutionalized. The value lies in changing organizations so that consultation becomes part of their operational activities rather than something that the law requires and that agencies undertake with only the minimal effort necessary to check the box.

If this activity is valued as a means to make government more responsive (i.e., to be an effective control mechanism), then political overseers must more strongly support the use of participative mechanisms in organizational routines. Currently, attention to the strategic planning process in Congress is very perfunctory, as this interviewee describes:

We hope the discussion and questions will be more, but over time we have not seen it. It is very true what the bureaus have said about the Hill being generally uninterested. Folks just do not want to hear this.

In fact, only 2 of the 20 interviewees described any substantive interest from the congressional or executive offices.

Future research must more fully consider the long-term impacts of consultation on agency processes and the degree to which the public interest is better served. The findings of this research suggest a couple of hypotheses that warrant additional investigation. Inquiry into the impact of legal control mechanisms such as the Results Act on the use of informal control mechanisms such as trust relationships, coalition building activities, and open communication through dialogue and feedback is indicated. The variety of possible outcomes expected from the introduction of control mechanisms is another avenue for research. As stated above, formal

mechanisms can have a positive impact and lead to the voluntary introduction of other mechanisms, or they can lead to resistance and goal displacement that would in turn require stronger controls to ensure compliance. These areas and others suggest a rich line of research as an outgrowth of this study.

REFERENCES

- Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Anderson, J. E. (1997). *Public policymaking: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bryson, J. M. (1995). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dye, T. R., & Zeigler, L. H. (1990). *The irony of democracy* (8th ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Etzioni, A. (1965). Organizational control structure. In J. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 650-677). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Garvey, G. (1997). *Public administration, the profession and the practice: A case study approach*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Gordon, G. J., & Milakovich, M. E. (1998). *Public administration in America* (6th ed.). New York: St. Martin's.
- Gortner, H. F., Mahler, J., & Nicholson, J. B. (1997). *Organization theory: A public perspective* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.
- Nutt, P. C., & Backoff, R. W. (1992). *Strategic management of public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- OMBWatch. (1998). *Measuring the measurers: A nonprofit assessment of the Government Performance and Results Act*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Stillman, R. J., II. (1996). *Public administration: Concepts and cases* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Stone, D. (1997). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Thompson, F. (1993). Matching responsibilities with tactics: Administrative controls and modern government. *Public Administration Review*, 53, 303-318.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1989). *Bureaucracy: What government agencies do and why they do it*. New York: Basic Books.

Aimee L. Franklin is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma. Her current research focuses on the role of strategic management functions in improving governmental performance and accountability.