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Abstract

Scholars have noted that United States federal government reforms come in waves (Light, 1998; Barley & Kunda, 1992; Kettl, 2002), accompanied by values that alternate between rational and normative conceptions of public administration and service. Extending Paul Light’s (1998) reform waves metaphor, we investigate whether two predominant management philosophies have influenced and reconfigured the values found among federal agencies over a particular period of time. Using empirical methods, we examine how the values of New Public Management and its humanist (post-NPM) counterpart have taken root among U.S. federal agencies. We followed three lines of inquiry: determining the existence of reform values in the bureaucracy, examining the prevalence of different sets of values, and investigating whether “crowding out” of values occurred, that is, whether there was a detectable shift in the distribution of values over a particular period. Our analysis yields evidence for the predominance of certain NPM and post-NPM values and indicates that bureaucracy concurrently holds competing values side-by-side. Implications for research and future reforms are suggested in the final section of the paper.
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INTRODUCTION

The last few decades have seen several initiatives to reform the U.S. federal bureaucracy. While reforms often tack the “new” label upon their names, they sometimes resemble a pendulum with discernible interplay between more efficiency-driven initiatives and initiatives that prize values other than efficiency in public service performance. Barley & Kunda (1992) suggest that, “rather than having progressed steadily from coercive to rational and then to normative conceptions of control” (p. 392), American managerial ideology has been conceptualized in waves that have alternated between normative and rational rhetoric (p. 363). Of late, this has been observed in the shift from New Public Management (NPM)-based values to a more normative, post-NPM emphasis on value-laden, knowledge-based, and team-based ethical management (Christensen & Laegreid, 2008).

NPM reforms emphasize the values of individualism, production (productivity and performance), rationality, and materialism (Fox & Miller, 1995). On the other hand, post-NPM reforms pursue the antithesis of logical positivism and the post-rationality-based social science approaches, sharing common perspectives with organizational humanism, postmodern public administration, organizational development values, and even the old notion of New Public Administration (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Frederickson & Smith, 2003). These approaches reveal the limitations of rational and public choice models (see Argyris, 1973; Barley & Kunda, 1992), expose the internal contradictions of the NPM movement in public agencies (Fox, 1996), and seek ways to “enlarge the area of discretion…to increase individual freedom” and to “create an open problem-solving climate through the organization” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003, p. 37; Golembiewski, 1967, p. 305).

The presidential administration of George W. Bush (2001-2008) carried out a
management agenda with a “results-oriented” theme that was aligned with NPM. “The Bush administration was enamored of practices believed to be common in the private sector where managers typically have greater discretion than their counterparts in the public services in recruitment, selection, management, and retention of employees” (Kellough, Nigro, & Brewer, 2010, p. 417). The many reform initiatives since the 1980s – privatization, the National Public Review, the President’s Management Agenda, cutback management, and performance and human capital assessment prompt us to examine the configuration of values in the federal bureaucracy today. What exactly would it look like, if the configuration of values were to be mapped with a visual model? Is there evidence that NPM’s strict, market-based values have taken hold? If so, to what extent? Can we also find evidence of social equity, democratization, and humanization values, even though NPM reforms have been executed?

Focusing on the years of the Bush administration, this paper investigates salient values among federal agencies in the United States, as reflected by employee surveys from the period. We establish whether a sort of “crowding out” occurred, meaning whether some values predominated over others. We also determine whether a shift in values happened over time. This investigation is significant in light of ceaseless attempts to “improve” the U.S. bureaucracy: is there evidence that some principles have been cherished more than others, or have been more lastingly influential? As more fluid governance arrangements emerge, we need to understand what salient values have taken hold among bureaucratic agencies. In turn, this may subsequently help us determine whether newer structures and governance arrangements align with, or support, existing values.
INTERPLAY OF REFORM VALUES

Stone (1997) defines and compares two different models of society – the so-called polis and market models. The polis model, which is based on the political community and anti-rational-analytic rationales, can be a useful framework for thinking about government reform, especially when a rationality-based, market model might not provide significant, real-life implications for employees. Two influential philosophies behind many federal management reforms are New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM principles, which have a more humanist bent relative to NPM’s more economic approach to public service and management of bureaucracy. Paralleling the tension between the polis and market society, this section briefly compares the tenets of each reform philosophy.

New Public Management

Since the 1980s, NPM reforms have emphasized the values of individualism and economic rationality. NPM is known for systems and cultures of productivity improvement, reinvention, process re-engineering, entrepreneurial leadership, privatization, and performance measurement (Kelly, 1998; Osborne, 2006; Pollitt, 1995; Fox & Miller, 1995; Lane & Woodard, 2001; Hood, 1995). NPM offers a shift in “how we think about the role of public administrators, the nature of the profession, and how and why we do what we do” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p. 550). It sees “citizens as consumers, taxpayers, and customers,” and “leads people to evaluate government according to what each individual receives rather than what the community as a whole receives” (King & Stivers, 1998, p. 57). At its core, we can distill NPM reform values into three sets: 1) performance and results-oriented values (managerialism and debureaucratization), 2) market and customer-oriented values (downsizing, privatization, and decentralization), and 3)
The most recent incarnation of NPM reforms were the Bush administration’s (2001-2008) human resources reform strategies that plugged partially into a strategy pursued since the presidency of Ronald Reagan (Milakovich, 1988). Broad reflections on the civil service legacy of George W. Bush (see for instance, Durant, Stazyk, & Resh, 2010b; Campbell, Rockman, & Rudalevige, 2007; Maranto, Lansford, & Johnson 2009) mostly acknowledge his political, ideological, and technical resolve to shape the bureaucracy after conservative values.

At the heart of Bush’s big government conservatism (Durant, Stazyk, & Resh, 2010a) were initiatives such as the President’s Management Agenda (PMA), the Program Assessment Rating Tool, and the personnel management system overhaul of both the Defense (DOD) and Homeland Security (DHS) departments. Guided by the principles that government should be results-oriented and market-based, the PMA, for example, focused on improving five management areas: 1) strategic management of human capital, 2) competitive sourcing, 3) financial performance, 4) electronic government, and 5) budgeting and performance integration (OMB, 2004), with competitive sourcing of federal jobs meeting the most resistance from federal employees (Joaquin, 2009). Another initiative, the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), which launched in 2003, tried to build upon the earlier Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). PART evaluated nearly a thousand federal programs on the basis of 1) program purpose and design, 2) strategic planning, 3) program management, 4) program results, and 5) overall rating scores. As the White House intended it, PART was an opportunity to examine agency factors related to performance, findings that would, in turn, inform the budgetary process, linking tax dollars to program improvements or results.

In addition to the PMA and PART, far-reaching changes were also carried out at the DHS
and DOD (e.g., the Max HR and Human Capital Operational Plan in the DHS and the National Security Personnel System in the DOD). The DHS initiatives were intended to create a system that would be flexible, contemporary, and grounded in principles of merit and fitness, equal pay for equal work, and equal employment opportunities. The ascendancy of management rights was considered of paramount importance due to national security concerns, thus enabling management to retain maximum flexibility pertaining to hiring, pay, discipline, job classifications, and labor relations (see Ryan, 2003, pp. 101-106). The DOD’s National Security Personnel System also shaped a new HR system. It proposed a merit-pay system, an occupational classification, an objective performance appraisal system, as well as labor relations, adverse actions, and employee appeals systems (see Risher & Fay, 2007, p.10). The Bush administration’s confrontational and ideological approach to implementing these reforms (Kellough, Nigro, & Brewer, 2010), however, met union backlash and forced management to modify some of these proposals with a more incremental HR system (Ricucci, & Thompson, 2008; Underhill & Oman, 2007; Thompson, 2010). Still, NPM philosophy was fundamental in the proposed reforms, distinguished clearly from traditional principles of public administration (Battaglio & Condrey, 2006; Condrey, 2005).2

Criticism of NPM includes its neglect of “the creation and development of an intense relationship of the individual with the larger issues of community, constitutional government, democratic values, and public service” (Perry, 1996, p. 7). The market model for society also modified selection processes and incentive systems, adversely affecting the attitudes and performance of employees (Moynihan, 2008). Many critics have noted the lack of convincing evidence that government agencies are inherently less effective than private firms in performing public services (Boyne, 1998; Lowery, 1998; Savas, 2000; Sclar, 2000). The case of the Internal
Revenue Service during the late 1990s also showed that the implementation of a radical performance measurement system did not bring about a more positive organizational culture, or a more productive workforce (Thompson, 2006). NPM is also said to undermine democratic and constitutional values, as well as the “public ethos” that provides civil service with a constitutive role in the traditional American governance system (Berry, Chackerian, & Wechsler, 1999; Thompson, 2001).

**Beyond Efficiency: Post-NPM Values**

In reaction to the NPM philosophy, newer conceptions of public management arose that shared perspectives with organizational humanism, postmodern public administration, organizational development values, and even the old notion of New Public Administration (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Frederickson & Smith, 2003). Post-NPM approaches point out the limitations of rational and public choice models (see Argyris, 1973; Barley & Kunda, 1992), expose the internal contradictions of the NPM movement in public agencies (Fox, 1996), and seek ways to “enlarge the area of discretion…to increase individual freedom” and to “create an open problem-solving climate through the organization” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003, p. 37; Golembiewski, 1967, p. 305).

Current normative approaches trace their foundations to the work of Chester Barnard (1938), and later, of Douglas McGregor (1960), and organizational humanists (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). In the late 1960s, the normative approach informed the thinking of the New Public Administration (NPA). Frederickson (1996) argued that unlike NPM, NPA espoused the importance of humanistic and democratic administration, professionalism, and most importantly, social equity. After NPA, Denhardt and Denhardt (2000; 2003) conceptualized the New Public
Service (NPS), a movement emphasizing democratic governance and civic engagement. The model recognizes public servants not just as employees who crave the security and structure of a bureaucratic job (as typified by the old public administration), or as participants in a market (as they would be considered under New Public Management), but as people whose motivations and rewards are beyond the material or the monetary (Perry & Wise, 1990). Moore (1995) and Bozeman’s (2007) conception of “public values,” defined as “the desires and perceptions of individuals… citizen’s aspirations, expressed through representative government” (Moore, 1995, p. 52) and as “the content-specific preferences of individuals concerning, on the one hand, the rights, obligations, and benefits to which citizens are entitled and, on the other hand, the obligations expected of citizens and their designated representatives” (Bozeman, 2007, p.14), recognize that public goods and services are provided to fulfill public values. In a similar vein, discourse theory, which supports the post-modern participatory and humanistic approach to public administrative reforms, suggests that the role of the public administrator is to act as a facilitator of discourse and communications outside the confines of institutional settings, and to prioritize equality among social groups, humanization of the workplace, intrinsic job involvement, empowerment, and expanded political and social participation (Box, 2002; Wise 2002). In addition, the tenet of social equity further embraces distributive justice, equal opportunities for employment, fair treatment, and the value of diversity, while prohibiting discrimination in the workplace. Finally, democratization values include employee empowerment, greater employee participation, and cooperative management practices (Wise, 2002).

These newer perspectives raise expectations for better quality of work life in organizations, and other broad social changes (Ingelhart, 1997; Ingraham & Jones, 1999). They
provide an alternative framework for viewing management reform in public agencies. In light of recent attempts to evaluate the Bush administration’s impact on federal human resources management (Kellough, Nigro, & Brewer, 2010), it is useful to take a look at the configuration of values during those years in order to see what the findings suggest about future reforms. Reform, by definition, will never cease from executive or legislative action. Future forms of governance might require that bureaucracy overcome the rigid dichotomy between values of efficiency, and more normative values, in order to effectively address new problems in public administration.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Based on the preceding literature review, this study aimed to identify the configuration of reform values in the federal bureaucracy over a period spanning the last several years. We structured the research questions as follows:

Research Question 1: What management reform values (pertaining either to NPM or post-NPM) are salient in the U.S. federal bureaucracy? Can we identify those values?

Research Question 2: Is a particular set of reform values more predominant than other sets? Is there a crowding out of certain values by one set of values over others?

Research Question 3: Can a trend be detected in changing values over a certain period of time, resulting from differing reform philosophies?

We aimed to capture value presence and dynamics over time. Based on the descriptive literature of NPM-oriented and post-NPM values, we developed Figure 1 to guide us in discovering and analyzing values from the results of federal agency surveys.

[Place Figure 1 about here]
METHODOLOGY

The unit of analysis is the United States federal bureaucracy as represented by agencies whose employees participated in the Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS). Administered by the Office of Personnel Management in 2002, 2004, and 2006, the FHCS project consisted of surveys that contained 71 common questions between the 2004 and 2006 surveys, and 59 common questions between the 2002 and 2006 surveys. The largest federal-level survey of its kind, the 2006 sample covered 390,657 full-time permanent civilian employees from 29 agencies and 59 small/independent agencies (88 agencies in total). The response rate was approximately 57 percent (almost 221,479 responses). The original questionnaire contained 84 questions on employee job satisfaction and work attitudes, leadership, knowledge and diversity management, performance culture, and other personnel and managerial reform issues.

This study required three phases of data analysis to answer our research questions. Our methods consisted of 1) exploratory factor analysis, 2) confirmatory factor analysis, and 3) latent growth curve modeling to operationalize variables, reveal and confirm latent constructs and important factors, and investigate a growth process in federal agencies using structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM is a useful tool for testing interrelationships among variables in a multivariate setting and assessing the relative strengths of each variable (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 1996).

To construct the factor structures base, the three sets (years) of FHCS data were collapsed into a single database using the means of the scores. The surveys used a 5-point Likert scale to measure agreement on given survey statements. This study used 14 questions to measure the factorial structure of NPM reform values, and 21 questions for post-NPM values (see Appendix). From there, the instrument revealed various sub-factors for NPM and post-NPM reform values,
following in particular the taxonomy of reform values proposed by Wise (2002).

We screened the data for outliers and extreme non-normal distribution patterns. See Table 1 for the means and standard deviations for all variables. No problematic case of skewness was noted, and all values exhibited a high value of kurtosis (more than absolute 2.0). Missing data were excluded by the listwise deletion function, and the final survey sample amounted to 74,505 valid sample numbers. Since SEM is highly subject to problems based on missing data, we performed additional missing data analysis using the expectation maximization (EM) method. In addition, from KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy results, the adequacy value of KMO was 0.970, indicating that the matrix for this dataset is highly acceptable. In other words, the variables in the matrix may share common factors at a high level.⁴

[Place Table 1 here]

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Identifying Existing Values

First, in order to establish the structure of reform values present in the bureaucracy (including both NPM and post-NPM values), exploratory factor analysis was employed on the items initially developed. The method of principal axis factoring extraction was used. To determine the number of factors to extract, the scree plot, Kaiser’s rule of eigenvalues greater than 1, Velicer’s MAP test, and parallel analysis were generated from raw data. The results suggested that six factors should be retained.

Under the assumption that these bureaucratic value constructs would be interrelated, an oblique direct oblimin rotation method was used to produce factors with the smallest number of cross-loadings from a parameter called delta. Table 2 shows the results of rotation. The
percentage of variance accounted for by these six factors was 53.153%. To ensure internal consistency, we employed Cronbach’s alpha scores, which showed that the scores of the subscales had a relatively high degree of internal consistency (all above 0.7) on each of the six factors.

[Place Table 2 here]

Based on this analysis, we detected evidence to answer our first research question: multiple reform values do exist and are identifiable in the federal bureaucracy during recent years. These results suggest that the six-factor solution extracted six distinctive values according to those having the highest factor loadings (equal to or greater than 0.50). These are market values, work-life balance values, performance values, social equity values, knowledge management values, and democratization. These loadings fit our assumption that an array of values, which are aligned with different philosophies, can be found in the federal bureaucracy. Their distribution is as follows:

- **Factor 1** - values based on the missions and objectives of federal agencies, customer service, and service improvement; dubbed *Market and Strategy-oriented values*; accounted for 39.99% of variance
- **Factor 2** - reflected values of work-life balance in the bureaucracy; dubbed *Work-Life Balance values*; accounted for 6.69% of variance
- **Factor 3** – values related to performance management, award programs, accountability for results, and merit systems; dubbed *Performance and Results-oriented values*; accounted for 4.07% of variance
- **Factor 4** – related to values of representative bureaucracy, diversity management and culture, and organizational fairness and procedural justice; dubbed *Social Equity values*; accounted for 3.58% of variance
- **Factor 5** - reflected values of learning and training, information and knowledge for job
performance; dubbed *Knowledge Management-based values*; accounted for 3.47% of variance

- **Factor 6** - represented values of empowerment, knowledge sharing, and cooperative communication; dubbed *Democratization values*; accounted for 2.94% of variance

**Distinguishing Outstanding NPM and Post-NPM Values**

We tried to determine which values predominate among these values. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the type typically used to test the factor structure of an instrument. We used overall fit indices and modification indices (MI) to identify a best-fit model. Following some of the MI suggestions, we added an error covariance among several indicators and respecified the model for the sake of decreasing the chi-square value. We tested and retested all alternative models. In our second-order CFA model, the two sets of reform values of NPM and post-NPM (second-order factors) in federal agencies were explained by six different reform values (first-order factors), indicating that NPM and post-NPM reform values are salient, and distinct, and positively correlated (the covariance coefficient is 0.88). Several goodness-of-fit indices indicate that the entire model fits well (see Figure 2). The chi-square value was 1434.06 (p< 0.05).

[Place Figure 2 here]

The results show moderate to high $R^2$ for each of the first-order factors (from 0.68 to 0.82). Two reform values stand out among agencies in terms of factor loadings: (1) performance and results-oriented reform values ($R^2 = 0.78$) on the NPM side, and (2) work-life-balance values ($R^2 = 0.82$) on the post-NPM side. This means that these values predominate among reform values in federal agencies, partially answering our second research question. Thus, an NPM
value that emphasizes performance and cultures of accountability, together with a post-NPM value that focuses on employee discretion and flexibility, could be outstanding components of any future reform initiatives. This might even be an indicator that agencies already realize the importance of finding a way to balance the conflicting objectives and goals of reform (Lasseter, 2002).

T-tests (the critical value is ±2) indicated that all six first-order factors had significant loadings (positive and significantly different from 0). The second-order factor analysis confirmed that NPM and post-NPM values are distinct, co-variant, and significantly related to each latent first-order factor. This confirms that differing managerial reform features have been blended and preserved in bureaucracies, while remaining distinctive and salient among federal employees, as previous studies predicted (e.g., see Barley & Kunda, 1992; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Kaufman, 1969; Wise, 2002). Although our results do not provide evidence of the complete crowding out of one set of reform values by another, analysis implies that values from clashing philosophical camps have dually influenced the bureaucracy and may have complemented one another’s strengths. To stretch this to a logical conclusion, one might say that reforms leave a legacy of their best and strongest features, while weaknesses and gaps are filled by succeeding reform movements.

**Detecting a Shift in Bureaucratic Values**

Next, longitudinal analysis was used to address our third research question, if and how bureaucratic values shifted during the period under study, and, if possible, pinpointing when a shift occurred. In latent growth curve modeling, intercept and slope terms are treated as latent variables (factors). This method allowed us to obtain an estimate of the initial level of main
outcome variables and the rate of change over time, and to link these parameters of growth to
time-varying and time-invariant variables. The maximum likelihood method was used. The
covariance matrix was used as input to LISREL 8.72 in order to evaluate the measurement model
and full structural model.

The slope (linear change) and intercept (initial status) parameters were measured at each
of the three time points: 2002, 2004, and 2006. The results of NNFI (0.960), NFI (0.960), IFI
(0.965), RFI (0.955), RMSEA (0.07), and SRMR (0.06) values suggest that this model fits well
(cut-off criteria are 0.95 and 0.08). The coefficients for intercept and slope were fixed in the
equations. The only parameters estimated were the error variances, which showed that the
amount of variability in the three time points is not explained by the intercept and slope
parameters. The error variances in NPM and post-NPM at time 1 (2002), time 2 (2004), and time
3 (2006) were 0.15, 0.04, and 0.58, respectively. None of these variances were statistically
significant.

The results indicate that the levels of NPM reform values in federal agencies diminished
over time (negative slope), whereas post-NPM values constantly increased (positive slope)
during the same period (see Figure 3). While one set of values emphasizing democratization,
equity, and other normative principles was ascendant in the bureaucracy, it was accompanied by
a decline in the more rationalistic, efficiency-driven set of values. At what point did this occur?
When we consider the period under study, NPM-based values were more influential in 2002 and
more prominent in federal agencies. Reforms introduced by the Bush administration carried
those values forward. As Figure 4 illustrates, however, the growth trajectories of the reforms
show that after 2002, NPM values marginally but continuously decreased as more normative
initiatives gained popularity at the federal level. Regardless, NPM reform values are still
principal pillars of current public management reform philosophies. Can we expect that these two schools of reform values will be in constant flux, depending on political and socio-economical contingencies? Or does this trend mean that with new forms of governance taking hold, public administration is returning to its traditional and long-cherished normative principles before embarking on less conventional arrangements?

[Place Figures 3 and 4 here]

CONCLUSIONS

During the period between 2002 and 2006, as reviewed, the United States federal bureaucracy was inundated by NPM-inspired executive orders, directives, and congressional actions. In this study, we tried to determine whether NPM-related values and more normative values would emerge from surveys of employee perceptions about their agencies, whether certain values were more dominant than others, and whether we could establish the ascendance of certain values over others. We believe in the relevance of these questions because reforms are constantly introduced by executive or legislative actions, and also because new forms of governance might require that bureaucracy overcome the rigid dichotomy between values of efficiency and more normative values, in order to effectively address newer problems in public administration.

Regarding the values that we found to be predominant, and the further studies that they necessitate, our findings suggest that diversity management in relation to social equity is poised to become more crucial in the near future. By 2020 a considerable portion of the U.S. workforce will be elderly, employment diversification will increase with immigration, and women, African-Americans, and other minority groups will have become more numerous than white males.
Accordingly, efforts should be made to welcome a labor force with many different characteristics into organizational cultures (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991). Future studies might explore the influence of diversity management on organizational performance. Another component of social equity, organizational justice, and the way these are perceived by employees, might be related to attitudes about work and the activities of employees. Fairness in pay, job security, and merit-based advancement among specific groups of employees such as females, and racial and cultural minorities, should be explored.

From a human capital perspective, the findings from the knowledge management construct herein imply that human resources development issues - organizational development, career development, personnel training, and personnel development - will be significantly emphasized in the future (Werner & DeSimone, 2009; Swanson and Holton, 2001). Through coaching activities, for example, employees can learn the values and norms of their employment units, establish informal working relationships, and learn how to function in their jobs. These efforts will provide employees with humanized, democratized, and equitable work environments and conditions.

Managers and supervisors in agencies should enable the direct participation of employees in strategic management, as well as provide education and training in concepts and methods of strategic management and planning with employees (Werner & DeSimone, 2009). As agencies become increasingly democratized, federal employees should be granted the authority to make independent managerial decisions and thereby claim ownership of work processes. If participatory and cooperative communication is supported and facilitated within agencies, it follows that group and developmental cultures focusing on people, flexibility, and adaptability will, in turn, be strengthened (Quinn & Kimberly, 1984). From a leadership perspective,
environments and cultures of delegation, communication, engagement, and knowledge sharing are highly encouraged. This may contribute to a high level of motivation, and enhance the level of effective and normative commitment of employees.

Regarding our findings that agencies value policies of work-life balance, we might ask whether this belies the stress felt by agencies due to the relentless criticism of bureaucracy engendered by NPM. Policies of work-life balance might have mitigated some of the pressures accompanying reforms that have cast bureaucrats as inept, free riding, or simply worthless, in comparison to their private sector counterparts. These policies of balance help generate positive employee perceptions of their work and the citizens they serve (Ezra & Deckman, 1996; Facer & Wadsworth, 2008; Saltztstein, Ting, & Saltztstein, 2001). As Fredrickson (1996) noted, to expect civil servants to be loyal to their work, the bureaucracy must also be loyal to them, and safeguard certain values and principles on behalf of the employees. Moynihan (2008) echoed this injunction when he noted that governments must link performance measures to intrinsic values. The preeminence of work-life balance values at the same level as performance values must be seen as a good thing. These principles should inform future efforts, although classical organizational principles have already indicated that performance rationality should be tempered with incentives that value the human worker.

Finally, our overall findings suggest that it is important to find connections between the normative values and the core characteristics of agencies and employees representing those values. The pursuit and production of public values might have a significant influence on organizational cultures, structures, processes, and behaviors (Rainey, et al., 2008). For example, when taken as an individual attribute, public service motivation (PSM) is usually associated with serving the public good or public interest.6 Hence, PSM is expected to influence certain values
(e.g., rational/extrinsic and normative/intrinsic values), behaviors (e.g., prosocial behaviors and institutionally grounded behaviors), and cultures (e.g., group or developmental culture) in public organizations. It is necessary to determine whether variations in conceptions and patterns of motivation relate to public values at the individual level, as well as to making meaningful differences in organizations.

In conclusion, we have detected evidence for the concurrent existence of various reform values from different decades in the United States. Certain reform values were more emphasized by agencies than others, and some were more ascendant than others. It can be argued that the factor analysis model is formative and heuristic, rather than reflective, because the model was not specified in advance. We acknowledge this limitation. Nonetheless, the results bring to our attention that indeed the shoreline is shifting (Kettl, 1997; 2002) – bureaucracy changes each and every time a reform is instituted – and the pendulum of more, and then less, normative values of public administration may have to be transcended in order for bureaucracy to be more capable of meeting twenty-first century challenges. Despite its limits, this study is necessary in conducting further inquires. For instance, which predictors significantly influence any shift in values? And, does a shift correspond to better results, whichever standards (normative or rationalistic) are used? Our study does not address whether changing values reflect changes in the direction of federal human resources policies with changing party control (from Republicans to Democrats), or rather, fundamental value changes separate from partisan control. The existing literature is replete with accounts of what not to do. It is acknowledged that a “one-size-fits-all” reform strategy or policy never works. Non-incremental approaches do not work (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). Careful planning does not work for dramatic reforms (Maranto, 2002, p. 188). Because the work of governments is complex and increasingly complicated as time passes, any
reform efforts should also be able to guide public administrators in a way that enables effective action and efficient use of resources. A focus on exclusive, sectoral goals (cost-cutting) needs to be qualified in the eyes of managers, their program evaluators, the politicians, and the public so that everyone recognizes that efficiency can only be met within limits. As some authors have noted (e.g., see Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999), there may be no crisis in a bureaucracy, but crisis will sometimes be manufactured so that reforms can be launched. In the same vein, bureaucracy may be as efficient as it can be, but problems will arise when we evaluate efficiency in non-logical ways.

From the results of this study, we know that bureaucracy encompasses normative and managerialist values, despite the clashing tenets. Weaknesses in individual pieces of reform, the passage of time, politics, and complications of the dilemma of public administration may have led agencies to adopt these conflicting values side-by-side. We are not certain, but data suggest that the best elements of reforms tend to rise to the top, and leave lasting legacies for employees and agencies, even when an empirical approach is not able to test how, in practice, those values have taken hold or are reflected in agency actions. But what does this imply for future initiatives in public administration? Public management reform has been, and will continue to be, a difficult task if differing reform values are conceived as being mutually exclusive. The challenges of reforming public bureaucracies are increasingly complex and wide-ranging, because governments must simultaneously recognize political leadership and management oversights, they must encompass and balance the competing and contradictory values of citizens, and they must fairly evaluate the performance of their agencies (Breul, 2007). The findings herein impel us to examine the norms that arise with network arrangements and other forms of governance structures, e.g., the New Public Governance (see Osborne, 2006). Can network governance
accommodate these values, or eschew them for something completely new? Having become accustomed to evaluating bureaucratic improvements in terms of efficiency or democratization, would we uphold these same values when assessing reforms that might fundamentally change bureaucracy to structures of hollow networks? Would the multi-sector service, currently comprised of traditional civil servants, contractors, grantees and/or partners, find these same values meaningful? We do not know the answers to these questions. As bureaucracy evolves, however, it is worthwhile to remember historical configurations of values, before everything changes again.
Appendix
Construction of Index Variables:
Selected Representative Survey Items

New Public Management (NPM) Reform Values

1) **Performance and Results-oriented Reform Values Scale**
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.913)
- Selections for promotions in my work unit are based on merit.
- Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.
- High-performing employees in my work unit are recognized or rewarded on a timely basis.
- Employees are rewarded for providing high quality products and services to customers.
- I am held accountable for achieving results.
- In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.

2) **Market and Strategy-oriented Reform Values Scale**
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.821)
- In my work unit HRM strategies are targeted to achieve my agency’s missions and objectives.
- Managers review and evaluate the organization’s progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.
- Products and services in my work unit are improved based on customer/public input.
- I believe my organization can perform its function as effectively as any private sector provider.

Note: All Cronbach scores are standardized based on the standardized items. A complete listing of items in the indices is available from the authors.

Normative Post-NPM Reform Values

1) **Social Equity Reform Values Scale**
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.892)
- Supervisors/leaders in my work unit are committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.
- Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace.
- Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of different backgrounds.
- Complaints, disputes, or grievances are resolved fairly in my work unit.
- Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.

2) **Knowledge Management (KM)-based Reform Values Scale**
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.828)
- Employees have electronic access to learning and training programs readily available at their desk.
- I receive the training I need to perform my job.
∙ I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
∙ I have enough information to do my job well.

3) Work-Life Balance (WLB)-based Reform Values Scale
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.730)
How important are the following WLB programs to you?
∙ Telework/telecommuting
∙ Alternative work schedule
∙ Childcare subsidies
∙ Employee assistance programs
∙ My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues

4) Democratization Reform Values Scale
(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.770)
∙ Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment and ownership of work processes.
∙ Employees in my work unit share their knowledge with each other.
∙ Managers promote communication among different work units.

Note: All Cronbach scores are standardized based on the standardized items. A complete listing of items in the indices is available from the authors.

Figure 1: A Conceptual Framework for NPM and Normative Reform Values
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 1</td>
<td>97080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 2</td>
<td>98528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 3</td>
<td>98097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 4</td>
<td>98405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 5</td>
<td>98133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 6</td>
<td>99657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 7</td>
<td>94546</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 8</td>
<td>100159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 9</td>
<td>97085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 10</td>
<td>96645</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 11</td>
<td>98172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 12</td>
<td>100089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 13</td>
<td>96800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM Value 14</td>
<td>98816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 15</td>
<td>95531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 16</td>
<td>96681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 17</td>
<td>98093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 18</td>
<td>92839</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3147</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 19</td>
<td>99639</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 20</td>
<td>95689</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3399</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 21</td>
<td>93012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5266</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 22</td>
<td>97629</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 23</td>
<td>99485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 24</td>
<td>100420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 25</td>
<td>100210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 26</td>
<td>98949</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 27</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 28</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 29</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 30</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 31</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 32</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 33</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 34</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Value 35</td>
<td>100571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Sample Size (Valid N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,505</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2: Total Variance Explained After Rotation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>6.698</td>
<td>46.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>4.079</td>
<td>50.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>3.589</td>
<td>54.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>57.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>2.945</td>
<td>60.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A Factor Pattern Matrix table, which indicates six-factor dimensions, is available from the authors upon request.

**Figure 2: The Results of the NPM and Normative Reform Value Structures (A Pooled Cross-Sectional Model): Using a Second-Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) a**

**Overall Fit Indices of the CFA Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Cut-off Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Measurement Model</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1434.06</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aBased on the WLS (ADF) method, all coefficients of the factor loadings (lambda-Ys and gammas) in this CFA model are standardized.
Figure 3: The Results of the NPM and Normative Reform Value Structures (A Pooled Cross-Sectional Time-Series Model): Using a Latent Growth Model (LGM) *

The intercept and slope are defined as latent variables. Variables representing all 3 time points have loadings of 1 on the intercept factor. This sets the initial status in equations for each time point as the same. The parameters a1 and a2 represent the slope and intercept means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Fit Indices of the Latent Growth Curve Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Cut-off Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Measurement Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The intercept and slope are defined as latent variables. Variables representing all 3 time points have loadings of 1 on the intercept factor. This sets the initial status in equations for each time point as the same. The parameters a1 and a2 represent the slope and intercept means.
Figure 4: Mean-Score Profiles for Two Reform Values in Federal Agencies

![Graph showing mean-score profiles for two reform values in federal agencies.]
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Notes

1 Hays and Kearney (1997) concluded that NPM has five key managerial components: managerialism, downsizing, decentralization, debureaucratization, and privatization. Based on this typology, this study categorized NPM values into three dimensions. From an international perspective, Pollitt (1995) also proposed eight common elements of NPM values in Western European and North American countries such as market mechanisms (privatization), decentralization, service quality, and customer-oriented values.

2 For example, Condrey (2005) identifies and classifies four models of Human Resource Management Service Delivery: the traditional model, the reform model, the strategic model, and the privatization model. The traditional model is depicted as a centralized, merit-based system with top down management and uniform enforcement of rules, policies and procedures, where the role of HR managers is to be the “enforcers of merit.” On the contrary, NPPM principles may include the other three models which mainly focus on such values as decentralization, multi-directional communication and collaboration, and contract-out systems based on a strategy, effectiveness, and efficiency management model.

3 He contrasted these two paradigms along six dimensions: 1) concepts of change; 2) relevance, responsiveness, and empowerment; 3) theory of rationality; 4) organizational structure and design; 5) theory of management and leadership; and 6) epistemology, methodology, and the issue of values. Fox (1996) argues that even in Osborne and Gaebler’s “reinventing government” and the NPR philosophy, there are some postmodernity factors such as contradiction and inconsistencies.

4 The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) values greater than 0.9 are regarded to be superb; 0.8-0.9 are meritorious, 0.7-0.8 are middling, 0.5-0.7 are mediocre, and less than 0.5 are unacceptable. In addition, Bartlett’s test of sphericity determines whether the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. H0: R=I (the variables are completely uncorrelated with each other); in this case, we can reject the null hypothesis because Chi-Square (595) is 1478131.365, p<0.0001. So, we can conclude that variables are not completely uncorrelated with each other and there is a meaningful relationship among the variables. Both methods suggest that the correlation matrix is amenable to factor analysis.

5 Wise (2000) suggests that democratization values include democratic accountability, employee empowerment, greater employee participation, and cooperative management practices. Some examples of organizational democratization values are: “effort to advance access to leadership to more social groups, including mentoring; participative decision-making styles; use of work teams and leaderless teams” (p. 558).

6 Perry and Wise (1990) defined public service motivation (PSM) as “an individual predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (p. 368). They identified a typology of motives associated with public service that included rational, norm-based, and affective motives.