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Abstract

In examining gender dimensions of managerial values, we account for alternative explanations. Specifically, we expect the organization and the profession to be powerful socializing forces that may have similar or larger influence on managerial values. Early public administration work found that bureaucratic organizations can take participants through a process of socialization where they adopt and internalize the central values of the organization (Denhardt, 1968). Organizational controls such as size, number of employees, department, and tenure with the organization are considered as a set of variables that could influence managerial values. Another competing theory is that of professional socialization being a significant influence on managerial values. In the area of professionalization, studies have found that educational and professional experiences can shape value preferences (Edwards, Nalbandian, and Wedel, 1981). Professional variables like MPA degree, membership in professional organization and a professionalism scale are included as explanatory variables. With the consideration of these professional and organizational factors, we question if gender still plays a part in managerial value importance?

The data for this study come from Phase IV of the National Administrative Studies Project. The dataset includes United States senior local government managers in communities with populations over 50,000. These senior managers occupy key positions such as city manager, deputy/assistant city manager, public works director, parks and recreation director, planning director, budgeting and finance director. We use responses to how important specific values are to these managers when making decisions about public services for their departments. We expect that managerial value importance will differ amongst men and women even when controlling for professional and organizational factors. Preliminary findings support this hypothesis. We find men and women differ in value importance when making major decisions.
Women in the City Hall: Gender Dimensions of Managerial Values

Introduction

Studies on gender differences in management have been few and far in between in recent years. Scholars have sought to better understand why gender matters in the area of management and how those differences can affect organizational outcomes. While there is a plethora of research examining the differences between women and men leaders in private organizations (e.g., see Powell and Graves, 2003; Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Rosener, 1990), elected posts (see, Little, Dunn and Deen, 2001 and Dodson and Carroll, 1991) and even in educational settings (see Rosser 2003), there have been comparatively fewer studies examining this issue in public sector organizations (see Guy, et. al, 1992).

One issue that scholars have done extensive work on in the arena of gender and outcomes is that of representative bureaucracy. Some studies have examined the specific roles women play in organizations (Connell, 2006; Newman, 1994; Stivers, 2002) others have highlighted ways in which issues of race and gender effect organizational outcomes (Selden, 2006; Hindera, 1993a; Hindera, 1993b; Keiser, Wilkins and Meier, 2002; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty, 2006). Among the work that has been done in this area the issue of if gender matters is still unanswered. To what extent gender matters is also explored.

Two theoretical perspectives suggest that local government managers will draw on values to make decisions about public services in their department. The first suggests that local government managers will have gender differences in the way they make decisions. Gender differences will make particular values more important to different sets of managers. An
alternative theoretical argument is that organizational and professional values play a key role in managerial decision making.

The data for this study come from Phase IV of the National Administrative Studies Project. The dataset includes United States senior local government managers in communities with populations over 50,000. These senior managers occupy key positions such as city manager, deputy/assistant city manager, public works director, parks and recreation director, planning director, budgeting and finance director. We use responses to how important specific values are to these managers when making decisions about public services for their departments. We expect that managerial value importance will differ amongst men and women even when controlling for professional and organizational factors.

In the next section we outline two theoretical perspectives about explaining expected value differences in local government managers, and examine the literature supporting each of these positions. Next, we examine and values in organizational and professional positions, and consider how these values may influence expected differences in ender. Our hypotheses are then empirically tested, and the implications of their findings for both research and practice are discussed.

Theories of Managerial Values and Local Government

Values play an import part in the decisions local government managers play. Work by Edwards, Nalbandian and Wedel (1981) demonstrates that student’s program affiliation (social welfare, business administration and public administration) accounted for differences in value preferences. These differences are expected to influence professions they practice and their professional education. Further research in this area found that professional values influence the way individuals define and resolve problems (Nalbandian and Edwards, 1983).
Gender and Managerial Values

There are four streams of research that inform the question of potential gender differences in leadership and decision making in government organizations. The first, which has received considerable attention, is whether there are differences in the manner in which women compared to men lead or manage private firms. Research shows that women are more collaborative and less hierarchical than their male counterparts.

In an early study, Eagly and Johnson (1990) sought to go beyond the impressionistic generalizations about gender stereotypes in leadership styles extant at the time. Their study revealed, for example, that women exhibited a democratic, participative style to leadership compared to men, who were more autocratic (also see Rosener, 1990). They also found that, contrary to stereotypic beliefs, there were no differences between men and women regarding task-oriented behaviors. In a later study, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001: 794) confirm that women’s leadership style was more democratic than men’s, “possibly reflecting the special legitimacy problems that female leaders face if they attempt to take charge in a clear-cut, traditionally hierarchical manner” (also see, Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani, 2001).

Ridgeway’s (2001) study is interesting because her findings suggest properties of a self-fulfilling prophecy. She finds that women leaders may be viewed as less influential because of negative perceptions and stereotypes about women’s abilities to lead. Thus, workers may be less likely to legitimate women’s leadership or authority, ultimately affecting the ability of women to lead effectively. Carli’s (2001) results are similar with regard to gender effects on social influence. She finds that negative stereotypes about women’s abilities and competencies lead to beliefs that women are less influential overall than men (also see, Heilman, 2001; Cann and Siegfried, 1990).
The second stream of literature informing our study focuses on potential gender differences among elected officeholders. In an early, classic study, Dodson and Carroll (1991) found, controlling for such factors as party, ideology, seniority, age, and feminist identification, that women state legislators prioritized women’s issues more so than their male counterparts (also see Saint-Germain, 1989). Dodson and Carroll’s (1991: 91) study showed that “Elected women are working to make the agendas of legislative institutions more responsive to women’s demands for equal rights…and more reflective of women’s concerns stemming from their roles as caregivers in the family and in society more generally.”

A number of additional studies have found that women officeholders have distinctive leadership skills as well as policy preferences (see Rosenthal, 2001; Little, Dunn and Deen, 2001; Duerst-Lahti and Kelly, 1995). Examining the impact of women in the U.S. Congress, Swers (2002), for example, finds that women show a greater commitment to women’s issues compared to men at all stages of the law-making process, from the introduction of bills through final votes.

In a study of U.S. mayors, Rinehart (1991) compared the leadership styles of women and men in five large cities. She found significant differences, where women as opposed to men exhibited qualities of teamwork and collegiality. Rinehart also found that women mayors were more likely than their male counterparts to focus on women’s issues, and that women attributed the differences in leadership styles to gender whereas men ascribed them to personality.

Beck (1991) studied whether women serving on local councils in seven suburban towns across the country exhibited different leadership skills or styles compared to men. She found that women were more responsive to constituent concerns or demands, were more cooperative and less likely to engage in “dirty politics” and “backstabbing.” They were also more likely to
advocate for such “social” issues as building women’s shelters and community centers and supporting a measure to redefine family to include unrelated individuals.

Studies on gender differences in educational settings represent a third line of research. Eagly, Karau, and Johnson (1992), for example, examined gender differences in leadership styles of public school principals. They found no differences on measures of interpersonal style, but, unlike Eagly and Johnson’s (1990) study in private organizations discussed earlier, they did find that women principals scored higher on measures of task-oriented behaviors. They further found that the leadership styles of women principals were more democratic, while their male counterparts acted more autocratically (also see Kezar, 2000).

In a study of gender differences in leadership positions at colleges, universities, and foundations, Astin and Leland (1999) found women leaders were more likely to exhibit collaborative and nonhierarchical qualities than men, and more likely to empower others, develop interpersonal relationships, and rely on networks within the organization or community to accomplish their goals. In a more recent study, Rosser (2003: 77) found that women deans and directors were viewed as being more effective than their male counterparts because faculty and administrative staff perceived women deans to: “enhance the quality of education in their units; engage in research, community, and professional endeavors; promote and support institutional diversity within their units; and manage personnel and financial resources fairly and effectively” (also see Rosser, Johnsrud and Heck, 2003).

The fourth stream of research on gender differences examines governments in the context of leadership and more indirectly representative bureaucracy. At the outset, it is important to recognize the significant, critical work of Stivers (2002) on the gendered environment of public administration and public service more broadly. She points to fundamental problems of studying
gender differences in public organizational structures that are themselves plagued with gender biases. In fact, studies by Guy, Newman and Mastracci (2008) and Guy and Newman (2004) on emotional labor demonstrate and reinforce this concern. They argue that women and men are segregated into separate jobs and occupations, and that the tasks required by women’s work often requires “emotive work thought natural for women, such as caring, negotiating, empathizing, smoothing troubled relationships, and working behind the scenes to enable cooperation” (Guy and Newman, 2004: 289). In effect, women’s work in any capacity, including as leaders is “invisible and uncompensated.” They go on to say that “Public service relies heavily on such skills, yet civil service systems, which are designed on the assumptions of a bygone era, fail to acknowledge and compensate emotional labor” (Guy and Newman, 2004: 289).

Other studies of leadership in the public sector also show that gender does matter (see, for example, Duerst-Lahti and Johnson, 1992; Guy, 1992; Burn, 1979). One study similar to ours is Fox and Schuhmann’s (1999), which compared the behavior of women and men city managers. Their survey of 524 city and town managers in 1997 revealed that women placed greater emphasis than men on such factors as budgetary constraints, public opinion, citizen participation, and city norms, while men on the other hand placed greater emphasis on input from their staff. Men were also more likely than women to terminate a problem employee.

Similar to the research discussed earlier illustrating that gender matters in elected leadership posts, the representative bureaucracy literature shows that gender matters in nonelected positions in government. Representative bureaucracy seeks in part to determine if there is a linkage between ascribed characteristics (e.g., gender or race) and policy preferences of bureaucrats that benefit individuals in the general population with the same characteristics.iii As

In one of the first studies involving gender, Keiser, Wilkins, Meier and Holland’s (2002) examine whether women in the Texas educational system had an impact on the performance of women students. Their analysis reveals in part that women math teachers are, in accordance with their hypothesis, positively associated with the math scores of young girls in grade 8 as well as on their exit exams.

Other representative bureaucracy studies have also pointed to the importance of gender in decision making or policy outcomes (see, e.g., Saidel and Loscoco, 2005; Riccucci and Meyers, 2004). Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) examine whether there is a linkage between the presence of women police officers and the number of sexual assaults reported and arrests made for such crimes. Based on data collected between 1990 and 1997 from the 60 largest metropolitan counties across the United States, their study revealed that as the representation of women police officers rises, so too does the reporting of sexual assaults and the arrest of the perpetrators.

In sum, studies of public and private organizations as well as educational institutions reveal that there are gender differences in management and leadership styles as well as decision-making outcomes. Women tend to be more collaborative and democratic and their presence in organizations has an impact on policy outcomes. While there are considerably more studies examining theses issues in the private and educational spheres, fewer studies exist on public sector organizations. The current study seeks to help fill that gap.

Limited work has looked at gender differences in local government. Literature on elected officials, private managers and public administrators provides some foundation for our analysis.
In a study of state legislatures Thomas (1994) found women state legislatures placed high priorities on the policies that concern women, family and children while male legislatures were more focused on business and economic legislation. Female executives have also been found to have a higher level of intuition about people, different approach to teamwork, greater sensitivity to subordinates and a different approach to teamwork (Lunneborg 1990; Billing and Alvesson 1994). In a study of 590 men and women from city government Burns (1979) found gender differences in the areas of professional ambition, definition of the role of managers and the use of support networks. Fox and Schuhman found that female city managers are more likely to have a style of management that relies on citizen input (1999).

Hypothesis

H1 Female public managers will place a higher emphasis on values of equity, long-term outlook, sense of community and representation.

H2 Male public managers will place a higher emphasis on values of efficiency, effectiveness, expertise and individual rights.

A Competing Perspective: Organizational and Professional Forces

In examining gender dimensions of managerial values, we account for alternative explanations. Specifically, we expect the organization and the profession to be powerful socializing forces that may have similar or larger influence on managerial values. Early public administration work found that bureaucratic organizations can take participants through a process of socialization where they adopt and internalize the central values of the organization (Denhardt, 1968). Organizational controls such as size, number of employees, department, and tenure with the organization are considered as a set of variables that could influence managerial values. Another competing theory is that of professional socialization being a significant
influence on managerial values. In the area of professionalization, studies have found that educational and professional experiences can shape value preferences (Edwards, Nalbandian, and Wedel, 1981). Professional variables like MPA degree, membership in professional organization and a professionalism scale are included as explanatory variables. With the consideration of these professional and organizational factors, we question if gender still plays a part in managerial value importance?

Literature in the area of values in public administration dates back to earlier work where researchers sought to understand the uniqueness of public service work and those that operate within it (see Mosher 1968; Mosher and Stillman 1977; Rohr 1978). Values are associated with professional standards and influence decisions. Part of what is explored in this paper is if professional and organizational controls will override expected differences due to gender. Organizations serve two purposes in socializing individuals that join them. The organization indoctrinates the individual and presents them with the basic values that are unique to the bureaucracy (Denhart 1968). The profession of public administration can be thought of as a collection of specialized skills, knowledge, behavior and values (Edwards, Nalbandian and Wedel 1981). It is dangerous to assume that everyone enters the public service with the same set of values and the profession should fill in that void. Edwards, Nalbandian and Wedel found that students enrolled in Public Administration (MPA), Social Welfare (MSW), Law (LLB), and Business (MBA) enter with different espoused value preferences (1981).

For the purposes of this analysis a value is defined as “an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-state of existence along a continuum of relative importance” (Rockeach, 1973:5). Values are found to vary by profession and because of this individuals select into particular sectors (Edwards et. al, 1981). Organizations play a key part in
making sure values of the individual are consistent with the goals of the organization. A key part of this is organizational socialization which is scholars have considered as what happens when administrators adopt behaviors and preferences that are more consistent with the organization and minimize their own personal influence on their behavior (see Downs, 1967; Gawthrop, 1969; Meier and Nigro; 1976; Simon; 1957; Thompson, 1976; Weber, 1946). For various reasons individuals may comply with organizational and professional values. Administrators may place those values ahead of their personal beliefs in order to increase opportunities for promotion or further career success. This internalization of organizational beliefs can happen because of peer pressure or because the individual begins to agree with the dominant organizational view (Romezek, 1990; Simon, 1957; Thompson, 1976). In an unexpected finding Wilkins and Williams (2008) find that the presence of black police officers is related to an increase in racial profiling in the division. Therefore, organizational and professional socialization may strip away expected gender associations with particular values and replace them with organizational and professional needs. This paper seeks explain if gender can overcome organizational and professional norms in public administrators.

_Hypothesis_

H3 Managerial value importance will differ amongst men and women when controlling for professional and organizational factors.

_Data and Methods_

The data used for this project were collected during the fourth phase of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP IV). NASP IV is a multi-method study, which includes a survey instrument distributed to municipal government managers of jurisdictions with a population of 50,000 or more across the United States. The NASP IV team compiled a list of
3,316 potential respondents based on contact information provided by the International City/County Management Association, which was verified with publicly available information. All respondents were sent a pre-notification letter through US postal service indicating that they had been selected to participate in the survey. The letter introduced the study and provided details on accessing the study website. The voluntary nature of the study was emphasized and assurance regarding reasonable efforts to safeguard respondent confidentiality was provided. In order to improve response rate, extensive follow-up efforts were made. These efforts included multiple modalities of contact such as email, fax, and phone calls. When survey data collection phase ended 46.4% of potential participants responded to the survey (n=1,538). The 1,538 respondents represented 545 municipalities. The respondents come from 545 different jurisdictions and their mean age was 51.4 years. In addition to generalist managers such as the city manager and deputy/assistant city managers, respondents came from a variety of functional domains in municipal government such as Finance/Budgeting, Public Works, Personnel/Human Resources, Economic Development, Parks and Recreation, Planning, and Community Development. As expected, majority of the respondents were male (71%), white (86%), highly educated (more than 60% with graduate degrees), and well compensated (68% with salaries over $100,000). Most measures used in the study have been tested and validated in earlier studies; some measures were developed in earlier administrations of NASP and others were written and/or refined for NASP-IV.

[Insert Figure 1 HERE]
Findings

The model is estimated using ordered probit regression. The first set of hypotheses tests the theory that value importance for local government managers when making decisions will be influenced by gender. The second set of hypotheses tests the theory that organizational and professional values may play an important part in these decisions and override expected findings based on gender. To what extent does empirical evidence support these theories? The results in Table 1 help to shed some light on this question.

[Insert TABLE 1 HERE]

Gender

Looking first at gender differences we find support that men and women differ in values when making decisions for their departments. The hypotheses suggested that women would be more likely to place higher emphasis on equity, long-term outlook, sense of community and representation. Where men would hold the values of efficiency, effectiveness, expertise and individual rights as more important when making decisions. We find a positive statistically significant relationship (p<.05 or above) that women are different from men when making major decisions about their departments even when controlling for professional and organizational influences. The findings on gender challenge our hypothesis. Women not only differed from men in the values of equity, long-term outlook, sense of community and representation, they also were statically different in the areas of efficiency, effectiveness and expertise. Women were more likely to use all of these values in their decision making process even while controlling for professional and organization factors. (need to decide what the ending story will be???)

Professional and Organizational
There were no significant findings as to an MPA degree having any influence on value importance when making decisions. This finding failed to support our hypothesis that value importance will differ between males and females even when controlling for professional and organizational variables. An interesting finding was that as professional commitment increased so did the emphasis on values. All values were highly significant and positively related to professional commitment (p<.01). Professional commitment was a scale of importance of networks, pride in profession, profession set standards, enthusiasm about profession, respondents professional association meeting attendance, and importance of professional contacts. Professional membership was negatively related to effectiveness, sense of community and expertise (p<.05). It would seem that being a member of a professional association wouldn't decrease the importance of the value of expertise.

Department affiliation value results are referenced to the omitted groups which are city managers. Value importance varied among the different departments. Finance and Economic Development managers were less likely to place higher value on equity (p<.05) when compared to the omitted groups of city managers. With regards to efficiency Planning and Economic Development managers were negatively statically significant (p<.01) when compared to the omitted group of city managers. The value of sense of community placed Personnel and Finance managers were negatively related to city managers (p<.01). With regards to representation Economic Development managers were negatively statically significant (p<.01) when compared to the omitted group of city managers and Parks and Recreation managers were positively related (p<.01). Deputy Manager, Personnel and Community Development managers placed higher values on individual rights when compared to city managers (p<.01). (discuss some reasons
department differences might happen, these might also be better discussed by department instead of value)

**Conclusion and Implications**

In a recent article on gender dimensions, DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, and Pandey (2006: 883) conclude, “Despite our ‘activist’ inclinations, we recognize that the state of knowledge about the gender dimensions of public service motivation is rudimentary at best.” We can safely generalize this assertion to gender dimensions of managerial values as well. Although there is notable scholarship on gendered nature of public administration institutions (e.g. Guy 1992; Stivers 2000), not much is known about individual values and motives. More specifically, the relative role of gender -- which can encapsulate a range of significant life experiences and influences – with respect to other major sources of influence is not well understood. While there has been a long and venerable tradition emphasizing the role of values in local government service (see Edwards et al. 1981; Nalbandian and Edwards 1983), traditional explanations have emphasized the influence of educational, professional, and organizational influences on shaping managerial values.

While our findings lend credence to such explanations, they also point to the overwhelming influence of gender on managerial values. Even when we control for a variety of professional and organizational influences, we find that women score higher on the values of efficiency, effectiveness, long-term outlook, sense of community, and expertise. Only on respect for individual rights, there is no significant gender difference. The size of the gender effect on managerial values is moderately strong with few other influences being as powerful. Overall, our findings contradict some commonly held beliefs. For example, we find that women score higher on managerial values of efficiency, effectiveness, and expertise. This is an interesting
finding that deserves further scrutiny. Do these findings contradict stereotypical notions about the gender dimensions of managerial values? Or is it that our study design – relying on cross-sectional survey – places limits on the nature of inference we can draw. Would the findings have been different, for example, if instead of asking individuals to report their value preferences, we assigned choice situations which would allow us to assess the extent to which individuals approached trade-offs between competing values. Would men, for example, value efficiency over a long-term perspective?
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In a follow up study, Carroll (1992) similarly found that women state legislators are more likely than men to advocate policies aimed at women’s needs and interests.

Also see Stivers (1995; 2000), who examines gender differences in Progressive-era reformers, whereby men supported improvements in administrative methods and women advocated for the overall betterment of society.

Comparatively, there are more studies examining a potential linkage between active and passive representativeness for people of color rather than for women.

Also see Selden (1997), who found no linkage between passive and active representation for women.
When making major decisions about public services in your department, how important are the following values: (1=of little importance, 6=extremely important)

Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency (avoidance of waste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness (valid and useful outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity (a just distribution of resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Outlook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of Community (common good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation (responsiveness to all residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism (expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual rights (property rights, civil rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many managers make decisions based on their own insights and experience in certain circumstances. At other times, managers rely on professional standards and best management practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate which of the following most closely mirrors your approach when faced with particularly difficult decisions.

(1=rely primarily on my own insight and expertise, 6=rely primarily on professional standards or best management practices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>When the need for a decision is identified, and an immediate response is necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize Conflict</td>
<td>When it is important to minimize conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Solutions</td>
<td>When it is difficult to differentiate among solutions to a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Dilemma</td>
<td>When confronting an ethical dilemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Technology</td>
<td>When faced with an issue regarding the use of new technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Career</td>
<td>When making a decision that will impact career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Problem</td>
<td>When encountering an ambiguous problem that you have not faced before</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Membership</th>
<th>Are you a member of a professional society (such as ASPA, ICMA, GFOA, NRPA, APWA, APA, etc)? (0=no, 1=yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Which of the following categories best describes your income from the organization during the last year: (1=less than $50,000; 5=$150,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>1=MPA, 0=other education levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Networks</td>
<td>Professional networks are an important source of new ideas (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Profession</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Meetings</td>
<td>I attend as professional society meetings as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Contacts</td>
<td>Being in a professional organization has allowed me to make a great number of contacts with others in my profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational

| Current Tenure          | How many years have you worked for this organization?                                                   |
| Current Position        | How many years have you been in your present organization?                                             |
| Number of employees     | Total Number of employees in your organization (Log)                                                   |
| Department              | 1=city manager, 2=deputy/act city manager, 3=finance/budgeting, 4=public works, 5=personnel/hr, 6=economic development, 7=parks&recreation, 8=planning, 9=community development (dummy variable for each category, city manager is dropped from model) |
| Council Manager         | Form of government (1=council manager, 0=other forms of government)                                      |

Controls

<p>| Age                     | In what year were you born?                                                                           |
| Gender                  | 1=female, 0=male                                                                                      |
| Race                    | 1=white, 0=non-white                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Long-term Outlook</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>0.263***</td>
<td>0.150**</td>
<td>0.152**</td>
<td>0.180**</td>
<td>0.210***</td>
<td>0.226***</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.464***</td>
<td>-0.170*</td>
<td>-0.301***</td>
<td>-0.264***</td>
<td>-0.204**</td>
<td>-0.428***</td>
<td>-0.577***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td>0.018***</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.050***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.049***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
<td>0.041***</td>
<td>0.065***</td>
<td>0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.318**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>-0.325**</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.308**</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Tenure</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.243**</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.415***</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.228*</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.252*</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.361***</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.378**</td>
<td>0.505**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>-0.639***</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.650***</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.310**</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Recreation</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.338***</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.312*</td>
<td>0.296*</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.348**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.221***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees (log)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.066*</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.01.