

ABSTRACT

NELSON, KIMBERLY HILLENBURG. Political and Administrative Roles in City Government: The City Manager's Contributions to Economic Development. (Under the direction of James H. Svava, Ph.D.)

Since the inception of public administration as a field of study, the nature of the relationship between politics and administration and the respective roles of politicians and administrators in these functions have been central concerns. Despite the typical conclusion of researchers that city managers mediate between politics and administration, minimal research has been conducted to determine how managers contribute to the creation of policy for a municipality. This study seeks to fill that gap by explaining the manager's role in economic development policy.

Employing a five-city, comparative case study methodology and a limited quantitative analysis this study specifically addressed the following propositions; that city managers:

- may be extensively involved in a wide range of economic development tasks.
- may bring a professional perspective to the policy creation process.
- may be centrally involved in shaping policy goals, not just implementing the goals determined by others.
- may have a cooperative relationship with the political actors.
- may tend to have reciprocal influence with elected officials—the influence of each affecting the other.

The research confirmed that city managers are highly influential in economic development policy. Additionally, there is some difference in the level of influence of the city manager in large cities versus small cities, especially relative to that of other actors in the process. A third finding is that knowledge of the personal beliefs of the manager can contribute to a profile of managerial involvement in economic development. City managers

who emphasize attracting new resources, initiating projects, and protecting disadvantaged groups tended to see themselves as having substantial influence in economic development policy. Lastly, the findings indicate that managers with control over the responsibilities of commercial recruitment and retention define economic development success in terms of per capita income and total assessed valuation of property within the city. In contrast, managers who do not have recruitment authority, view success more broadly—considering items such as poverty, housing, child care, and minority issues. Overall, the results from this study provide the basis for a future broad-scale study on the manager's role in development policy.

**POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES IN CITY GOVERNMENT: THE
CITY MANAGER'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

by
KIMBERLY HILLENBURG NELSON

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Raleigh

2004

APPROVED BY:

Chair of Advisory Committee

BIOGRAPHY

Kimberly Nelson was born in Greensboro, North Carolina. She completed her undergraduate studies in Public Relations and Marketing at Virginia Tech in 1991. Interested in the activities of government and non-profits, she later decided to study for Master's in Public Administration at the University of Texas in San Antonio, completing her degree in 1995. Upon relocating back to North Carolina, she enrolled in the Public Administration Ph.D. program at North Carolina State University. She is currently an Assistant Professor at the University of Illinois, Carbondale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>v</i>
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Basis	2
Research Questions	4
Chapter Descriptions	7
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
Politics and the City Manager	12
Strict Dichotomy Model/Separate Roles.....	13
Modified Dichotomy Model/Autonomous or Responsive Administrator.....	14
Partnership Model/Overlapping Roles.....	15
Theories of Urban Power	17
Elite Theory.....	18
Pluralism.....	19
Growth Machine Theory.....	20
Regime Theory.....	21
Economic Development	21
Economic Development as Outcomes.....	22
Economic Development as Process.....	22
Economic Development Activities.....	23
Organizing for Economic Development.....	24
Actors in the Economic Development Process	25
The Mayor.....	26
Council Members.....	27
The Public.....	28
Private Business.....	29
Economic Development Corporations.....	29
City Managers and Economic Development	30
Conclusion	34
Chapter 3: RESEARCH DESIGN	37
Quantitative Analysis	37
Qualitative Analysis	40
Selecting the Sample Cities.....	40
Interview Subjects.....	41
Areas Covered.....	43
Validity.....	44
Data Analysis Procedures.....	45
Chapter 4: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS	47
Methodology	48
Findings	50
Perceived Managerial Influence in Economic Development.....	50
Comparison of Population Ranges below Target Sample.....	52
Importance of Personal Belief Systems of the Manager.....	54

Summary	57
Chapter 5: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS.....	58
Background on Subject Cities.....	59
Testing the Propositions	61
Economic Development Tasks of the City Manager	64
Recruitment and Retention Tasks	64
Quality of Life and Human Development Strategies	66
Infrastructure Activities	68
Structural Arrangements for Economic Development	69
Professional Contribution to the Policy Process.....	72
The Manager’s Ability to Shape Policy Goals.....	75
The Relationship of the City Manager to Elected Officials.....	79
The City Manager’s Influence Related to that of Elected Officials.....	80
Summary	83
Chapter 6: CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	85
Conclusions.....	85
Suggestions for Future Research	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
Appendix I: CITY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE	97
Appendix II: UDiTE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	100

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 2.1: Perception of CAO Role Importance</i>	16
<i>Table 4.1—Descriptive Statistics—Influence of Various Actors on Economic Development</i>	50
<i>Table 4.2: Overall Rankings, U.S. Council-Manager Cities, with Population 100,000 or Greater</i>	51
<i>Table 4.3: Influence Ratings of Primary Actors, Classified According to Population</i>	52
<i>Table 4.4: Comparison of Economic Development Influence in Two Population Categories</i>	53
<i>Table 4.5: Comparison of Means: Population vs. Administrator’s Economic Development Authority</i>	53
<i>Table 4.6: Independent Samples T-Test: Population vs. Administrator’s Economic Development Authority</i>	54
<i>Table 4.7: City Managers’ Time Allocation—Council Relations, Community Leadership, and Administrative/Management</i>	55
<i>Table 4.8: Personal Beliefs of Managers and Level of Influence</i>	56
<i>Table 5.1: Interview Subjects</i>	59
<i>Table 5.2: Background of Subject Cities</i>	61
<i>Table 5.3: Specific Economic Development Activities of City Managers</i>	71
<i>Table 5.4: Education and Experience of Subject City Managers</i>	72

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“In all governmental systems [there are] two primary or ultimate functions of government...the expression of the will of the state and the execution of that will...these functions are, respectively, Politics and Administration” (Goodnow 1900, 22). Since the inception of public administration as a field of study, the nature of the relationship between politics and administration and the respective roles of politicians and administrators in each of these functions have been central concerns. For an extended period, the issue was expressed as a question of whether a dichotomy exists or should exist between the political and administrative roles of public managers. The council-manager form of municipal government has been one of the foci of this discussion. The common view of city managers as politically neutral vehicles of council mandates is neither historically sound (Svara 1999) nor desirable or practical. Indeed, contemporary researchers have concluded that the line between politics and administration can be quite indistinct for practicing administrators (Ammons 1998; Nalbandian 1999; Svara 1998, 2001).

Since no clear separation of roles exists, there are two areas of research that should be pursued in the area of political/administrative division of labor on the part of public administrators; the professional contributions managers make to policy or the political impacts on administration, although the latter has been rarely done. One way to examine the extent of management involvement in the political arena is to investigate in depth the role of the city manager, an individual who has generally been perceived to operate at the forefront of politics and administration, in particular public policy areas. Patterns of involvement and influence vary with the area of local government decision-making (Dahl

1961). Despite the typical conclusion of researchers that city managers mediate between politics and administration, minimal research has been conducted to determine how managers contribute to the creation of policy for a municipality. Prior studies of managerial policy involvement have typically discussed overall policy involvement or specifically addressed the manager's role in fiscal policy. Only rarely has the influence of the city manager been considered.

The purpose of this study is to examine the manager's participation in economic development policy. Through a multi-city, comparative case study analysis, I will determine the extent of managerial engagement in the economic development policy process and the ways specific actions of managers impact the economic vitality and governmental processes of the municipality. The research will also permit examination of the less commonly addressed question of whether politicians cause managers to support politically expedient economic development choices that conflict with professionally sound approaches to economic development. With this approach, the relative influence of city managers compared to other actors can be assessed.

Theoretical Basis

This study addresses the gap in the research between theories of the manager's overall level of policy involvement and specific actions the manager takes in the process of policy formulation and development. There are two reasons this information is important to the field of public administration. First, although many scholars argue against the existence of a dichotomy between politics and administration or argue for a complementary relationship, there is no consensus regarding the appropriate level of policy involvement of the manager. Second, gaining a greater understanding of the extent to which managers are

actively involved in the policy arena could allow for an assessment of the relationship between the level of political involvement and government effectiveness.

The council-manager form of government is the most common type of government in the United States today in municipalities over 2,500 in population (Nelson 2002). Developed at the end of the Progressive Movement, the council-manager form of government has a professional administrative manager who works at the will of an elected city council (Kemp 1986). Under this form of government, the mayor serves as the city's political leader and acts as a member of the council with no administrative and usually no veto powers. As originally conceived, the legislative and administrative functions of city government were to be divided between the council and manager respectively, although the manager was to assist the council in the development of legislation. However, by the late 1920s this theory had been re-interpreted to equal a strict separation between politics and administration. Under this view, the council would develop policy, and the manager would implement such policy (Svara 1998).

Public administration began as a profession in the United States in the late 19th century (Wilson 1887). A conception of the ideal public servant as a politically neutral, technically competent administrator emerged in the orthodox period of public administration in the 1920s and 30s and has persisted since that time. However, empirical studies have subsequently concluded that the competent administrator is not completely detached from policy responsibilities at the local level (White 1926; Price 1941; Nalbandian 1989; Svara 1999).

Despite the consistent research findings that a dichotomy does not exist between politics and administration, the overall question of whether the city manager should be

strictly confined to the role of administrator has been a frequent topic in the public administration literature. Primarily, the question concerns the appropriateness of managerial involvement in the political aspects of policy development.

Research Questions

The objective of this study is to determine the contribution of the city manager to economic development policy-making in the municipality. The contribution may be shaped by:

- the nature and range of tasks a city manager performs in the creation of economic development policy;
- the sources of the manager's policy proposals (Is there a distinctive city manager/professional "style" of economic development policy?) and the extent to which city managers adapt their strategies to match circumstances in their cities;
- the relationship between the policy preferences of the city manager and those of other actors;
- the interaction between the city council and the city manager, in general, and the mayor and the city manager, in particular, as economic development policy actors.

Despite research that describes economic development tasks in general—for example, structuring incentive packages or providing infrastructure improvements for new corporations—there is limited information about which tasks in the process are actually performed by city managers. In order to gain an understanding of the manager's impact on economic development policy, we must first determine specific responsibilities toward economic development that city managers either are assigned or voluntarily undertake.

Once I have determined if the economic development tasks of the manager include policy suggestions, I will also seek the sources of those proposals. These sources may include budgetary concerns; managerial influence in comprehensive planning; gaps in

leadership by the council or mayor; or requests by council members or the mayor for policy suggestions. The manager's own belief system regarding the appropriate role of the CAO in economic development is also important. A manager who believes his role is integral to economic development may be more likely to take on a significant role in that process. Additionally, I will determine whether the manager's perspective is different from that of elected officials—in both economic development and in the overall determination of the city's fiscal stability and future economic prospects. If differences are discovered, are the sources of those differences a result of the manager's professional training or some other factor? Understanding the sources of the manager's policy proposals should also allow for conclusions regarding the manager's perspective on the legitimate role of the CAO in the policy process.

Finally, discerning the nature of the interactions between managers and elected officials is essential to shaping conclusions regarding the role of the manager in economic development policy. These interactions may take several forms. First, if economic development experience and skills were emphasized in the hiring process for the manager, it is likely that the council is supportive of a significant role of the manager in economic development. Second, determining who initiates discussion of economic development as a policy priority—whether the manager, council, or the mayor—is a potential indicator of which government personnel are most influential in the creation and implementation of economic development policy. A manager who takes the lead, either with or without knowledge and consent of the council in the policy process, is able to shape the particular priorities of the city.

Given the overall research questions and based on the limited existing research, I have formulated five tentative propositions that I will explore with the data gained from the interviews; that city managers:

- 1) are extensively involved in a wide range of economic development tasks. Using an analysis of the literature to determine what activities are involved in economic development in general, I will compare those tasks to ones identified by the interview subjects as appropriate responsibilities for the city manager. From the research, I also will seek to determine what factors influence variation in the level of the manager's involvement among cities. I expect to find that managers are involved in a wide range of tasks, both administrative and policy-related. This high level of involvement has potential consequences for both economic development and administrative quality.
- 2) bring a professional perspective to the policy creation process. Most managers have graduate degrees in administration and/or years of experience in government administration that give managers a viewpoint that is decidedly different from that of elected officials. The acceptance of the manager's professional competence could mitigate conflict between the manager and elected officials when disagreements occur.
- 3) are centrally involved in shaping policy goals, not just implementing the goals determined by others. In other words, the manager does not merely act on the directives of the council but suggests policy initiatives independent of elected officials. Whether this occurs through direct policy proposals, suggestion of

alternative policy options, or influence in the long-term planning and visioning process, or all of these activities, will be examined through my research.

- 4) have a cooperative relationship with the political actors. Prior research has determined that a cooperative relationship between the manager, council members, and the mayor could lead to higher quality governance (Svara 1999). While determining the nature of the relationship is important in itself—a cooperative relationship indicating that the lines between politics and administration are not concrete—the dynamic of manager-politician interactions can also indicate whether the manager is performing as expected or deviating from the expectations of the elected officials
- 5) tend to have reciprocal influence with elected officials—the influence of each affecting the other.

Chapter Descriptions

The remainder of this dissertation presents findings from the literature search, quantitative research, and qualitative research. I conclude with a discussion of the questions raised through this research that may be answered with further investigation. Chapter 2 contains the literature review. Despite the fact that limited research has been undertaken to determine the role of the city manager in economic development, there is a great deal to be gained from examining prior research into the manager's role. The literature review is divided into three sections. First, I examine economic development terminology that will be used throughout the study and how those terms are defined in the literature. Terms such as success and failure and even the meaning of economic

development itself must be defined before I can explain the actions of the city manager. Unfortunately, in many cases, there is no consensus in the literature regarding acceptable definitions. In those cases, I will describe alternative definitions and justification for my choice of explanation.

Second, I summarize existing research on the city manager both as a participant in economic development and as a leader in general. Current research into the city manager's economic development role is largely non-empirical. Instead, it is primarily narrative—describing cases in which managers have been especially influential in achieving an economic development goal for their communities. Included in this section is a discussion of prior research that examines the structural foundations that contribute to active leadership by a city manager, the relationship of the manager to elected officials, and the nature of general policy involvement. Since these factors are discussed in the propositions, it is essential to gain an understanding of prior research in the area of managerial leadership.

I conclude the chapter with a discussion of research on urban power theories. Scholars continually consider the question of who governs the modern city. Elite theory, pluralism, and regime theory have all been advanced as explanations for the way power is wielded and distributed within municipalities. A discussion of the municipal policy process would be incomplete without addressing the potential sources of power and influence within cities. Therefore, the final section examines urban power theories, and specifically addresses the influence of the city manager in each system.

The remainder of the dissertation presents the methodology and the findings of the study. Chapter 3 describes the study's research design. This includes the process and

justification for selecting the sample and the methods I used to gather, process, and analyze the data. Since this study contains both quantitative and qualitative components, I describe the methodology for each type of research separately.

Research findings are presented in Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 contains the analysis of quantitative data from the American sample of an international survey of chief administrators. Previous publications based on this survey (Svara 1999; Mouritzen and Svara 2002) indicate that managers consider themselves highly influential in the economic development process relative to other actors. I will re-examine these data focusing on relative influence levels of city managers in moderately large cities—the population category from which cities were chosen for the qualitative study. The survey data are also used to determine whether a relationship exists between level of influence and form of government or population size. Lastly, I compare city managers' thoughts on the importance of their roles in community relationships, council relations, or administrative functions.

In Chapter 5, I present the findings from the qualitative portion of the study. I discuss whether the data gathered through the series of in-depth interviews support the five propositions presented at the beginning of this chapter. Does the manager:

- Take an active role in economic development policy?
- Bring a professional perspective to the policy process?
- Become centrally involved in shaping policy?
- Have a cooperative relationship with politicians?
- Tend to have a greater level of influence than elected officials?

The final chapter contains a summary of the dissertation and outlines a plan for future research regarding the city manager and economic development. Qualitative

research on five cases cannot definitively establish patterns of the role managers play in economic development or support analysis of factors that explain variation in roles. However, it can identify potential variables for exploration in larger-scale studies. While I do not believe that those roles are as varied as the cities themselves, it does appear that the variation is extensive enough to prevent the creation of a consistent model for economic development and the role of the CAO. However, I will present in the final chapter an initial framework for further testing—one that could become a future model for examining the typical role city managers play in the policy process and the implications for improving governance.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Since prior research on the city manager's role in economic development is limited, the literature review for this study is broad, covering both general information on defining economic development as well as summarizing the existing data on city managers' actions. With the overall objective of framing the discussion in future chapters about the city manager's involvement in development policy, this study builds on previous research in five areas: political versus administrative roles of city managers, urban power structures, the economic development process, actors in the economic development process, and research that addresses the role of the manager in economic development.

First, I will assess the literature that examines the relationship between politics and administration and the actions of the manager. While most theorists have discarded the concept of the manager as a detached professional, they have not yet fully described the nature of an "engaged" professional. Since I will be exploring the manager's actions in a specific policy area, I will first summarize the consensus regarding how city managers balance the administrative and political aspects of their positions.

The second section of the literature review will draw upon the premises and methods of social science research regarding urban power structures. Although I am focusing on a single actor in this study, the involvement of one actor has to be considered in relationship to other actors. Furthermore, it is important to establish a theoretical context regarding influential groups in the municipal environment.

Third, I will examine literature on the economic development process in general. To address the research questions presented in this study, several critical areas must be explained including: defining the term "economic development", discussing tasks that have

been identified as being part of the economic development process, and determining how economic development success is assessed.

The final two sections of the literature review contain a summary of prior studies that have focused attention on the role of various actors in the development process. The fourth section is an investigation of the roles of other actors in the economic development process. The last section summarizes existing research concerning the city manager in economic development.

Politics and the City Manager

The council-manager form of government is the most common type of municipal government in the United States today (ICMA Form of Government 2001 Survey). Developed at the end of the Progressive Movement, the council-manager form of government has a professional administrative manager who works at the will of an elected city council (Kemp 1986). Under this form of government, the mayor serves as the city's political leader and acts as a member of the council with no administrative and usually no veto powers. As originally conceived, the legislative and administrative functions of city government were to be divided between the council and manager respectively, although the manager was to assist the council in the development of legislation.

In the United States, the complex issue of defining the nature of contributions by public administrators in the political process began with the founding of public administration as a profession in the late 19th century (Wilson 1887). A conception of the ideal public servant as a politically neutral, technically competent administrator emerged in the orthodox period of public administration in the 1920s and '30s and has persisted since that time. However, empirical studies have concluded that the competent administrator is

not completely detached from policy responsibilities at the local level (White 1926; Price 1941; Nalbandian 1989; Svava 1999).

Despite the consistent findings of researchers that there is no absolute dichotomy, the overall question of whether the city manager should be strictly confined to the role of administrator has remained a frequent topic in the public administration literature. Primarily, the question concerns the nature and appropriateness of manager involvement in the political role of policy development. A key indicator of a manager's role in politics and policy is his relationship with elected officials. Mouritzen and Svava (2002, 26-27) developed four models of the relationship between chief administrators and elected officials:

- 1) Separate roles—true dichotomy between politics and administration. The manager is subordinate, in all cases, to elected officials.
- 2) Autonomous administrator—the chief administrator assumes an equal or greater role than elected officials in the policy process while elected officials remain restricted from the administrative arena.
- 3) Responsive administrator—the manager is subordinate to elected officials and political norms dominate administrative norms.
- 4) Overlapping roles—both the manager and elected officials are influential (reciprocal influence) and they share administrative and political functions.

Dunn and Legge (2002) use a similar, three-model approach: the orthodox politics-administration dichotomy, the modified dichotomy, and the partnership. In their study of local government power sharing, they found all three models existed in some form. However, governments were more likely to fall into the latter two categories.

Strict Dichotomy Model/Separate Roles

Although the early public administration scholars Woodrow Wilson (1887) and Frank Goodnow (1900) are often credited with first endorsing the politics-administration

dichotomy, contemporary scholars believe that Wilson and Goodnow were misinterpreted (Svara 1998). During the Progressive Era, the primary concern of those advocating municipal reform was the influence of party machines. Svara (1998) believes that when Wilson and Goodnow advocate for a separation of politics and administration, they are referring to party politics, not politics in any form—such as policy involvement.

However, during the orthodox period of public administration, a strict separation of the political and administrative roles for city government was considered the ideal. Although today the notion of a completely distinct administrative role for the city manager is deemed unrealistic, many practicing managers attempt to retain a great deal of separation from the political sphere (Mouritzen and Svara 2002, 34). In these cases, the administrator relies on his professionalism and technical expertise as justification for policy involvement—providing only broad policy advising.

Modified Dichotomy Model/Autonomous or Responsive Administrator

In contrast to the separate roles model, the modified dichotomy model argues that managers may take an active role in policy or elected officials an active role in administration. The first of these possible arrangements argues that administrators may be able to remove themselves from council oversight by separating elected officials completely from administrative functions while still maintaining a policy role for themselves (Mouritzen and Svara 2002; Montjoy and Watson 1995). While administrators under the autonomous model retain a detachment between politics and administration, the loss of oversight by elected officials means that managers are not subordinate to them.

A second potential arrangement under this model is that of the administrator who is subordinate to elected officials and acts with responsive competence rather than neutral

competence (Mouritzen and Svara 2002). In other words, the manager does not just act at the will of the mayor or council, but believes in the goals of the elected officials and takes action to support their implementation. Elected officials in these situations have a great deal of influence over administrative functions in city government.

Partnership Model/Overlapping Roles

Unlike the other two models, where administrative and political authority are controlled by either the administrator or elected officials, the partnership model assumes that administrators and politicians work together, often sharing the roles of administration and politics in order to implement the best policies possible for the good of the community. Numerous studies have demonstrated that managers spend a considerable amount of their time on non-administrative functions (Ammons and Newell 1988, 1989; Svara 1985, 1989, 1990, 1999; Nalbandian 1999).

Ammons and Newell (1988) examined the percentage of time devoted to the management, policy and political roles by 153 city managers in U.S. cities with 1980 populations greater than 50,000. As the results in Table 2.1 depict, nearly half their time is spent on activities that are political in nature. In the study, policy activities, management activities, and political roles were contrasted by defining policy as city manager interactions with council members; political activities as those in which the manager provides leadership to the community; and managerial roles as those activities undertaken in the operations aspects of government.

Ammons and Newell argue that in order to be successful (their definition being to retain their position) a manager cannot merely be a skilled administrator but must also be able to actively engage members of the community and propose policy alternatives.

Table 2.1: Perception of CAO Role Importance

<i>Role Perceived as Most Important to Job Success</i>	<i>City Managers</i>	<i>Mayors</i>
Management Role (administrative activities)	38.5%	23.1%
Policy Role (and council relations)	55.8%	34.6%
Political Role (community leadership)	5.8%	42.3%

(Ammons and Newell, 1988)

Synthesizing the conclusions of Ammons and Newell, Deil Wright, and his own survey research, James Svara (2002) argues that, since the 1960s, the role of city managers in cities over 100,000 in population has changed considerably. Specifically, there is an increased need for communication with council members in order to determine policy direction and to assist members with constituent issues.

Researchers have also attempted to further analyze the specific nature of the duties of city managers that exceed the administrative role (Svara 2001, 1999, and 1989; Nalbandian 1999). Through a review of the literature exploring management involvement in policy, Svara concludes that there is “overwhelming evidence that managers do what traditionalists say they shouldn’t do,” that is, they participate in political activities (1989, 77).

In a study of United States council-manager governments, Svara (1999) finds that the boundary between politics and administration is shifting with “more of what might be considered to be administration and management in the council’s sphere and more of mission formulation in the manager’s” (50). Svara suggests the type of relationship that does exist between the political and administrative is one of “complementarity” (2001). “The complementarity between politics and administration is based on the premise that elected officials and administrators join together in the common pursuit of sound governance” (2001, 179). According to Svara, “complementarity entails ongoing

interaction, reciprocal influence, and mutual deference between elected officials and administrators. Administrators help to shape policy, and they give it specific content and meaning in the process of implementation” (2001, 180). Svava also argues that this relationship, in which the politicians respect the administrators’ managerial competence and the managers are committed to accountability and responsiveness, is the most common arrangement found in municipal government.

Reinforcing Svava’s arguments, Nalbandian (1999) finds that city managers’ roles are much broader than the traditional council-manager arrangement indicates. Nalbandian contends that contemporary managers act as facilitators, both internal and external to government. Managers must build networks between the community and government in order to achieve consensus among divergent interests (195).

In summary, the bulk of public administration literature dealing with the issue of politics and administration at the local level concludes that city managers regularly engage in policy functions. Instead of a strict separation between politics and administration, a continuum of potential relationships exists, the qualities of which are determined by the structural elements of the government as well as the personalities of the actors involved in the process. Given the consensus in the literature, I expect to find a complementary relationship between politics and administration in the economic development policy arena.

Theories of Urban Power

In order to understand political influence in any policy area, it is important to gain an understanding of the broader conception of community power that may be at work in a particular city. Research in this area has primarily been confined to single-city case study

analyses; therefore, generalizations are made based on subsequent applications of theoretical conditions hypothesized by others.

Most research that attempts to determine who or whom exercises power in a community centers on the ways that influential people or groups are involved in the decision-making process. This study will also use an approximation of the decision-making model. However, Bachrach and Baratz (1963) noted the phenomena of blocking change in a community, the nondecision, which is also important to address in this study. In their study of community power and influence, Bachrach and Baratz question the basic assumption that power can be possessed, as is often assumed in the literature. Instead, they suggest that power is conditional and influence is determined by a person's perspective.

Typically, when scholars have studied the balance of power in a community, they have used one of four theories: elitism, pluralism, regime theory, and growth machine theory. Although the growth machine theory can be seen as a sub-group of regime theory, its prevalence in the economic development literature demands individual attention.

Elite Theory

According to elite theory, local government power is concentrated in the hands of a privileged few. Political elites are those persons "who regularly exercise a significant amount of authority and power in making decisions and nondecisions that affect a significant number of persons" (Bachrach 1971, 8). The source of an elite's power may be their personal wealth, political position, employment position, or social class.

Robert and Helen Lynd (1937) conducted the first study that argued economic elites could control a community. According to the Lynds, one influential family was able to assure that people representing their personal and business interests were installed as the

government leaders in Muncie, Indiana. In a later study of Atlanta in the 1950s, Hunter argued that power was concentrated in the hands of a group of approximately forty economic elites (Hunter 1953). Hunter used a reputational method, interviewing citizens and political actors and asking their opinions about who in the community held the greatest political influence to arrive at his conclusion that the politicians in Atlanta merely acted out the policy will of this economically privileged group.

Pluralism

In contrast to the concept that elites control the governmental process in a community, pluralistic theory suggests that the public, acting through interest groups, primarily affect the decision-making process. Proponents of elite theory suggest that the majority of citizens are apathetic to the political process, and therefore remain uninvolved (Berelson 1954; Mills 1956; Lasswell 1965). Presthus (1964) argues that decision-making actually occurs on a continuum in a community—from high public participation and democracy in a pluralistic community, to limited participation in a community controlled by elites (1971).

Robert Dahl's *Who Governs?* (1961) is considered the seminal work in pluralistic decision-making theory. Dahl examines the political influences at work in local government through a single case study analysis of New Haven, Connecticut. Through historical research and a series of interviews, Dahl presents his theory of pluralistic control in local governments. Dahl describes five possible patterns of influence in municipal government: elitism, executive-centered coalitions, legislative-centered coalitions, plurality with overlapping spheres of interests, and pluralities with competing interests. Although Dahl immediately rejects elitism, he argues that the each of the other four types of power

structures existed in New Haven at some point, sometimes with two overlapping patterns at the same time. These four power structures all rely on the power of group action to influence government.

Urban power scholars in the 1960s were unable to reach a consensus on who governed the typical American city. Researchers began conducting a meta-analysis of multiple studies to discover what variables defined city government. Clark (1973) compared the results from four of these studies and found that population, direct election of the mayor, competing political parties, and absentee ownership of industry led to greater decentralization in decision-making, while reform characteristics—non-partisan elections, at-large council elections, and administration by a city manager—were linked to increasing centralization.

In the 1980s, researchers began focusing on the South and Southwest for case studies in community power. Trounstine and Christensen (1982) used the unique characteristics of a Sunbelt city (San Jose) and contrasted their findings with former research in rust belt cities. Using the reputational method, they found the existence of a small group of economic elites who were highly influential in the San Jose's policy outcomes. They found that, in contrast to the older cities, where the elite often came from the prominent, "old money" families, in San Jose, the elite came entirely from the ranks of those who were successful in corporate endeavors.

Growth Machine Theory

Other researchers have focused on the importance of real estate developers and their influence on contemporary communities. Logan and Molotch (1987) argue for the existence of an urban growth machine that attempts to affect development through

improving land use. In addition to answering the question of “Who governs?” Logan and Molotch argue that we should also answer “For what?” (199). As land becomes more valuable, members of the growth machine who own the land become wealthier. The growth machine theory assumes the existence and strong influence of a group of elite developers whose goals may be detrimental to the community as a whole. The authors conclude that, “use values of a majority are sacrificed for the exchange gains of a few.” Framing the growth issue in these terms makes it a value issue, contrasting the good of the minority with the good of the whole.

Regime Theory

The highly influential theory of urban regimes synthesizes pluralistic and elitism theories and was first proposed in Clarence Stone’s (1989) case study of Atlanta. Stone defines regimes as “the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions” (6). According to Stone, neither government nor influential community groups can effect widespread change without forming coalitions. In Atlanta, Stone identified the regime as a coalition between city hall and the business elite. Despite the acknowledged power of the business elite, Stone’s argument departs from elite theory by pointing out occasional policy failures by Atlanta’s business elite and the necessity of intervention by the city’s politicians to gain policy success.

Economic Development

Economic development is a term with many interpretations in the literature. Usually the term is framed in one of three ways—as economic outcomes, economic

processes, or government activities undertaken to achieve economic growth (Sharp 1990). In addition to examining economic development in these three contexts, I will also give a brief introduction of how economic development activities are formally organized at the local level.

Economic Development as Outcomes

Economic outcomes are the potential improvements of a community's economic status and are, perhaps, the most conventional description of economic development. Typically, fiscal outcomes are defined as an increase in per capita income and a reduction in unemployment rates (Wolman and Spitzley 1996). Outcomes may also be gauged according to the relative economic status of a community versus other, similar communities (Sharp 1990).

Within the description of economic development as a set of outcomes, there exists the potential for misconception due to the contrasting motives of the parties involved. For example, developers may consider positive economic development in terms of growth or real estate development. Others may view it in terms of job availability and citizen income-earning potential. Both are positive economic outcomes but need dramatically different policy designs in order to achieve their respective goals.

Economic Development as Process

A second view of economic development is that of longitudinal process. In other words, according to this definition, it would be inaccurate to merely look at the effects from a development initiative at only one point in time. Instead, economic development is seen as a "multistage, dynamic process that occurs over time" (Hoyman 1997, 8). According to

this perspective, economic development occurs in a series of stages, marked by the types of issues that government officials must address over time.

From this perspective, researchers measure the effects from a development initiative, whether positive or negative, over several years. For example, though a local government may celebrate the siting of a new business in their community the year it arrives, should it close within a short period, the incentives given may not have been worthwhile.

Economic Development Activities

The final perspective of economic development is as a set of activities undertaken by both government and private citizens to improve the economic conditions in an area. These activities can be sub-divided into three categories, with some overlap between categories: traditional (recruitment and retention), quality of life/human development, and infrastructure development.

Traditional economic development consists primarily of financial incentives used to attract and retain commercial development. Incentives can be as general as efforts to make a community inviting to prospective developers by facilitating permitting or can take the form of tax abatements, land subsidies, and infrastructure improvements (Alexander 1992; Robinson 1989). Other strategies that fit the traditional category are efforts to assist small business development—primarily incubators and low-interest loan programs—and to retain existing businesses, which usually involves having a city staff member available to address the concerns of local businessmen (Knack, Bellus, and Adell 1995).

Another set of economic development activities is associated with improving the quality of life for the city's residents. Cultural amenities such as performing arts facilities,

parks, and museums are considered important to attract companies that employ primarily white-collar workers. Other efforts can be made to improve parking in downtown areas and reduce traffic and pollution. These are indirect measures to stimulate economic development (Fleischman and Green 1991). A broader, but related perspective includes any activities that help improve the economic well being of a city. Two specific strategies can be identified: human development and infrastructure development. Activities related to human development include job training, housing, transportation, and childcare. Human development initiatives have dual purposes of directly improving the lives of citizens affected by the programs as well as the potential to improve the labor force, reduce crime, and increase the city's tax base. The latter set of strategies relate to assuring that the locality's infrastructure is attractive for development, including securing adequate wastewater treatment and water capacity and providing well-maintained streets to facilitate the transport of people, raw goods, or finished goods (Fleischman and Green 1991; Clark and Gaile 1992). Provision of infrastructure such as water or sewer lines is a common type of in-kind development assistance as well.

For the purposes of this research, I will consider economic development as a process, the impacts of which may take many years to be realized. Additionally, I will attempt to determine the specific activities government officials undertake as part of that process and whether officials define development activities narrowly or broadly. Therefore, I will be using a multi-dimensional perspective of economic development.

Organizing for Economic Development

The responsibilities for the traditional functions of economic development—recruitment and retention—may either be retained by city government, formally contracted

out to a private or semi-private organization, or handled through a combination of both government and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). I will describe the nature of NGO involvement in the following section; therefore, here I will focus on how local governments are typically structured for in-house economic development.

When traditional economic development functions are retained by government, they typically are housed either within the planning department or as a larger department that encompasses both planning and community development (Knack, Bellus, and Adell 1983). As such, these activities fall under the supervision of the city manager. In situations where traditional economic development functions are contracted out to private organizations, cities still engage in development activities through planning, community development, and infrastructure provision.

Although city managers do not have direct control over these private organizations, they are in a position to have greater influence than are other members of the local government. For example, the manager may be tasked with overseeing the contract with the private organization or may sit on the board of directors.

Actors in the Economic Development Process

A primary focus of economic development research has been to identify the parties involved in the economic development process. The literature generally focuses on the mayor as the primary driving force behind economic development legislation. Other research has examined the influence of city council members on development policy. The role of the public has also been considered in the literature. The public is usually divided into three groups: the public at large, private business organizations, and semi-public development corporations.

The Mayor

Mayors are frequently the primary subjects of case studies on economic development. Richard Lee in New Haven was the prototypical entrepreneurial mayor, particularly for his involvement in urban renewal (Dahl 1961). As the most visible elected officials, mayors receive most of the credit in economic successes. In some cases, mayors act as policy entrepreneurs, actively creating policy, lobbying for its implementation, then overseeing the implementation of the policies. For example, Mayor Schaeffer in Baltimore and Mayor Rendell in Philadelphia are identified as dynamic mayors who led their cities through successful economic overhauls (Sharp 1990). In a survey of American cities with more than 100,000 population, Clarke and Gaile (1992) conclude that mayors usually spearhead the promotion of economic development activity.

According to Wolman and Spitzley (1996, 116), “a mayor is seen as a focal point for leading an economic development effort and for negotiating deals with development interests.” The mayor also facilitates coalition building and provides leadership throughout the process (Wolman and Spitzley 1996). Other authors highlight an important caveat however. Mayors typically only get involved with high salience economic development issues (Reese 1992). These may include high-profile corporate recruitment efforts or opposition of particular development projects to which an influential contingent of constituents are opposed.

There is evidence that a strong executive is more likely to pursue the use of economic development strategies such as tax abatements (Feiock and Clingermayer 1986) than officials in council-manager governments are. Feiock and Clingermayer speculate that this could indicate one of three conditions: the city managers in the subject cities were

weak; a strong mayor is able to act as a policy entrepreneur for economic development; or that it is necessary for strong mayors to visibly demonstrate political success to remain in office (224). The election imperative may also lead mayors to claim credit for economic development projects, whether or not it is legitimate for them to do so.

Council Members

Like mayors, studies that address the council members' activities in economic development indicate that they attach greater importance to high-profile projects (Elkin 1987). According to this research, politicians believe that if they can become associated with policies that improve the lives of their constituents, they have a better chance of winning their reelection bid (Elkin 1987). In order for the public to take note of these policies, they usually must be highly salient.

This motivation for reelection could cause development policies to be implemented for symbolic reasons. If the city is experiencing economic hardship, leaders do not want to be accused of inaction, therefore they may implement policies simply to avoid that charge (Wolman and Spitzley 1996). In these cases, the decisions may have long-term negative impacts on the community. Often, council members are responding to public pressure when they promote or vote in favor of economic development initiatives. Therefore, council members often make reactive decisions dealing with economic development instead of proactively proposing new activities.

Clingermayer and Feiock (1995) conducted a national survey of council members to determine whether political ideology, race, or a city's level of experience in economic development impacts council members' decisions about whether development efforts should be targeted to the most needy areas of the community. They conclude that

minorities and council members elected by district rather than at-large are supportive of targeting efforts.

The Public

Public involvement in economic development can be critical to success or failure. Citizens may lobby their representatives either for or against development, organize into neighborhood or community organizations, or seek support from external interest groups. Special interest groups, organized labor, and individuals may become active in the development policy-making process. While individual involvement rarely leads to policy changes, citizens do have a great deal of impact when they act as a group (Wolman and Spitzley 1996).

Research shows that when a city's tax burden is high, citizens will usually approve of development hoping to experience lower taxes (Levy 1990). If they do not perceive the tax rate as a problem or they believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact—such as congestion, pollution, or relocation due to highway construction—on their community, they will oppose a new policy. Neighborhood groups may be formed specifically in response to negatively perceived policy (Wolman and Spitzley 1996). For example, opposition to particular development projects due to the impact on the environment may be cause for formation of neighborhood coalitions.

Sharp and Elkins (1991) found a relationship between the level of fiscal stress a community experiences and the level of citizen participation in economic development. In communities with high property tax levels, citizens are more likely to be involved in the process and politicians tend to rely on economic development tools other than tax abatements such as loan guarantees or special assessment districts.

Private Business

Perhaps the greatest external impact on economic development policy comes from members of the business community. Some researchers argue that business groups are actually able to shape economic development policy in some cities to the detriment of average citizens (Wolman and Spitzley 1996). Real estate developers are the most frequently cited example in the literature. They commonly attempt to gain passage of liberal zoning and building laws to facilitate land development. Logan and Molotch (1987) hypothesize that in many cities an “urban growth machine” exists that attempts to influence policy in order to benefit from the increased rents available, as land becomes more valuable. According to this theory, the motives of growth machine members are purely profit-centered and do not consider the potential side effects for the community.

Private business also can be influential in economic development through the involvement of Chambers of Commerce or other private organizations. In some cities, industrial recruitment tasks are contracted to the Chamber with limited government oversight. In other cases, business leaders have formed private organizations that operate separately from similar government-run organizations—both of which handle recruitment (Knack, Bellus, and Adell 1983).

Economic Development Corporations

Economic or community development corporations are public-private partnerships formed to facilitate the creation and implementation of economic development policy. Also known as neighborhood development organizations, these NGOs were originally funded by the federal government in the 1960s to rehabilitate housing and provide jobs for inner city residents (Wilson 1996).

Today, however, they no longer receive federal funding and may be run on a for-profit or non-profit basis (Knack, Bellus, and Adell 1983). Staff and funds may be generated publicly, privately, or through a combination of public and private. One benefit of using an NGO is that the funds can be generated privately, allowing the organization to act more quickly than government organizations that are burdened by procedural requirements.

Baltimore is an example of a city that has benefited greatly from NGOs. The Baltimore Economic Development Corporation (BEDCO) directed the development of the Inner Harbor and Charles Center areas and has a close relationship with Baltimore city government (Knack, Bellus, and Adell 1983; Sharp 1990). Separate NGOs were founded to handle projects such as the Inner Harbor shopping pavilions and the National Aquarium. The aquarium is owned by the city but run by a quasi-public organization, Baltimore Aquarium, Incorporated (Sharp 1990).

City Managers and Economic Development

Although research into the actions of the city manager in economic development policy is rare, studies of other policy areas in local government have been completed. Meltsner's (1971) study of Oakland, California's budgeting process is one such example. Oakland's manager thoroughly believed in the concept of the politics-administration dichotomy, however, he primarily interpreted that as a need to remove politicians from administration while acknowledging the necessarily political aspects of his job. For example, the manager often tailored his policy proposals according to which options were most likely to earn council and public approval. He was constantly mindful of the

importance of gauging public opinion on an issue (58) and his expertise in budgeting and accounting gave him a clear advantage in controlling the budget policy outcomes.

Although the role of the city manager in fiscal policy has been examined in depth, research on the city manager's role in economic development seems, in most cases, to be merely an afterthought to other research on general economic development issues. For example, an article by Andrew Levine (1999) discusses techniques managers can use to market their development efforts. There are also profiles of city managers that discuss their economic development successes (Blackwell 2000 and Coffman 1998). In a profile of City Manager Robert Taylor of Colonial Heights, Virginia, Blackwell mentions Taylor's efforts to persuade council to develop an interchange.

Profiles of successful managers also provide insight into managers' opinions of the policy aspects of a city manager's position. In another profile of Casper, Wyoming's manager Davis (2000) discusses the city manager's belief that there is a need to maintain a separation between his role and that of council. The manager states that he is active in making policy suggestions and recommendations but does not object if the council rejects his advice. Although this research indicates that managers do engage in active policy proposals, there are few empirical studies to establish the extent of involvement.

A more in-depth case study relating the role of the chief administrator in economic development was Nalbandian's study of Kansas City, Kansas (2000). Although Kansas City uses a mayor-council form of government, the findings are still relevant to this research. The chief administrator in Kansas City took the lead role in the effort to attract a NASCAR track to the city. In addition to handling logistical concerns, such as land acquisition and utility provision, the CAO also took the primary role as negotiator on

behalf of the city. Although not entirely comfortable with such an overtly political position in economic development, the CAO justified his actions based on the following conditions: he had the support and encouragement of the mayor, council, and the majority of the public; it led to greater efficiency for him to take on the negotiating tasks; and he was able to maintain perspective on social equity and individual rights while serving as point-person on the project.

The most interesting study to date examined twelve economic development issues in Lawrence, Kansas to determine which actors affected growth policy (Schumaker, et. al 1986). Lawrence has a council-manager government in which the mayor has very little formal power. The authors found that managers were supportive of economic development policy but did not take on the role of policy entrepreneurs, despite the presence of a weak mayor in city government. Managers are not neutral regarding economic development, but they are not initiators. The authors speculate that managers are cautious about overstepping their administrative position if they were to propose policy. However, as stated above, general research into the roles of city managers found that managers do engage in policy activities. The findings of the Lawrence study raise the question of whether managers behave differently in economic development decisions than they do in other policy areas.

Through a literature search, I have discovered only one article that deals directly with the relationship between a city's form of government and its economic development. James Banovetz (1989) explored the issue through a single case study in Illinois. He investigated a threefold hypothesis:

- 1) Have local governments operating under the council-manager form of government responded to the new service expectation for economic development?
- 2) Have such governments demonstrated competence in responding to economic development pressures?
- 3) Have local governments organized under the council-manager form of government responded better to economic development expectations than governments organized under other forms? (1989, 205)

The author's intent is not to prove or disprove the hypotheses empirically but merely to make an argument for future research in the area of form of government and economic development.

Banovetz concludes that council-manager governments have responded to the demand for economic development and they have demonstrated competence in their response, at least in the single case study he presents. However, Banovetz argues empirical proof would require more elaborate and detailed research to control for other variables influencing economic development success besides form of government. Banovetz' article is useful in the context of this paper for a single reason. If council-manager cities are more successful at economic development than cities operating under another form of government, it points to the possibility that the manager is at least partly responsible for the difference since the other forms of government do not have managers. Feiock and Clingmayer (86) suggest one possible explanation. Council-manager governments are more likely to base economic development strategies on need, whereas mayors and council members in mayor-council governments pursue economic development as a "credit-claiming" activity—using economic development projects as a visible indication that the elected officials are accomplishing something—whether or not those actions have truly benefited the community (Svara 1990, 67). This pattern indicates that the manager may be

partly responsible for infusing professional values into a strongly political issue. The role and impact of the managers would indicate that they are involved in policy as well as administrative issues, making a dichotomy and thus a strict hierarchy for this issue unlikely.

A major recent study examines the relative influence of chief administrative officers in economic development and compares it to influence in budgeting (Mouritzen and Svava 2002). Several factors are shown to affect the level of managerial influence in economic development. Perhaps surprisingly, CAO influence in economic development was positively related to mayoral influence—as mayoral economic development influence increased, so too did the chief administrator’s influence. Additionally, the research demonstrated that personal beliefs of the manager and characteristics of the community were more likely to contribute to a manager’s level of influence in economic development than in the budget. These beliefs and behaviors include the manager’s level of policy activity; the extent of importance with which he views community involvement and communication with community leaders; and the extent to which the CAO believes that it is an advantage for the CAO to share the same opinion as the majority of council (216).

Conclusion

After examining the literature on the politics-administration relationship for city managers, community power theory, and economic development—what do we know and where should we go from here?

For practicing city managers, there is little evidence that a true dichotomy between politics and administration exists at the local level. Numerous studies have demonstrated that the manager’s job duties include more than simply implementing policies dictated by

council. Accepting a role for the manager in the policy process however does not mean that the same balance between politics and administration exists in every city. In fact, evidence indicates that much of the distribution depends on situational factors unique to each community. These factors may include leadership ability of the city's elected officials; tenure of the manager; or the existence of laws that increase or restrict managerial authority.

Distribution of power in a community often appears to be at the same time structured and situational. Both the method of studying community power and characteristics of the community itself may affect real and apparent influence in decision-making. Studies conducted using the reputational method are more likely to conclude that a group of elites control decision-making while analyzing individual decisions leads to a pluralistic conclusion that both governmental structure and individual and group interaction are important. It does appear that centralized decision-making is linked to reform variables—such as council-manager government. Additionally, existing research has emphasized the importance of considering those groups or individuals who are able to preempt policy as equally influential to those who broker policy towards implementation.

The literature has provided evidence that the city manager is influential in economic development policy—both directly through survey research (Mouritzen and Svara 2002) and indirectly through single city case studies. Compiling the findings from various studies, it appears that managers take on a multitude of roles in the process of forming economic development policy. However, there is insufficient literature to address what specific actions the manager takes and what factors may lead to greater or lesser

involvement in economic development policy by the manager. This research seeks to fill that gap.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN

As I discussed in the previous chapter, there is a paucity of research into the nature of the city manager's role in the economic development process. For this reason, it would be difficult to launch an expansive survey-based quantitative study; there is insufficient knowledge and theory to adequately construct the survey questionnaire. Although the long-term goal of this research is to develop a quantitative, nationwide survey instrument, I must first gather in-depth information from the parties involved in the policy process.

Consequently, the bulk of the data for this dissertation was collected through a series of in-depth interviews with managers, mayors, city staff members, and government outsiders who are concerned with economic development. The quantitative analysis of data collected by another set of researchers serves as an indicator of an expansive role for city managers in economic development and the findings from the quantitative research will be compared to that in the qualitative study.

Quantitative Analysis

Data from the United States sample of the U.Di.T.E. (Union des Dirigeants Territoriaux de L'Europe) Leadership Study (Local Government Research Unit. University of Southern Denmark, Odense. Data collected 1995-1997) was used for the quantitative portion of the dissertation. The survey, conducted internationally and administered to Chief Administrative Officers, contained questions related to test the perceived level of importance of the CAO in the economic development process.

Using the dataset, I selected the American cases for analysis. There were 59 council-manager cities that responded to the survey having a population range of 100,000-500,000—the range chosen for the qualitative sample set. The purpose of this portion of the study was to determine whether quantitative data supported my supposition that the manager has an extensive role in economic development policy in cities of this size. The expected findings for this portion of the study were as follows:

- 1) The majority of city managers in council-manager cities will indicate that their influence in the economic development of the community is equal to or higher than that of other actors in the process.
- 2) City managers in cities with population over 100,000 will rate their influence at similar levels to that of managers in smaller cities.
- 3) City managers with higher influence in economic development will give higher ratings to the importance of attracting new resources, promoting vision, initiating projects, protecting disadvantaged groups, supporting an activist role for government, and community relations and council relations compared to less influential managers.

Although prior research confirms the argument in Hypothesis 1 for the international sample, the data were limited by neither population nor country. Since the target population for the qualitative portion of this study is between 100,000 and 300,000, I was interested in determining if American city managers in that population range agreed with the assessments of their colleagues in the larger sample.

The second hypothesis deals directly with the impact of population size on level of economic development influence. In this case, I compared the responses from managers in the targeted population range to those from smaller cities. Although I expect to find limited variation in the responses based on population, there are two competing factors that could affect the results based on population—professionalism and level of resources. In larger cities, city managers typically have a greater level of professionalism (defined as

education and experience) than managers in smaller cities due to usual method of promotion in the profession—city managers move to larger cities as they gain additional experience. In addition, the fact that larger cities can pay higher salaries than smaller cities can affect the level of professionalism. However, in smaller cities, managers have greater control of the resources of the city, which they can use to have greater influence on policy outcomes.

To test the third hypothesis, I used data from a series of questions related to the personal belief systems of managers as leaders. The questions asked the managers to rate the importance of the following factors attracting new resources to the city; promoting the city's vision statement; initiating projects; protecting disadvantaged groups; supporting an activist role for government; and community relations and council relations. Using a comparison of means, I analyzed the results to find relationships between these belief systems and the managers' rating of economic development influence. Distilling this set of variables to only those that show a relationship between characteristic and influence, allows me to create a profile of the influential manager.

Limiting the usefulness of this data set is the fact that it is based on the responses of the chief administrator alone. My qualitative research adds perspectives of other actors both inside and outside government who play roles in the economic development policy arena. Additionally, although the quantitative data can answer questions about levels of managerial influence in economic development policy, it cannot address what form that influence takes. In other words, it does provide information about what specific actions managers take related to economic development.

Qualitative Analysis

The source of the data for the qualitative research is a comparative case study analysis among five medium-sized cities in the Southeastern United States. I conducted a series of interviews in each city with the city manager and the major actors in the economic development process. To maximize validity and eliminate some extraneous variables, the sample cities were similar in population, economic base, and form of government.

Selecting the Sample Cities

Before selecting cities to use in the case study data collection and analysis, I established a set of criteria. First, the population range was limited to between 95,000 and 499,999 people. My goal was to select cities that were large enough to engage in extensive development activities. Cities over 500,000 were eliminated because there are a very small number of council-manager cities at that population range. Two hundred forty-eight cities in the United States fall within the selected population range. Second, in order to limit travel and variability, the sample was limited to cities in the Southeast: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia. Applying the regional limitation reduced the total number of remaining cities to thirty-three that meet both the population and area criteria.

Form of government was the third criterion for selection of sample cities. Since the primary research question centers on the activities of the city manager in economic development, only cities with a council-manager form of government were included. Restricting the sample to council-manager cities reduces the population to twenty-two cities. Finally, using the list of twenty-two cities, I chose four states and conducted

research on the demographics and economic bases of each city in those states as well as a newspaper search.

I screened out cities that relied on only one or two industries or institutions¹ for their economic vitality and one city in which the manager was embroiled in a public controversy in the press with the belief that the manager had little time and energy to contribute to the study or possibly to even concentrate on economic development.² From the remaining sixteen cities, I chose seven to request participation in the study. Due to the large number of interviews in each city and the amount of travel involved, seven was the maximum number I could manage independently. I sent letters to each of the managers in those seven cities explaining the study and requesting their consent for a face-to-face interview. One week after sending the letters, I called the administrative assistants to the managers and asked if they were willing to meet for an interview; five agreed. While I hoped for at least six cities in my sample, I decided to conduct the five sets of interviews and add to the sample later.

Interview Subjects

After selecting the cities, I conducted background research on each to determine the individuals and organizations both inside and outside the government who are involved in economic development. I used newspaper searches, examination of data on the cities' web sites, and a review of the charters and statutes in each city. In general, I interviewed the same types of people in each city. The literature on active participants in economic

¹ In all cases, those industries were either tourism or military bases. Cities that had both tourism and military as primary economic sources were retained in the sample.

² The conflict was unrelated to economic development.

development and a desire to have a balance of political, administrative, and community perspectives shaped the list of potential interview subjects. The persons interviewed included the subjects from the following list:

1. City manager
2. Mayor
3. One or two council members—either the mayor pro tem and/or the chair of a committee in charge of economic development—if they do not have committees, I chose a council member who was elected at-large
4. Director of the economic development department (if the city had one) and/or the planning director—in some cities, one person shares both roles
5. Director of the chamber of commerce, unless I was directed that the Chamber performed no economic development activities
6. Director of downtown associations, retail merchant associations, quasi-public economic development authorities, and/or other private or semi-private organizations involved in economic development
7. Director of a minority community development corporation, the director of the NAACP, or another organization representing minority interests
8. City hall reporter from the local newspaper

The variability in the economic development process is enormous. Therefore, in each city, there were differences in the formal titles and responsibilities of the subjects I interviewed. The intent was to interview six to ten persons in each city including the city manager, council members, the senior administrative staff, and community members. Once I had determined the pool of potential research subjects for each city, I researched contact information for each and made appointments. In some cases, I used advice from the manager to add other subjects to the interview list.

In all but one case, the interviews were conducted face-to-face and lasted between 30-60 minutes. The basic questionnaire I created was customized for different subjects—managers, elected officials, and non-governmental actors. The questionnaire contained both open- and closed-ended questions (See Appendix A—Manager’s Questionnaire).

Areas Covered

This study attempts to discover the roles the manager plays in the economic development process. Specifically, I examine the activities of city managers, during creation and implementation of economic development policy, to determine if variation exists in the “political” content of the activities. Since this is a qualitative study, there are no true independent or dependent variables.

In place of variables, I cover several general areas in the research. In order to determine the manager’s role and how he or she may have expanded it, I need to determine how economic development functions are assigned in the subject cities, through both law and custom. In other words, how the responsibilities for development activities are meted out. Are there requirements in the ordinances that require a particular function be handled within government or outside of government? For example, does a city government department handle corporate recruitment, or is it the responsibility of the local chamber of commerce?

A related consideration is how the formal economic development responsibilities of the manager (for example, those assigned directly by council) compare to those tasks independently assumed by the manager. Has the manager remained confined to those duties prescribed by ordinance or by council, or has he expanded his role in the economic development process?

Finally, what is the nature of the relationships between the manager, mayor, council-members, staff, and non-governmental actors? Although my primary consideration

is the relationship between managers and elected officials, interactions between the managers and other actors may prove to be equally insightful.

Validity

Internal validity of the study will be gauged by how well the research measures a manager's activities in the economic development policy process. The greatest threat to the accuracy of the research comes from poor questionnaire design or interpretation. Bias on my part or that of the subjects is also a potential threat to internal validity. Peer reviews of the questionnaire and pretest interviews were used to reduce these risks. Interview questions were written to determine the steps in the economic development policy creation process in each city. I conducted two preliminary interviews with city managers from cities with similar populations to those in the sample and the questionnaire for managers (Appendix A) appeared to be adequate.

Multiple interviews per city and the use of closed-ended questions from other surveys promote internal validity and help to prevent interviewer bias. All interviewees were informed that they would remain anonymous, as would the names of the cities, in an effort to gain open and honest responses to the questions.

Traditionally, qualitative research methods, especially case studies, are not considered externally valid or generalizable to other situations (Jensen & Rogers 2001). In exchange for in-depth information, researchers, to some extent, sacrifice external validity. Using a small sample size presents challenges to external validity—particularly the inability to gain enough variability in the sample to be able to generalize the findings beyond cities with very similar demographics and governmental structures of the sample

cities. However, a sample of this size may be broad enough to allow for generalizations among similar cities and to create a framework for more extensive research. For example, although the study deals with economic development, one can argue legitimately that the findings could apply to other policy processes as well in the subject cities. Although I will not be exploring that option in this paper, it will be a good starting point for future research.

Since this proposal deals with a topic not covered in previous studies, detailed information through case studies is a necessary prerequisite for further, more generalizable research. Therefore, the goal is to make preliminary generalizations and use the findings to develop a survey instrument for use in a nationwide empirical study. Svvara's study of council-manager relations in five moderately large cities in one state using a similar interviewing strategy (1985) produced useful generalizations that that been substantiated in a variety of larger scale follow-up studies.

Data Analysis Procedures

This study will be a comparative case study analysis. Using the model first used by Dahl in 1961 to examine decision making in urban government, I will make an in-depth examination of the relationships and roles leaders play when creating economic development policy. Each interview was taped and later transcribed. I then analyzed the responses from the participants in each of the five cities to look for patterns or consistency in the responses.

Responses from the subjects were compared from both a city-to-city perspective and a person-to-person perspective. In other words, I examined the responses to determine if there were patterns across cities or among people according to their perspectives as

managers, mayors, staff, or government outsiders. In addition, the use of several closed-ended questions administered to governmental actors regarding the importance of various actors in the economic development process, helped with making comparisons across cities.

CHAPTER 4: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Before conducting the interviews for the qualitative portion of my research, I wanted to determine if existing data provides justification for my research questions. An international study conducted between 1995 and 1997 surveyed chief administrators from cities throughout the world (U.Di.T.E. (Union des Dirigeants Territoriaux de L'Europe) Leadership Study, Local Government Research Unit. University of Southern Denmark, Odense). Although the survey contained a host of leadership questions, the questions of most interest to me addressed the perceived level of importance of the city manager in the economic development process.

Previous publications based on this survey (Svara 1999; Mouritzen and Svara 2002), using the variables that address the city manager's ratings of how influential various city leaders are in the economic development process, indicate that managers consider themselves highly influential in the economic development process relative to other actors. I re-examined these variables, focusing on relative influence levels of city managers in the moderately large cities—the population category from which I chose the sample of cities for the qualitative portion of the research. I then used the survey data to determine whether a relationship exists between level of influence and population size. Lastly, I examined the belief systems of city managers who consider themselves highly influential in economic development to help clarify their orientation and motivation.

Methodology

Due to the need to match the quantitative sample as closely as possible to that of the qualitative sample, I analyzed only the responses from American city managers in the UDiTE study. Using the data, I tested the following three hypotheses:

- 1) The majority of city managers in council-manager cities will indicate that their influence in the economic development of the community is equal to or higher than that of other actors in the process.
- 2) City managers in cities with population over 100,000 will rate their influence at similar levels to that of managers in smaller cities.
- 3) City managers with higher influence in economic development will give higher ratings to the importance of attracting new resources, promoting vision, initiating projects, protecting disadvantaged groups, supporting an activist role for government, and community relations and council relations compared to less influential managers.

Although the argument in hypothesis one has been confirmed by prior research for the international sample, the data were limited by neither population nor country. Since the target population for the qualitative portion of this study is between 100,000 and 300,000, I was interested in determining if American city managers in that population range agreed with the assessments of their colleagues in the larger sample.

Population is also a factor in the second hypothesis. In this case, I compared the responses from managers in the targeted population range to those from smaller cities. There are two expectations in large versus small cities that could influence the results of the analysis—professionalism and resource availability. Managers in larger cities tend to be more professional, in other words, they are typically better educated and have more experience than administrators in smaller cities. This higher level of professionalism may lead to greater influence in economic development in several ways. First, the manager's technical expertise may give his opinions more credence with council. Second, his

experience as an administrator may help him to structure/restructure the city government to give himself more influence.

The second, competing, aspect relating to population size and potential influence is the level of resources that are available to the manager. In a smaller city, the manager has a significantly greater amount of resources than other actors do in the city government—for example, he is a full-time manager, while council members are more than likely part-time. Therefore, although a manager may wish to be active and influential in economic development policy, other actors both inside and outside government constrain his influence. In this case, I chose to use the comparison of means and the *t*-test to determine whether there was a significant probability that population size affects influence level in economic development.

To test the third hypothesis, I used data from a series of questions related to the personal belief systems of managers as leaders. The questions asked the managers to rate the importance of the following factors: attracting new resources to the city, promoting the city's vision statement, initiating projects, protecting disadvantaged groups, supporting an activist role for government, and community relations and council relations. Using a comparison of means, I analyzed the results to find relationships between these beliefs and the managers' rating of economic development influence. Distilling this set of variables to only those that show a relationship between characteristic and influence, allows me to create a profile of the influential manager.

Findings

Perceived Managerial Influence in Economic Development

For my initial analysis, I ran a set of descriptive statistics related to the economic development question that included the United States' council-manager form cases at all population levels. The question read: "Please estimate how influential the following actors are regarding the economic development of the community. Place a check in the column that shows the level of influence on the scale from 1 (high influence) to 5 (no influence)."

Table 4.1 shows that the average city manager in the sample rated himself at the highest level of economic development influence, at a mean of 1.8—the closer to one, the higher the level of influence. Private business interests received the second highest rating (1.9). The mayor was ranked third, with a substantially lower mean influence rating of 2.26.

Table 4.1—Descriptive Statistics—Influence of Various Actors on Economic Development

<i>Actor</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>
The city manager	503	1.80
Private business interests	503	1.90
The Mayor	483	2.26
The majority group on the council	500	2.39
Users/clients	502	2.93
The department heads	504	3.04
Upper level governments	504	3.33
The media	503	3.38
The committee chairs	479	3.76
Voluntary associations	504	3.81
Trade union leaders	501	4.32
The local political parties	498	4.55

The second step in analyzing the Hypothesis 1 was to limit the population range to no less than 100,000 to match that of the qualitative study, and re-examine the descriptive

statistics. Table 4.2 summarizes the results of the data for the limited population range. Restricting the population size caused a drop in the number of cases from approximately 500 to only 59.

Several changes occurred in the influence ratings when population was restricted to large cities of at least 100,000; private business interests were rated as most influential (1.64) with city managers receiving the second highest rating (1.71)—both scores improved however, over the scores received in the less restrictive sample. Although remaining in third, the mayor’s influence level increased—the mean level of influence increasing to 1.88 from the earlier mean ranking of 2.26.

Table 4.2: Overall Rankings, U.S. Council-Manager Cities, with Population 100,000 or Greater

<i>Actor</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>
Private business interests	59	1.64
The city manager	59	1.71
The Mayor	59	1.88
The majority group on the council	59	2.32
The department heads	59	2.64
Users/clients	59	2.85
The media	59	3.14
Upper level governments	59	3.51
Voluntary associations	59	3.80
The committee chairs	55	3.80
Trade union leaders	59	4.14
The local political parties	59	4.64

Simply examining the comparison of means indicates that the manager does not consider himself most influential in economic development in the target range. Although the manager is not ranked highest in the larger cities, his influence level is higher than that of the overall sample. Testing hypothesis two allows for a fuller analysis of the relationship between population and level of economic development influence.

Comparison of Population Ranges below Target Sample

For a final assessment of whether population influences the city manager’s perception of economic development influence, I compared the findings of the targeted population range to that in smaller cities. In hypothesis two, I argue that city managers in cities with population ranges below 100,000 will rate their influence at similar levels to that of managers in the population range above 100,000.

Table 4.3 shows a comparison of the four top-rated actors in cities in the target population range versus cities that have a population of less than 100,000. Since the number of cases in the smaller cities is much higher ($N > 400$) than in the smaller cities ($N = 59$), it is likely that the results from the unrestricted population means were skewed towards the results of the smaller cities. Private business interests again have the highest influence rating in large cities; city managers received the highest ranking in the smaller cities. The mayors in large cities are considered more influential than those in small cities as well.

Table 4.3: Influence Ratings of Primary Actors, Classified According to Population

<i>Actor</i>	Population Category			
	<i>100,000 or Greater</i>		<i>99,999 or Less</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>
Private business interests	59	1.64	444	1.93
The city manager	59	1.71	444	1.81
The Mayor	59	1.88	424	2.31
The majority group on the council	59	2.32	441	2.40

Table 4.4 compares the sample population range to that of cities above and below the range. Data were condensed into four categories: low influence (rankings 4 and 5),

medium influence (ranking 3), fairly high influence (ranking 2) and high influence (ranking 1).

Table 4.4: Comparison of Economic Development Influence in Two Population Categories

Influence Rating	<i>Population 2 Categories</i>	
	Population >= 100,000	Population <= 99,999
High Influence	8	178
Fairly High Influence	10	193
Medium Influence	2	65
Low Influence	0	22
Total	20	458

To test for significance of the results, I ran a comparison of means t-test, hypothesizing that there would not be a statistically significant difference between the average managerial influence ratings of the two population groups. Table 4.5 shows that the mean influence rating in large cities (1.71) is higher than that in small cities (1.81).

Table 4.5: Comparison of Means: Population vs. Administrator’s Economic Development Authority

		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
The city manager	Population >= 100,000	59	1.71	0.645	0.084
	Population <= 99,999	444	1.81	0.825	0.039

Table 4.6 shows the results from the independent samples t-test. Levene’s test is used to verify that the primary assumption for the t-test is met—homogeneity of variance. Since the F-test statistic is not significant, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the variances are equal, demonstrating that the data meet the primary assumption. The t-test statistic has a significance level of .365, which is not significant. Therefore, there is not

sufficient evidence to conclude that the variation between large and small cities and the ranking of the influence level of the city manager is statistically significant.

Table 4.6: Independent Samples T-Test: Population vs. Administrator’s Economic Development Authority

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error Difference</i>	<i>95% CI of the Difference</i>	
								<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Equal variances assumed	2.263	0.133	-0.906	501	0.365	-0.101	0.112	-0.321	0.118
Equal variances not assumed			-1.093	85	0.278	-0.101	0.093	-0.285	0.083

The comparison of large versus small cities demonstrates that although there are some numerical differences in the means of the economic development influence ratings, the differences are not statistically significant. However, there is some evidence to indicate that managers in larger cities perceive the influence of private business interests and the mayor to be more important than in smaller cities. Thus, although the influence of the city manager is slightly (but not significantly) greater than that of managers in smaller cities, the influence advantage of the city manager over other key actors is lower in the large cities.

Importance of Personal Belief Systems of the Manager

For the final portion of the quantitative analysis, I attempt to discover if relationships exist between the manager’s economic development influence rating and personal beliefs as reported on the survey. There were several variables used for this part of the analysis.

The first question of interest asks managers to rank the amount of time they spend on council relations, community leadership, and administrative or managerial functions. The third hypothesis argues that managers who spend a greater proportion of time on council relations and community relations versus administrative tasks will have a higher economic development influence rating.

According to the data, administrators in council-manager governments spend a significant portion of their time on non-administrative activities [See Table 4.7]. This is particularly so with council relations, in which 52% of city managers ranked council relations as occupying the greatest percent of their time. Managers were evenly divided when asked to estimate the proportion of time spent on administrative activities, with 42% responding that they spend most of their time in that area and the another 42% stating that administrative tasks are the second-most time consuming activities.

Table 4.7: City Managers' Time Allocation—Council Relations, Community Leadership, and Administrative/Management

Activity	Percent Ranked #1	Percent Ranked #2	Percent Ranked #3
Community Leadership	7%	18%	75%
Council Relations	52%	39%	9%
Administrative Activities	42%	42%	16%

The other questions related to this hypothesis address how important city managers perceive the following to be: attracting new resources to their communities, promoting the vision of the community, initiating projects, protecting disadvantaged groups, and supporting an activist role for government. Table 4.8 shows the comparison of means for those variables as well as the variables dealing with the amount of time managers would

prefer to spend on community relations and council relations—distributed according to the level of managerial influence in economic development.

The results of the comparison of means indicate that there is apparently no relationship between having an activist role and preferred time spent on non-administrative activities—council relations and community leadership—and their impact on economic development influence. Protecting disadvantaged groups, initiating new projects, and the importance of attracting resources is highest for high and medium-influence managers. Promoting the community vision has limited variation but is highest for managers with very high economic development influence.

Table 4.8: Personal Beliefs of Managers and Level of Influence

<i>Managerial Influence</i>	<i>Vision</i>	<i>New projects</i>	<i>Attract resources</i>	<i>Support Disad. Grps.</i>	<i>Activist Role</i>	<i>% of Time Preferred-Council Rel.</i>	<i>% of Time Preferred-Community Ldrshp.</i>
Low	70.8	48.9	46.0	39.1	72.1	17.1	17.7
Medium	77.4	64.6	55.6	50.8	68.7	20.0	20.5
High	80.2	68.7	60.5	49.9	74.1	23.2	22.4
Very high	82.7	72.2	65.1	51.3	77.1	22.2	25.6
Total	80.4	68.6	60.9	50.1	74.4	20.6	23.2

The results for the third hypothesis indicate that a possible profile for a city manager with high economic development influence should include characteristics that involve taking steps to bring resources and new projects into the community. Additionally, managers with medium to very high influence appear to be more likely to favor taking action to support of disadvantaged groups. Similarly, the idea of promoting a community vision is more pronounced among city managers who exert at least some influence on economic development.

Summary

The cumulative result of this brief quantitative analysis indicates that city managers:

- 1) Perceive themselves to have a substantial role in economic development;
- 2) In large cities, are highly influential but face greater constraints in economic development due to the influence of other actors, both inside and outside of government.
- 3) Are likely to place more emphasis on bringing new resources into the community and initiating new projects as their influence increases. All but the least influential managers also seek to be visionary and to support assistance for disadvantaged groups.

These three conclusions lend credence to my propositions for the qualitative portion of this paper—that city managers have a significant role in the economic development policy process. Unfortunately, these data do not answer the questions regarding what the precise nature of what that role may be. Based on the quantitative analysis, one would expect in large cities to find managers who are important in the economic development process but who share influence with other important actors. The picture also emerges of influential managers as interested in economic development for various reasons—not simply to promote business interests. The qualitative research findings that follow are meant to examine these questions and expectations.

CHAPTER 5: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

The previous chapter gives credence to the idea that city managers, at least according to their own perception, have a great deal of influence in the economic development policy process. In this chapter, I examine whether that conclusion is consistent with qualitative findings gathered through in-depth questioning of city managers and other municipal economic development actors. While it will perhaps not be surprising if the managers themselves rate their influence as relatively substantial given the findings in the previous chapter, it is important to determine whether that perspective is shared by other actors in the policy process. In addition, analysis of the interviews illuminates how city managers get involved in the economic development process, the values that guide their efforts, and the ways that structure and circumstances along with values shape the nature of the manager's involvement.

As stated in the research design chapter, I conducted research by reviewing each subject city's web site, charter and ordinances, and local newspapers to determine: which members of the community, both inside and outside of government, are active in economic development; what major, recent economic development projects were undertaken; what legal restrictions or mandates, if any, are placed on the manager, mayor, or council regarding economic development or other major municipal powers; and the general public impression of the manager as indicated by the newspapers and through editorial comments of the public at large. This initial investigation allowed me to narrow my list of potential interview subjects, particularly those outside of government, by allowing me to determine which organizations and individuals are active in development politics in each city. From

this background work, I was also able to create questions specific to particular development projects for each city, determine if the manager was a prominent media figure, and identify any legal barriers to the manager’s economic development role.

Table 5.1 lists the titles and numbers of persons interviewed. In all cities, I was able to speak to both the city manager and mayor. In one case, I conducted an email interview with the mayor, in all others I met with the subjects in person. In addition, I interviewed a least one city council member, department heads or directors of city departments relevant to economic development (economic development, planning, or community development), the director of the local or regional private or semi-private organization that handled development responsibilities in the area, and an individual active in minority issues in each city. In three cities, I was also able to speak to city hall reporters.

Table 5.1: Interview Subjects

Title of Interview Subjects	Number Of cities	Number of respondents
City Managers	5	5
Mayors	5	5
City Council Members	5	6
Directors of City Departments: Economic Development/ Planning/ Community Development	5	7
Directors of Chambers or other Private Organizations Charged with Economic Development	5	5
Minority Representatives	5	5
Reporters	5	3

Background on Subject Cities

Preceding analysis of the qualitative data related to the five propositions, I will describe the general background of the subject cities and the structural organization of their economic development program.

Assignments of the responsibilities for economic development are quite different among the cities, as are the needs of each city regarding recruitment, development, and retention efforts. The last column in Table 5.2 indicates what type of organization conducts industrial recruitment and marketing functions on behalf of the city and lists the assignment of the functions in economic development. Only two cities handle recruitment and marketing efforts internally, the others typically fund a private organization to handle those functions. In the two cities in which city government handles recruitment functions internally, each city has the assistance of quasi-private regional economic development recruitment organizations. One city benefited from a self-supporting private organization to handle recruitment efforts—although the organization was initially funded publicly by the city and two neighboring counties, the organization’s land acquisitions allowed the organization to become self-sustained.

The economies of the five cities are relatively diverse. Four of the cities have three or more primary industries (see Table 5.2). The one city (A) with only two industries seemed to suffer the most from the current recession, having lost the majority of its manufacturing jobs in the textile industry with no comparable industries to which laid off workers could go. Median household incomes in the subject cities, as recorded by the 2000 U.S. Census, ranged from approximately \$29,000 to nearly \$47,000 annually.

Two of the cities have military bases in close proximity that generated revenue, primarily in the form of sales taxes. All of the cities have at least one post-secondary educational institution within the city limits. City E is the only coastal city in the sample having a major port system.

Despite the fact that medium-sized cities in the Southeast tended to grow in population between 1990 and 2000 (Vey and Forman 2002), Cities C and E had negative population growth. Out-migration of city residents into the nearby suburbs and unincorporated counties is the probable cause of the population decline in cities C and E. In contrast to the city itself, the two closest counties to City E saw population increases of approximately 50% between 1990 and 2000; a similar, though less extreme pattern, occurred in the area surrounding City C.

Table 5.2: Background of Subject Cities

City Designation	Population Change (1990-2000)	Median Household Income (2000)	Unemployment Rate-MSA (April 2003) ³	Primary Industries	Industrial Recruitment/ Marketing By
A	16.9%	\$39,661	5.8	Higher education, manufacturing	City government
B	25.3%	\$46,612	4.6	Technology, education, tourism	Chamber of Commerce w/ public funding
C	-1.6%	\$30,719	3.2	Medical, technology, manufacturing, tourism	City government
D	3.9%	\$34,853	4.6	Military, insurance, medical	Chamber of Commerce w/ public funding
E	-4.4%	\$29,038	3.4	Tourism, manufacturing/distribution, education, military	Private organization w/out public funding

Testing the Propositions

Before I discuss whether the findings supported the propositions, I will review both the initial research questions and the propositions. The overall questions I addressed with the research are:

- What is the nature and range of tasks a city manager performs in the creation of economic development policy?

³ Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics web site, www.bls.gov

- What are the sources of the manager's policy proposals? (Is there a distinctive city manager/professional "style" of economic development policy?) To what extent do city managers adapt their strategies to fit the circumstances of their cities?
- What is the relationship between the policy preferences of the city manager and those of other actors? and
- How do the city manager and the city council, in general, and the mayor and the city manager, in particular, interact as economic development policy actors?

Given the overall research questions and based on the limited existing research, I formulated five tentative propositions that I explore through the analysis of the data. City managers:

- are extensively involved in a wide range of economic development tasks. Using an analysis of the literature to determine what activities are entailed in economic development in general, I will then compare those tasks to ones identified by the interview subjects as appropriate responsibilities for the city manager. From the research, I also will seek to determine what factors influence variation in the level of involvement among cities. I expect to find that managers are involved in a wide range of tasks, both administrative and policy-related. This high level of involvement has potential consequences for both economic development and administrative quality.
- bring a professional perspective to the policy creation process. Most managers have graduate degrees in administration and/or years of experience in government administration that give manager's a viewpoint that is decidedly different from that of elected officials. The acceptance of the manager's professional competence

could mitigate conflict between the manager and elected officials when disagreements occur.

- are centrally involved in shaping policy goals, not just implementing the goals determined by others. In other words, the manager does not merely act on the directives of the council but suggests policy initiatives independent of elected officials. Whether this occurs through direct policy proposals, suggestion of alternative policy options, or influence in the long-term planning and visioning process, or all of these activities, will be examined through my research.
- have a cooperative relationship with the political actors. Prior research has determined that a cooperative relationship between the manager, council members, and the mayor could lead to higher quality governance (Svara 1999). While determining the nature of the relationship is important in itself—a cooperative relationship indicating that the lines between politics and administration are not concrete—the dynamic of manager-politician interactions can also indicate whether the manager is performing as expected or deviating from the expectations of the elected officials.
- tend to have reciprocal influence with elected officials—the influence of each affecting the other. Finding the existence of reciprocal influence would support the findings in all five propositions.

The remainder of this chapter addresses the specific findings from the qualitative research and how those findings relate to my initial research questions and propositions.

Economic Development Tasks of the City Manager

Chapter 2 reviewed the literature examining economic development strategies, which include traditional recruitment and retention tactics, quality of life/human development objectives, and infrastructure improvement and maintenance related to development. Through my interviews in the subject cities, I learned that city managers perform a wide-range of tasks in all three of those areas.

Recruitment and Retention Tasks

Traditional recruitment and retention includes all tactics intended to encourage commercial development in a community. This can include offering financial incentives to businesses to either locate or remain in an area, advertising and other forms of marketing to potential new commercial establishments, and efforts to appease pre-existing business owners. Related to these tactics are specific activities undertaken in both the private and public sector, which include but are not limited to: conducting strategic planning, market analyses, and other research to match companies to a community; budgeting for, designing and approving advertising campaigns for the city; and determining the legal and political feasibility of individual incentive deals and handling the negotiation process.

According to my discussions with the city managers and staff in my sample, modern administrators are highly active in at least one of the three categories if not more. Legal constraints prevented the managers in the sample from having the ability to directly negotiate or offer tax abatements. However, three of the five are involved in financial

incentive programs—either through oversight and administration of the incentive program or by providing guidance to council on whether abatements for individual projects are worthwhile. When non-governmental organizations conduct commercial recruitment, the manager continues to maintain some role in the process; in each city sampled, for example, the manager served on the board of directors of a local economic development organization or the chamber of commerce.

Retaining existing businesses is also essential in economic development. Although there are usually financial incentives available to existing businesses that choose to expand—hiring additional staff—those who maintain a steady number of employees, small business owners, and retail establishments are not typically eligible. In those cases, retaining existing businesses is a matter of helping them address and problems or issues with their location.

Activities related to business retention include creating a line of communication with businesses so that they can get assistance with problems, setting up permitting and licensing offices to minimize red tape, and considering and minimizing negative impacts from land development or zoning choices. These activities are all the purview of the city government and therefore overseen by the city manager. Among the sample cities, one manager held a monthly breakfast meeting with local business leaders—meeting with all the real estate professionals one month, the downtown retailers the next, etc.—in order to personally determine what they needed from city government to remain happy with their location. Other managers streamlined permitting processes and encouraged the involvement of business leaders on local zoning and planning boards so they would have input on development decisions.

Planning for economic development is important to all of the city managers in the sample—each city has a long-range comprehensive plan created by the planning department that addresses development goals in the city and relates those goals to needs for physical improvements. Directing the creation of a city’s long-range plan and vision statement can have a significant impact on development decisions—often specifying what parts of the city should be targeted for growth or revitalization, the types of industry that are appropriate for the city, and the amenities that the city should seek to provide for current and future residents.

Quality of Life and Human Development Strategies

Provision and improvement of amenities is also essential to the second set of economic development strategies—improving the quality of life and personal conditions of the residents to make the city attractive for development, improve the living conditions of the residents, and make long-term impacts on factors such as the quality of the area workforce and the crime rate.

Cultural amenities include parks, museums, performing arts establishments, sports venues, and other facilities that provide entertainment and leisure activities for the city’s residents. Corporations, particularly those with a high proportion of white-collar workers, seek out cities with a full range of amenities when choosing a location for a facility. Therefore, the range and quality of amenities the city possesses becomes an important factor when deciding the types of commercial enterprises a city needs to target.

For example, city leaders who would like to see their cities become conference destinations typically choose to build or enlarge civic centers in order to accommodate the meetings. Two of the five cities in the sample were in the process of renovating their civic

centers during this project and one city just completed a large performing arts facility. In each subject city, the manager is integrally involved in this aspect of economic development. In the two cities undergoing civic center renovations, the city managers were the primary leaders behind the projects—suggesting the idea to council, lobbying for the passage of a plan, developing alternative implementation strategies, and troubleshooting. In both cases, the projects were highly controversial, drawing a great deal of attention from the community in the form of protests and letters to the editor, much of which was critical.⁴ In each story, the manager was mentioned as the person responsible for problems such as insufficient space allocated for parking and improper choice of a building contractor.

A second aspect related to citizens' quality of life is human development. Often related to diversity initiatives, the theory relating human development to economic development is that by improving the education, housing, and income of city residents, the entire city will benefit through higher property values, lower unemployment rates, better educational systems, and lower crime rates. Activities related to human development include job training, public housing improvements, daycare provision, and revitalization of predominately minority areas within the city (two of the five managers in the sample announced plans to make this goal one of their priorities—one manager made the announcement in a newspaper interview, the other at a community meeting).

Of the five city managers in the sample, three spent a great deal of time equating the improvement of the city's overall economy with the quality of the workforce in the

⁴ City A: 30 letters to the editor in the local newspaper between January 2002-February 2004 dealt with civic center renovations, 22 were opposed, 6 supportive, 2 neutral (77% opposition). City C: 14 letters to the editor between January 2001 to December 2003 dealt with civic center expansion, 8 writers were opposed to the project (57% opposition)—in addition a citizen's opposition group was formally organized and a protest of over 300 people was held at the civic center site.

community. They considered activities that help make people more employable to be keys to successful economic development. For example, one city established an office of economic development to oversee community development, job training, and daycare provision—one of the department's programs involves sending teachers and trainers to public housing community centers to give classes to residents.

Infrastructure Activities

There are two ways that infrastructure is related to economic development. First, in order for a city to grow in population or to add large-scale commercial establishments, there must be sufficient water supply and waste treatment capacity. Additionally, the city should have the necessary resources to handle the additional costs of road maintenance that accompany population growth in an area.

The second way that infrastructure relates to economic development is that provision of infrastructure at no or reduced cost is a common incentive when negotiating for a site location package. Since city managers oversee the administration of the departments that handle public works and road maintenance/construction, they have an integral role in this aspect of development. Additionally, most managers draft the city budget, allowing them to prioritize items fiscally and, by doing so, targeting individual projects or policies. One assistant city manager stressed the importance of infrastructure to economic development “if he [the former manager, whose tenure in office exceeded twenty years] hadn't had the foresight to lay those pipes and increase that capacity, we wouldn't have the city we do today.”

Structural Arrangements for Economic Development

Each city has different structural arrangements for management of economic development functions. These arrangements often prevent city managers from having a great deal of involvement in what many consider the classic economic development activity of business recruitment. In those cities in which managers are unable to directly affect commercial/industrial recruitment managers tended to define economic development more broadly than in the cities in which managers directly supervised the recruitment process. In the cities where managers are involved in industrial recruitment (cities A and C), they defined economic development in terms of growth of per capita income and the tax base. In the other cities, managers added quality of life, adequate housing, public safety, revitalization of blight, and/or low unemployment to increasing the tax base and per capita income.

City E's manager, who does not have recruitment authority, described the city's role in economic development as "that of economic infrastructure provider and preserver of quality of life—safety, neighborhoods, etc. The city is also responsible for maintaining a vibrant downtown. Inner city economic development involves eradicating blight and assisting at-risk families and the underemployed and unemployed." Although all the managers acknowledged the importance of commercial/industrial recruitment, those with limited input into that area focused on other activities that they viewed as critically important to the long-term vibrancy of the community. [i.e., the areas they could do something about.]

In cities in which most traditional economic development functions (specifically corporate recruiting and marketing) lay outside of city government, the managers have little

involvement in marketing or negotiating with in-coming businesses. However, in all cases, city managers do participate in limited aspects of the recruitment process such as meeting with corporate representatives (typically after or immediately before the location decision was made), directing the staff to provide information to prospective corporate representatives or private organizations that handle recruitment, determining the logistics behind necessary infrastructure improvements for attraction of particular companies, and serving on the board of directors of the local chamber of commerce or other organization(s) who have recruitment responsibilities. Table 5.3 lists specific economic development activities that city managers claimed as part of their responsibility.

As discussed earlier, there appears to be a relationship between internal control of recruitment and an increased number of traditional economic development tasks performed by the managers. Table 5.3 indicates that Cities A, C, and E have city government economic development offices. In City E, however, the economic development office is charged with administering programs in community development, poverty abatement, and minority small business initiatives, rather than traditional development tasks.

Managers in all the sampled cities visit other cities for best practice research, serve as board members on local economic development organizations, and ensure adequate resources for corporate sitings. However, city managers in A and C also typically meet with corporate leaders early in the negotiation process, suggest potential incentive packages, and make suggestions about the type of industries that should be recruited. Similarly, the managers in cities A and C also handle a greater number of retention activities than their counterparts in the other cities—setting up methods for business owners to communicate their problems to city government, developing incentives packages

for expansion projects, and either meeting personally with business owners on a regular basis or delegating a staff member to do so.

Table 5.3: Specific Economic Development Activities of City Managers

Recruitment & Marketing	A	B	C	D	E
Visit other cities	X	X	X	X	X
Meet with company representatives early in the siting process	X		X		
Supervise department of economic development (NA=cities do not have an ED Department)	X	NA	X	NA	X
Recommend incentives packages	X		X		
Serve as supervisor of the contract between the city and private economic development contractor	NA	X	NA	X	
Suggest industries to focus on for recruitment	X		X		
Serve as board member of private economic development organizations/chambers of commerce	X	X	X	X	X
Ensure adequate resources available for corporate locations	X	X	X	X	X
Retention					
Meet with business owners		X	X		
Support/suggest incentives for expansion	X	X	X		
Set up outlets for businesses to communicate with the city	X		X		
Address public safety concerns	X	X	X	X	X
Address other business concerns (i.e. parking, traffic, new sites)	X	X	X	X	X
Planning/Zoning/Information Provision					
Propose downtown development projects	X	X	X	X	X
Propose revitalization projects		X		X	X
Supervise creation of a comprehensive plan with economic development considerations	X	X	X	X	X
Suggest options to council	X	X	X	X	X
Provide information at the request of council	X	X	X	X	X
Engage in human development and/or housing activities		X		X	X
Maintain/improve infrastructure	X	X	X	X	X

Although two cities have economic development offices charged with traditional economic development recruitment and retention functions, their structural arrangements are different. City C has an economic development office run by an economic development director who is one of only three city department heads reporting directly to the city manager rather than to an assistant city manager. In City A, the manager, who has a very long tenure in his position, directed virtually all of the economic development

actions the city took through an executive-level economic development department headed by an assistant city manager. The manager's direction included supervision of the creation of a vision statement for the city that describes the city's long-term development goals, advising the city council regarding the direction or type of industries the city should try to recruit, and addressing the media regarding the city's economic development objectives.

Planning, zoning, and information provision activities related to economic development make up the third and final section of Table 5.3. All city managers are interested in downtown redevelopment efforts, supervision of the creation of a comprehensive plan, providing alternatives and information to council, and maintaining or improving infrastructure to facilitate economic development. The primary difference between cities A and C, those having internal control of traditional development, versus cities that rely on external organizations is that city managers in the latter set of cities also consider activities related to human development and revitalization of minority areas as essential to the economic development process.

Professional Contribution to the Policy Process

All but one of the city managers (D) in the sample have a traditional, professional managerial background, having worked as assistant city managers or city managers in other cities before beginning their present jobs (See Table 5.4). However, even the manager without a traditional public administration background received high marks from the other interview subjects, considering the manager highly professional in the way in which he performs his duties.

Table 5.4: Education and Experience of Subject City Managers

City	MPA	Other Master's/Ph.D.	Prior Experience in City Mgt.	Ever Worked for Another City?	Highest Previous Position Held	1st Year in Present Position
A	X		X	No	ACM	1996
B	X		X	Yes	CM	2001
C		X	X	Yes	ACM	2000
D		X		No		1997
E	X		X	Yes	CM	1994

(ACM=Assistant City Manager; CM=City Manager)

The managers discussed their experience as being one of the factors legitimizing their role in the economic development policy process. City B's manager stated, "A primary responsibility of the city manager is to look toward the future and to develop those opportunities and put those before council. If a city manager sees his or her role only as a sort of storekeeper, just providing good, reliable service every day, that is a big part of our job but if you don't take on the second part, which is preparing our community for the future by planning and investing, then I think we've only done half the job. So I see it as a very, very important role of the city manager to place that agenda out there, to push it."

The majority of non-elected persons I talked to mentioned a longer-term perspective on the part of the city manager versus elected officials; describing the manager in various terms such as "point person," "vision leader," and as an "advocate and facilitator." City A's manager stated that one of his responsibilities "is to look after the long term and work with council to make sure they pay attention to it." Those interviewed mentioned the importance of the manager service in the role of leader in economic development. In City B, one assistant city manager described a situation in which "there's a leadership vacuum in council." In those cases he suggested, "the manager needs to provide leadership, with caution not to overstep his bounds."

Perhaps as expected, in several cities, elected officials downplayed the importance of the city manager in economic development. They typically described a partnership between elected officials and the manager, often minimizing the role of the manager and emphasizing the importance of the mayor over the manager. City A's mayor described the manager's role in economic development as "a cheerleader for business and industry who should maintain infrastructure and provide public safety, not to build the next company." The mayor in City D reiterated his belief several times that teamwork is the key to successful economic development however, when asked to describe his perspective on the city manager's role in economic development he said that "I tell the manager what I need and he finds a way to get it."

Elected officials in the other cities in the sample have a different perspective. In City E, the council's confidence in the manager as technical expert allowed him to create a series of annual courses for council members at which he educated them about issues that he feels are of greatest importance for the city. By organizing these sessions, the manager not only selected the issues on which council is likely to focus but also educated them according to what he believed is the accurate perspective on the issue. This has the potential for an enormous impact on the council's agenda.

In City A, the manager considers it his responsibility to focus on the long-term perspective of the community's best interests and persuade council members to not lose sight of that perspective. "One of the jobs of the city manager is to look after the long term and work with council to make sure they pay attention to it."

In each of the five cities, managers, staff, and elected officials mentioned the importance of the manager as a facilitator. A central role they identified as a managerial

responsibility is the ability to provide solutions. Council members, government employees, or individuals with private economic development organizations may identify areas in need of resources or improvement; the city manager finds ways to fulfill those needs. Although the city manager may identify particular areas of shortages, many times those realizations are brought forth from elected officials. In most cases, these needs are related to infrastructure inadequacies—water supply, sewage treatment, or roads. Although these areas are typically the domains of the city manager, their importance to economic development bears mentioning.

The role of manager as facilitator supports Nalbandian's (1994) suggestion that chief administrators must serve as "translators" between politicians and staff, interpreting both the political and administrative aspects in the decision-making process. Nalbandian argues that the languages spoken by the elected official and that of the professional in local government (especially planners and other technical professionals) is quite different—the political language being fraught with symbolism while the administrative language is based on factual information. These differences make it necessary for someone to bridge the gap between the two in order to run a city with both efficiency and responsiveness to the constituents—Nalbandian argues that the chief administrator can and should fill that role. My findings concur with this thesis; interview subjects in each city mentioned the importance of the manager as the facilitator between council and staff.

The Manager's Ability to Shape Policy Goals

Despite the occasional contradiction about whom is most influential in economic development—the council or manager—managers and elected officials did appear to have a consensus regarding the way they defined economic development. Whether the

consensus is natural—the result of preformed ideas in the minds of both groups—or influenced through working in public office, I cannot determine. There is evidence however, that in at least one city, the manager helped to form the council members’ perceptions of economic development. In City E, the manager organized seminars several times a year to inform council about issues he deemed important to the community—usually promoting the policies he considers to be priorities, such as poverty. Council members expressed support of the workshops and seemed to welcome the idea of issue-specific education.

Although all of the city managers described their policy involvement as high, they are careful not to overstep their bounds. According to the manager in City B, managerial policy discretion “is more or less depending on the relationship with the mayor and council.” In City D, policy discretion is dependent on the level of trust with council and that “trust is based on experience.” City A’s manager believes that the overall impact of the manager is the highest of any other actor in the policy process. However, the manager must be careful—“he doesn’t need to be out front to be successful.”

In contrast to the high involvement city managers believe they have in economic development policy, elected officials tend to see the city manager’s policy role as much less significant than the administrative role—which they define as providing resources, overseeing staff, and developing alternative solutions to problems, at the request of council. For example, in City A, one council member stated that the city manager has “some” policy discretion. City D’s mayor said the manager has a great deal of policy discretion in economic development but that “the manager must always consult with the mayor.” In

contrast, from the staff perspective, the director of community development in the same city (D) described the manager as “very active in policy.”

Interview subjects, both from within and outside government, were able to name at least one project in their city for which the manager deserved credit for both conceiving of the idea and succeeding in having the policy implemented. These projects included: civic center construction and expansion, urban revitalization, housing projects such as receipt of Hope VI grants, and location or expansion of a major employment provider. In the case of the Hope VI grant, the city had failed to receive funding on two prior applications. The manager personally directed the writing of another grant application and the design of the project in a manner that was acceptable to HUD—the city’s third proposal was accepted.

In another city (City C), the manager received credit for retaining and finding a site for a large health care corporation in the downtown area. The company was originally only considering Greenfield sites (sites that were previously undeveloped) after it outgrew the former downtown office complex. The manager was able to secure sufficient land within the downtown area for both the new building and additional parking as well as incentives to prevent the company from moving into the county—the mayor, economic development director, and private regional development director all credited the manager with preventing the company from relocating.

The kind of project initiated reflected the focus of the manager. In City C, the manager spent a great deal of time on retention and recruitment activities and did not foster linkages between the economic development department and community development. In fact, the manager created the office of economic development soon after being hired, and made it an independent department. City A has a similar organizational arrangement and

the manager shares a focus on large-scale recruitment efforts. In contrast, City E's economic development department does no recruitment and limits business development to assisting small, primarily minority-owned businesses. The director of the economic development department and of a private community development organization both credit City E's manager with fostering the creation of a quasi-public agency to facilitate community development initiatives.

In City A, the manager has a long tenure in city government, and his name frequently appears in local newspaper headlines as the frontrunner on various policy proposals. The public knows and respects him and therefore places a great deal of trust in their manager as a policy entrepreneur. The council also seems to hold him in high regard, since he has retained his position as city manager despite multiple turnovers in council membership during his tenure. One council member described him as a man with "integrity and honesty." The manager himself described his role in this manner: "The community believes in the council-manager form of government. They want a strong city manager and I've been here so long I have an advantage because I'm considered an insider." This level of trust has allowed him to publicly take the forefront in economic development policy. For example, in 2002, he proposed that the city devote the majority of its resources not used to provide public services towards improving the city's economic development ability. He sent out a press release detailing his goals for the future of the city and specific budget items (nearly 1% of the city's total 2003 budget) he was proposing to help improve the city's economic prospects—financial incentives for new corporations, additional staff for economic development, and additional funds for private organizations that promote the city for corporate/industrial recruitment.

This research indicates that a manager's ability to shape policy goals is dependent on several factors: the willingness of council members to allow the manager a relatively high level of autonomy; the level of interest a manager expresses in a particular policy area; and the amount of control the manager has over the organization of the city's departments. The next two sections of the findings discuss how the relationships between the manager and elected officials can affect economic development policy and what level of influence the manager possesses.

The Relationship of the City Manager to Elected Officials

My research indicates that chief administrators and elected officials seem to have a cooperative relationship. Repeatedly, interview subjects from all categories used terms such as: "teamwork," "working together," and "supportive" to describe relationships between managers, mayors, and council members. City D was an exception because, although the mayor talked extensively about the importance of teamwork to economic development success, he nonetheless made it clear that he was in charge. Interestingly, the city staff and council members I spoke to do not agree with the mayor's assessment, instead they said that the manager exercises a great deal of discretion in economic development.

The CAO in City E described the perspectives and relationship between council members and himself as one in which they are all working towards the same goal, to fulfill the needs and desires of the citizenry: "There is little difference between staff and elected official perspectives. There is a lot of communication and involvement. They all listen to and speak to citizens—their priorities are the ones that are pursued."

The consensus among those interviewed was that there was a great deal of cooperation, necessary to fulfill goals related to economic development. That cooperation, which was attained in the sample cities, is not limited to the relationships between elected officials and managers but also carries over to those private individuals who are engaged in economic development activities for the city. Therefore, there is evidence to conclude that the fourth proposition, that the manager and elected officials have a cooperative relationship, is reasonable.

The City Manager's Influence Related to that of Elected Officials

While I was able to determine that city manager influence in economic development policy can be quite high, it is difficult to assess from the findings whether that level of influence is higher or lower than that of elected officials. Partly, the problem comes from the fact that the level of influence attributed to the manager may change based on the perspective of the interview subject. Although formal influence of the managers in the two cities (A and C) with internal control of economic development was greatest among the sample cities, the elected officials in each of those cities did not acknowledge a high level of influence—despite the fact that both managers were credited with several important development projects. For example, in City A, the manager lobbied to use federal Community Development Block Grant money to build a minor league stadium in a blighted section of town. Several nonprofit organizations mobilized against the projects, arguing that the funds should be used for low-income housing instead of a recreational facility for the rich. Public opinion, according to the editorial section of the newspaper was also opposed to the project. Despite the opposition, the city council approved the project. A similar level of public opposition occurred over the expansion of the civic center in City

C. Opponents to the project brought up the limited parking available as well as research showing that the new facility would be under-utilized.

The findings in Chapter 4 also indicate that personal beliefs of the manager affect the level of managerial influence in economic development policy. Specifically, managers who promote and encourage new projects in the community, try to attract resources from external sources, and who consider themselves prime movers in adapting local authority to society, are more likely to have greater influence in economic development policy. These factors are consistent with the findings above—those managers with control over recruitment activities are also more likely to have greater influence in traditional economic development policy.

In the other cities, the influence of the managers and elected officials did appear to be reciprocal, with each influencing the other. The workshops arranged by the manager in City E are an excellent example of this reciprocity. The manager uses his own expertise along with that of other professionals in local government to instruct council members on issues of importance to the city. The seminars help council members, especially those new to government, with information they need to perform better as elected officials. Another example is the way City D's manager relates to council members and the mayor. Despite having a great deal of public popularity due to his private sector work before becoming manager, the manager usually defers to the decisions of council without question, except in one instance. In that case, the council refused to grant pay raises to city staff members. When the city manager threatened to quit if the salary increases were not granted, the council gave in.

The attention devoted by managers to economic development may be another indicator of reciprocal influence. The influence of managers in economic development function is related to the overall level of policy initiative displayed by the manager (Mouritzen and Svara). Thus, in part their influence reflects their own volition and effort.

Indirect evidence of reciprocity is provided by the findings regarding cooperation. The influence over economic development decisions is not a zero-sum game. Each set of officials (and other actors as well) shapes the preferences and behavior of the other. Their respective action is blended in the pursuit of commonly accepted goals.

The findings above indicate that the extent of managerial influence in the policy process is dependent on two major factors—legal-structural constraints and the level of cooperation and support that exists between the manager, elected officials, and the public. Actions managers take to influence that policy are determined both by structure and by how the manager defines economic development. The level and nature of managerial policy influence therefore may be determined by comparing the interaction of these three factors: structural arrangement for economic development; the relationship between the manager and the mayor and council members; and the manager's own conception of his economic development responsibilities.

Internal control of commercial recruitment and a definition of economic development in terms of increased tax base and higher per capital income along with high trust and confidence in the manager on the part of the public and elected officials equate to high economic development policy influence on the part of the manager. It would be inappropriate, however, to interpret this condition as an accumulation of power by the manager at the expense of the council. This high level of involvement/influence is both

conferred by the council and earned by the manager. It has been conferred in the sense that the current or a previous council has structured the economic development function with the manager in a central role. It has been earned in the sense that the maintenance of this role depends on the manager maintaining the trust and confidence of the council.

Summary

According to the responses of the interview subjects, the roles of the city manager in economic development vary greatly among cities from highly political—policy development, community relations, and meeting with prospective industry leaders—to functions that are not traditionally considered part of economic development but which the managers themselves consider essential to successful municipal development—housing, community development, and education. City managers propose policy, negotiate for its passage with council, budget for development projects, educate council members on policy priorities, and suggest which industries would best fulfill the cities long-term needs—to name just a few of the economic development responsibilities city managers take on.

Structural restrictions and conceptual definitions of economic development seem associated with differences in the activities the managers undertook in the economic development process. In other words, internal versus external government control of commercial/industrial recruitment is associated with a different definition of the goals and tasks of economic development. Whether structure dictates the type of tasks is yet to be determined, and perhaps the manager has no choice if he wants to impact economic development or the manager may truly believe that economic development deserves a broad definition and is dedicated to affecting outcomes in human development.

Conversely, perhaps managers who do have control over recruitment define economic development more narrowly than it should be defined.

The level of authority and influence managers possess is partially constrained by the way economic development is institutionalized in each city. In cities where the city government itself maintains control over traditional economic development functions, the city manager takes on an active role in recruitment and retention of commercial entities. Cities that contract the traditional functions to private organizations leave little for the manager to do in the recruitment and retention areas. Although the manager is typically the primary point of contact for those private organizations, serves on the board of directors, and provides information to them regarding city services, the types of responsibilities are still quite different from those found in cities with direct managerial authority over recruitment and retention. In these cases, the manager finds other ways to influence economic development; defining development in terms of the quality of life of the citizenry. With the belief that improving quality of life makes a community more attractive for future development, these managers focus on improving housing, parks, infrastructure, and other elements of the community that many may not consider true economic development.

This study shows that all managers have chosen to be active in the function even when key components are assigned to actors outside of city government. It is also clear from the interviews in the five cities that the city councils want managers to emphasize economic development even if the council does not have a clear idea about how to achieve it. Thus to some extent, the managers are responding to the signals from the council about where they should devote their energies.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Scholars and practitioners alike have debated the appropriate role of the city manager in the policy process since the reform movement began. Although most agree that managers must become involved in policy on some level, there is no consensus on what that level should be. Studying specific policy areas and the actions managers take to implement or direct those policies proves insightful in this regard.

Conclusions

This study examined the role of the city manager in economic development policy. Through a limited quantitative analysis and an in-depth series of case studies, I reached a series of conclusions.

Although quite basic, and perhaps expected, this research did confirm that city managers are highly influential in economic development policy. Both the quantitative and qualitative analyses confirmed this conclusion. Additionally, although not statistically significant, there is some difference in the level of influence of the city manager in economic development in large cities versus small cities, especially relative to that of other actors in the process. While factors related to the size and scope of the city government may be the reason behind this finding, it is also possible that the larger cities have greater numbers of people involved in the policy process, shifting the balance of power from what may exist in smaller cities. Further research is needed using control variables, to determine what the reason behind the difference may be.

A third finding is that personal beliefs of the manager are related to the level of influence of the manager in economic development. The city managers with higher

influence are more likely to emphasize attracting new resources, initiating projects, and protecting disadvantaged groups. These managers are also slightly more active at promoting the vision of the community but this characteristic is strong among all city managers. The findings from the qualitative research indicate that elements related to the manager's belief system could be used to gauge whether a manager will be active in economic development policy or inactive and how they will be active. For example, some of the managers believed that economic development should not merely be confined to gauging the number of jobs that are added to the community; instead, the overall living conditions of the public should be considered.

In order to develop a profile of the active economic development manager using the characteristics above as well as those discovered in the case studies, an understanding of the impact of government structure on economic development influence is essential. Findings from this study indicate that the nature of the city manager's role in economic development is partially determined by the way economic development authority is structured at the local level. City managers with control over traditional economic development functions of recruitment and retention define economic development success in terms of per capita income and total assessed valuation of property within the city. In contrast, managers who do not have authority in the traditional areas of economic development, view success more broadly—considering items such as poverty, housing, child care, and minority issues.

These findings indicate that a manager can be active in economic development either by taking action in the recruitment and retention of companies to locate within their city or by focusing on human development. Whether the manager focuses on one or the

other based on legal and structural constraints, or because he genuinely believes in the issues, or a combination of both factors motivates him, is a topic for future research. However, both types of managers have the same end-goal, to improve the quality of life for the residents of their community; whether this is done by reducing property taxes or by improving conditions of the poor, managers can and do take an active role in promoting economic development success.

Suggestions for Future Research

Data collected in this project can be used to create a comprehensive survey questionnaire related to economic development and the role of the manager. The findings can serve as a set of guidelines to direct the development of the survey instrument. The next step in research in this area should be a large-scale survey to determine if the conclusions reached here could be applied to all council-manager cities nationally or in a state. A large-scale survey can also be used to gauge the relationship between managerial involvement and economic development success.

Findings from the qualitative data indicate that a large-scale survey should include consideration of the following elements and how each relate to the manager's economic development role: legal and organizational structure that determine economic development authority as well as the manager's tenure, personal beliefs and prior experience.

All bureaucrats face constraints on their roles and responsibilities based on legal and organizational arrangements. In the case of economic development, cities may choose to outsource corporate recruitment and/or retention functions to a private or quasi-public organization in lieu of handling those functions internally. In those cases, the manager still may have considerable oversight of those functions if he is the person directing to whom

the organization is accountable. Findings in this study indicate that cities with external economic development recruitment responsibilities may still maintain an economic development office. However, that office typically has a much broader set of responsibilities beyond increasing the number of jobs in the community. In accordance with the mandates of the economic development department, the manager himself tended to have a broader definition of economic development—including housing, daycare issues, and transportation as essential to a successful program. Future research needs to determine whether this finding can be used to identify a pattern in the economic development roles of the manager and the formal organization of the economic development functions.

A second objective of future research should be to develop a profile or set of profiles of managerial functions in the economic development policy process. Data from this study indicate that the manager's perspective on his role in economic development as well as his perspective on which elements are important to a city's development effect how influential he is in the policy process. Data from a large-scale survey could be used to create an empirical model of the manager's belief system and how those beliefs relate to influence level. Additionally, there may be a way to connect that model to measures of economic development success. However, measuring economic development success is not a simple matter.

Incorporating variables that address economic development is a complicated endeavor. Since success in economic development is largely defined on an individual basis, one must first determine how the respondent defines success. As with the qualitative research, specific projects could be identified and the benefits accrued from the projects could be measured. Overall demographic and economic indicators could also be used to

determine the development trends in individual cities. However, the survey should also examine non-traditional economic development indicators such as new public housing units, job training programs, and other services sponsored by cities that may be encompassed in a broader definition of economic development. With a large-scale study, it will also be possible to examine the impact of city size on other variables.

Finally, future research should explore the relationships between managers, elected officials and private citizens (particularly business and interest group leaders) and how those relationships and interrelationships impact the influence level of the city manager in economic development. According to the data collected in this project, there appears to be a disconnect between the perspectives of level of managerial influence between the city employees, elected officials and private citizens. City employees and private citizens seemed to indicate that they perceived the manager's role and level of influence to be higher than elected officials believed it to be. The scale of this study was too small to generalize on this point, however, a large-scale study could explore the issue further.

As economic forces cause states to send less assistance to the cities and production facilities move overseas, the competition for successful development programs in American communities has intensified. An understanding of who influences economic development as well as what constitutes success could prove to be essential for the future well being of our cities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Carl. 1987. *The New Urban America: Growth and Politics in the Sunbelt Cities*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Accordino, John J. 1994. Evaluating Economic Development Strategies. *Economic Development Quarterly* 8(2): 218-230.
- Alexander, Donna. 1992. Incentives as Economic Development Tools. *Economic Development Review* 10(4): 64-66.
- Altheide, David L. and John M. Johnson. 1994. Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ammons, David N. and Charldean Newell. 1988. City Managers Don't Make Policy: A Lie, Let's Face It. *National Civic Review*. 57: 124-132.
- Ammons, David N. and Charldean Newell. 1989. *City Executives: Leadership Roles, Work Characteristics, and Time Management*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Bachrach, Peter, ed. 1971. *Power Elites in a Democracy*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz. 1963. Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework. *The American Political Science Review*. 57(3): 632-642.
- Banovetz, James M. 1989. Council-Manager Government's Response to Economic Development. In *Ideal and Practice in Council-Manager Government*, edited by H. George Frederickson. Washington: ICMA.
- Berkowitz, Bruce. 1984. Economic Development Really Works: Baltimore, Maryland. In *Urban Economic Development*, edited by R. Bingham and J. Blair. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Berelson, Bernard, Paul Lazarsfeld, and William McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blackwell, Lorraine. 2000. Profile: In the Forefront but Not the Limelight. *Public Management*. 82(4): 20-21.
- Clark, Terry N. 1968. *Community Structure and Decision Making*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.
- Clark, Terry N. 1973. *Community Power and Policy Outputs*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Clarke, Susan E., and Gary L. Gaile. 1992. The Next Wave: Postfederal Local Economic Development Strategies. *Economic Development Quarterly* 6(2): 187-198.
- Clingermayer, James C. and Richard C. Feiock. 1995. Council Views Toward Targeting of Development Policy Benefits. *The Journal of Politics* 57(2): 508-520.
- Coffman, Keith. 1998. Profile: Neighboring City Managers have Long, Friendly Rivalry. *Public Management* 80(11): 20-21.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Davis, Deborah. 2000. City Manager Forslund Walks the Line Between Policy and Practice. *Public Management* 82(1): 20-22.
- DeLeon, Richard. 1992. *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco 1975-1991*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Dunn, Delmer D. and Jerome S. Legge Jr. 2002. Politics and Administration in U.S. Local Governments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(3): 401-423.
- Elkin, Stephen L. 1987. *City and Regime in the American Republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 1990. The Changing World Economy and Urban Restructuring. In *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, edited by Dennis Judd and Michael Parkinson, 37: 31-47. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feiock, Richard C. 1987. Urban Economic Development: Local Government Strategies and Their Effects. *Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management* 4: 215-240.
- Feiock, Richard C. 1989. The Adoption of Economic Development Policies by State and Local Governments, A Review. *Economic Development Quarterly* 3: 266-270.
- Feiock, Richard C. and James Clingermayer. 1986. Municipal Representation, Executive Power, and Economic Development Policy Activity. *Policy Studies Journal* 15(2): 211-229.
- Ferman, Barbara. 1996. *Challenging the Growth Machine*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Fleischmann, Arnold and Gary P. Green. 1991. Organizing Local Agencies to Promote Economic Development. *American Review of Public Administration* 21(1): 1-15.
- Gittell, Ross. 1992. Dynamic Development Cycles and Local Economic Management. *Economic Development Quarterly* 6(2): 199-210.

- Goetz, Edward. 1990. Type II Policy and Mandated Benefits in Economic Development. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 26: 170-190.
- Goodnow, Frank J. 1900. *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*. (Reprinted 1968) New York: Russell & Russell.
- Harlow, LeRoy F. 1981. *Servants of All*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press.
- Hoyman, Michele M. 1997. *Power Steering: Global Automakers and the Transformation of Rural Communities*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Hunter, Floyd. 1953. *Community Power Structure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Imbroscio, David L. 1997. *Reconstructing City Politics: Alternative Economic Development and Urban Regimes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jones, Brian and Lynn Bachelor. 1993. *The Sustaining Hand: Community Leadership and Corporate Power*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Kearney, Richard C., Barry M. Feldman, and Carmine Scavo. 2000. Reinventing Government: City Manager Attitudes and Actions. *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 535-548.
- Kemp, Roger. 1986. The Council-Manager Form of Government in the USA. *Cities* 3: 78-80.
- Kemp, Roger. 1995. Raising Revenue without Increasing Taxes. In *Economic Development in Local Government*, edited by Roger Kemp. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Company, Inc.
- Knack, Ruth, James J. Bellus, and Patricia Adell. 1995. Setting Up Shop for Economic Development. In *Economic Development in Local Government*, edited by Roger Kemp. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Company, Inc.
- Krumholz, Norman. 1999. Equitable Approaches to Local Economic Development. *Policy Studies Journal* 27(1): 83-95.
- Lasswell, Harold D., Daniel Lerner, and C. Easton Rothwell. 1965. *The Comparative Study of Elites*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Levine, Andrew. 1999. Marketing your Community for Economic Development: Trends and Insights for the Boardroom. *Public Management* 81 (10): 6-10.
- Levy, John M. 1990. *Economic Development Programs for Cities, Counties, and Towns*. New York: Praeger.

- Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch. 2002. The City as a Growth Machine. In *Readings in Urban Theory*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lynd, Robert and Helen Lynd. 1937. *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Malizia, Emil E. and Edward J. Feser 1999. *Understanding Local Economic Development*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- McGuire, Michael. 2000. Collaborative Policy Making and Administration: The Operational Demands of Local Economic Development. *Economic Development Quarterly* 14(3): 276-291.
- Meltsner, Arnold. 1971. *The Politics of City Revenue*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Montjoy, Robert S. and Douglas J. Watson. 1995. A Case for Reinterpreted Dichotomy of Politics and Administration as a Professional Standard in Council-Manager Government. *Public Administration Review* 55(3): 231-239.
- Mouritzen, Paul E. and James H. Svara. 2002. *Leadership at the Apex*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, David. R. and Robert E. England. 1999. *Managing Urban America*. 5th Edition. New York: Seven Bridges Press.
- Nalbandian, John. 1989. The Contemporary Role of City Managers. *American Review of Public Administration* 19(4): 261-277.
- Nalbandian, John. 1991. *Professionalism in Local Government*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nalbandian, John. 1994. Reflections of a “Pracademic” on the Logic of Politics and Administration. *Public Administration Review* 54(6): 531-536.
- Nalbandian, John. 1999. Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers. *Public Administration Review* 59(3): 187-197.
- Nalbandian, John. 2000. The Manager as Political Leader: A Challenge to Professionalism? *Public Management* 82(3): 7-13.
- Nelson, Kimberly L. 2002. *Structure of American Municipal Government*. Washington: ICMA.

- Pagano, Michael A. and Ann Bowman. 1992. Attributes of Development Tools: Success and Failure in Local Economic Development. *Economic Development Quarterly* 6(2): 173-186.
- Pagano, Michael A. and Ann Bowman. 1995. *Cityscapes and Capital: The Politics of Urban Development*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Peterson, George F, ed. 1994. *Big-City Politics, Governance, and Fiscal Constraints*. Washington: The Urban Institute Press.
- Peterson, Paul E. 1981. *City Limits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1963. *Community Power and Political Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1970. How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative. In *The Structure of Community Power*, edited by Michael Aiken and Paul Mott. New York: Random House.
- Presthus, Robert V. 1964. *Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Price, Don K. 1941. The Promotion of the City Manager Plan. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 5(4): 563-578.
- Rast, Joel. 1999. *Remaking Chicago: The Political Origins of Urban Industrial Change*. DeKalb, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Reese, Laura A. 1992. Local Economic Development in Michigan: A Reliance on the Supply-side. *Economic Development Quarterly* 6(4): 383-393.
- Ricci, David M. 1971. *Community Power and Democratic Theory*. New York: Random House.
- Rigos, Platon N. and Paulson, Darryl. 1996. Urban Development, Policy Failure, and Regime Change in a Manager-Council City: The Case of St. Petersburg, Florida. *Urban Affairs Review* 32(2): 244-264.
- Robinson, Carla Jean. 1989. Municipal Approaches to Economic Development: Growth and Distribution Policy. *American Planning Association Journal*, Summer.
- Ross, Bernard H., Myron A. Levine, and Murray S. Stedman. 1991. *Urban Politics: Power in Metropolitan America*. 4th Edition. San Jose: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Schneider, Mark. 1989. *The Competitive City: The Political Economy of Suburbia*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Schneider, Mark. 1992. Understanding the Growth Machine: The Missing Link between Local Economic Development and Fiscal Payoffs. *The Journal of Politics* 54(1): 214-230.
- Schumaker, Paul, John Bolland, and Richard Feiock. 1986. Urban Economic Development and Community Conflict. In *Research in Urban Policy*, edited by Terry Clarke. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Selden, Sally C., Gene Brewer and Jeffrey Brudney. 1999. The Role of City Managers: Are they Principals, Agents, or Both? *American Review of Public Administration* 29(2): 124-148.
- Sharp, Elaine B. and David Elkins. 1991. The Politics of Economic Development Policy. *Economic Development Quarterly* 5(2): 126-139.
- Sharp, Elaine B. 1990. *Urban Politics and Administration*. New York: Longman.
- Shively, Robert W. 1994. Relevant Studies and Publications in Community Power Structures. *Economic Development Review* 12(3): 13-15.
- Shumaker, Paul, John Bolland, and Richard Feiock. 1986. Economic Development Policy and Community Conflict: A Comparative Issues Approach. *Urban Policy* 2: 25-46.
- Stillman, Richard J. 1974. The Rise of the City Manager: A Public Professional in Local Government. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1980. Systematic Power in Community Decision-Making. *American Political Science Review* 74: 978-990.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1987. *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1948-1988*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1987. *The Politics of Urban Development*. Lawrence: KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1993. Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15(1): 1-26.
- Svara, James H. 1985. Dichotomy and Duality: Reconceptualizing the Relationship between Policy and Administration in Council-manager Cities. *Public Administration Review* 45: 221-232.
- Svara, James H. 1989. Policy and Administration: City Managers as Comprehensive Professional Leaders. In *Ideal and Practice in Council-Manager Government*, edited by H. George Frederickson. Washington: ICMA.

- Svara, James H. 1990. *Official Leadership in the City: Patterns of Conflict and Cooperation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Svara, James H. 1998. The Politics-Administration Dichotomy as Aberration. *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 51-58.
- Svara, James H. 1999. The Shifting Boundary between Elected Officials and City Managers in Large Council-Manager Cities. *Public Administration Review* 59(1): 44-54.
- Svara, James H. 2001. The Myth of the Dichotomy: Complementarity of Politics and Administration in the Past and Future of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 61(2): 176-183.
- Svara, James H. 2002. Presentation: Annual Meeting of ICMA.
- Tremblay, Denise. 1996. Strategies for Local Economic Development: The Experience of Montreal and Quebec. In *Local Economic Development in Europe and the Americas*, edited by Christophe Demaziere and Patricia A. Wilson. London: Mansell.
- Trounstine, Phillip J. and Christensen, Terry. 1982. *Movers and Shakers: The Study of Community Power*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Vey, Jennifer S and Benjamin Forman. 2002. *Demographic Change in Medium-Sized Cities: Evidence from the 2000 Census*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- White, Leonard D. 1926. *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Wilson, Patricia A. 1996. Community-Based Economic Development in the USA and Latin America. In *Local Economic Development in Europe and the Americas*, edited by Christophe Demaziere and Patricia A. Wilson. London: Mansell.
- Wilson, Woodrow. 1887. The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly* 2.
- Wolman, Harold and D. Spitzley. 1996. The politics of local economic development. *Economic Development Quarterly* 10(2): 115-141.

APPENDIX I: CITY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

To start with more “neutral” questions, review the manager’s experience in this city and previous cities in which he/she was city manager? Did he/she ever have significant responsibilities for e.d. as an assistant manager?

1. In general, how would you describe the roles and responsibilities of the city manager?
2. How would you define economic development?
3. How much of your time is spent in formulating policy proposals and seeking their acceptance? What types of policies do you initiate? [It will be useful to see how much e.d. is emphasized if this is asked before the “what responsibilities” question is asked.
4. How much emphasis do you give to communicating with the citizens?
5. What specific responsibilities should a manager undertake regarding economic development?
 - Attend commission meetings?
 - Suggest projects?
 - Meet prospects?
 - Meet with business leaders in the community?
 - Meet with citizen/community groups?
 - Mediate conflicts between citizens and developers?
 - Negotiate agreements with developers?
 - Monitor organizational regulations or procedures that affect the development process?
6. What [other] activities have you undertaken in the economic development policy process? Were these the same or different than in prior positions?
7. In your opinion, how important is the role of the city manager in economic development? How would you rate the manager’s involvement level? [depending on the response] Why do managers promote [or not promote] economic development?
8. How much discretion does a city manager generally have when dealing with economic development activities?
9. What are the primary goals for the city economically?
10. How would you define a successful economic development program? Do you consider the city economically successful? Do city managers have a different perspective than elected officials about what constitutes success?
11. What are 2-3 examples of successful economic development projects or strategies in the past 5 years? Who initiated? Who supported / opposed? What factors were critical to success?
12. Have you ever found yourself in the position of discouraging elected officials from pursuing projects? Have you opposed or had serious reservations about projects that were undertaken?
13. How is (*city name*) organized for economic development activities? Have you proposed changes to this organization? Are there any private individuals involved? If so, in what capacity? Who is responsible for supervising the process?
14. Who developed the city’s formal economic development plan? Whose ideas have primarily been used in the formulation of the policies?
15. What is (*city name*) greatest challenge in economic development?
16. Who do you consider most important to the economic development process?

17. Has the city council relayed to you how important they consider economic development to be? (Probe— are there explicit goals in an employment agreement?)

18. Is there anything else that you can tell me about economic development that I haven't asked?

How would you rate the overall level of involvement by the **city council** and the **city manager and staff** in the areas listed below. For each consider both the actual current level of involvement and amount of involvement you would prefer in the future using the following scale:

- 1 = very low: not involved but may receive a report on actions of others
- 2 = low: minimum review or reaction
- 3 = moderate: advising or reviewing
- 4 = high: initiating, proposing, actively reviewing and revising, instructing, or strongly defending
- 5 = very high: handle entirely although others may be informed of your action

For each area, circle the number for the actual level of involvement by the council and the manager and the level you would prefer. Both the council or manager can be highly involved, lowly involved, or any combination.

		Council	Manager & staff
DEVELOPING STRATEGIES FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
SETTING LONG-TERM FISCAL PRIORITIES FOR THE CITY	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
DEVELOPING ANNUAL PROGRAM GOALS & OBJECTIVES	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
SETTING PRIORITIES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
DETERMINING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
IDENTIFYING CURRENT ISSUES THAT REQUIRE ATTENTION BY CITY GOVERNMENT	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
DEVELOPING SOLUTIONS TO CURRENT ISSUES THAT REQUIRE ATTENTION BY CITY GOVERNMENT	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
DETERMINING THE PURPOSE OF CITY GOVERNMENT AND THE SCOPE OF SERVICES PROVIDED	Actual:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Prefer:	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

- . What is the approximate amount of time you spend in your job in each of the following areas: council relations, community leadership, and administrative/management activities? Which area is the most important to your job success? How would you prefer to allocate your time? Please provide the answers in the appropriate space.

	Council relations	Community leadership	Administrative activities
What is the approximate percent of time you spend in each area? The three should equal 100%.	%	%	%
What is the importance of each area to your job success? Mark the most important as '1', the second as '2' and the least important as '3'.	Rank ____	Rank ____	Rank ____
What proportion of your time would you prefer to spend in each area? The three should equal 100%.	%	%	%

APPENDIX II: UDiTE QUESTIONNAIRE

The U.Di.T.E. Leadership Study

Questionnaire for City Managers and Chief Administrative Officers in City Government in the United States

For purposes of this survey, the titles City Manager and Chief Administrative Officer are indicated as "CAO."

C0 **1. City code: six digit code**

C1 **1. Population: UDiTE codes**

R1 Population: ICMA codes

0=one million or over

1=500-999K

2=250-499K

3=100-249K

4=50-99K

5=25-49K

6=10-24K

7=5-9K

8=2.5-4K

9=missing

POPULTN Actual population

C2 **2. How many full-time equivalent (FTEs) personnel are employed by your local government?** (FTE is computed by totaling the number of hours worked by all personnel, including part-time, and dividing that number by 2,080.)

C201 _____ FTEs.

C202 How many of these FTEs are employed in administrative functions: _____ FTEs

R2 **-- Region**

1=Northeast

2=Midwest

3=South

4=West

9=missing

R3 **3. What is your jurisdiction's form of government?** (Check only one.)

[]1 Council-manager form

[]2 Mayor-council form

[]3 Commission form

[]4 Other _____

C3 **What is your official title:**

- 650: Manager (city, town, township, borough, village)
- 651: Administrator (city, town, township, borough, village)
- 652: Chief administrative officer
- 653: Administrative assistant to mayor
- 654: Business manager
- 655: Director
- 656: Executive assistant to mayor
- 657: General manager
- 658: President
- 659: Service/safety director
- 660: Superintendent
- 661: Other

R4/5 **3a. By whom are you appointed? (Check only one.) > >> By whom can you be removed? (Check only one.)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 City council | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 City Council |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Mayor with approval of city council | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Mayor with the approval of city council |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Mayor | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Mayor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Other: please specify _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Other: _____ |

R6 **4a. For each of the following functions, please indicate your involvement.**

Handle	Advise other	Not directly1	official(s)2	involved3
a. Propose executive budget		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Administer budget after approval		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Direct all or most department heads		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Reorganize departments		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

R7 **4b. Please indicate how many department heads are selected in each of the following ways. (The sum of the numbers should equal the total number of department heads.)**

Convert to percent: Allow three digits for each response

- ___ Number appointed by you alone
- ___ Number appointed by other official(s) with your advice
- ___ Number appointed entirely by other official(s)
- ___ Number directly elected

Record actual number: allow two digits

___ Total number of department heads

C4 **5. What is your age? _____**

C5 **6. What is your sex?**

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

R8 **6a. What is your race/ethnicity?** (Check all that apply.)

- 1 White
- 2 African-American
- 3 Hispanic
- 4 Native American
- 5 Asian/pacific islander
- 6 Other

C6 **7. How many years of education have you completed (including elementary school)?**

Re1 **8. Please indicate the highest level of education you had completed in the following listing:** (Check only one.)

- 1 Less than high school
- 2 High school graduate
- 3 Some college
- 4 4-year college degree-- *specify major or field: _____
- 5 Graduate degree

Re1t *Field of undergraduate study:

- 1-PSC
- 2-Business/economics
- 3-Other social science
- 4-Humanities
- 5-Engineering
- 6-Science
- 7-Other
- 8-not applicable - no 4-year degree
- 9-missing

Re2 **Please indicate all graduate degrees received.** (Check all applicable.)

- 1 MPA
- 2 MBA
- 3 Other masters degree
- 4 JD or equivalent
- 5 MD, DDS, or equivalent
- 6 Ph.D. or equivalent
- 7 MPA + other grad degree
- 8 Other combinations

Have you received any formal management apprenticeship training?

- Yes, in governmental organization
- Yes, in private business or corporation
- No

--Other education--Please specify:

C9 **9. What was your most recent positions before your present one? Please give these details:**

Title: _____

Place of employment: * Code in R9 below

Number of years employed: _____

R9 * 1 = Same state / 2 = changed states / 3 = First job

C10 **10. For how many years have you held your present position?**

_____ years

C11 **11. Which of the following statements best describes your future career plans? (Check only one.)**

- 1 I do not intend to seek another position
- 2 I may seek another position if the right opportunity arises
- 3 I am definitely planning to seek another position in the future

C12 **12. Please indicate why your immediate predecessor left his/her position. (Check all applicable.)**

- Career advancement to higher or better paid position
- Problems in relationship with mayor
- Problems in relationship with city council
- Problems in relationship with department heads
- Workload and other pressures stemming from the job
- Age
- Illness/death
- Don't know
- Other reasons (please state):

C13 **13. Please indicate how many local voluntary organizations you belong to.**

Number of organizations:

C15 **14. Are you now or have you been an active member of a political party? (Check all applicable.)**

- 1 I am presently an active member of a political party
- 2 I have previously been an active member of a political party
- 3 I have never been an active member of a political party

C16 **15. Please estimate the number of hours you work in a typical week:**

_____ hours

R16 **16. Your job can be divided into three areas: council relations, community leadership, and administrative/ management activities. Please answer the questions about these areas in the appropriate space below.**

	Council relations	Community leadership	Administrative/ management activities
What is the approximate percent of time you currently spend in each area? <i>The three should total 100%</i>	1 [2 digits] %	2 %	3 %
What is the importance of each area to your job success? <i>Mark the most important as '1', the second as '2' and the least important as '3'.</i>	4 Rank__	5 Rank__	6 Rank__
What percent of would you prefer to spend in each area? <i>The three should total 100%</i>	7 %	8 %	9 %

C17 **17. Did you spend part of your childhood (0-18 years) in the state where you presently work?**

1 Yes

2 No

C18 **18. Do you live within the boundaries of your employing local government ?**

1 Yes

2 No

C19 **19. What was the household head's occupation when you were approximately 15 years old:**
(Check one)

Self-employed

1 Farmer/fisherman

2 Professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, etc.)

3 Shop/company owner, craftsperson

4 Business proprietor, owner (full or partner) of a company

Employed by another individual or firm

5 Employed professional (e.g., lawyer, engineer, accountant)

6 General management, director or top management

7 Middle management

8 Position involving primarily desk work

9 Position involving primarily travel

10 Service position (hospital, restaurant, police, firefighter)

11 Supervisor (do not choose if supervision is part of another category already chosen)

12 Skilled manual worker

13 Unskilled manual worker, servant

14 Other occupation

Not employed

15 Retired

16 Unemployed

C20 **20. In choosing an ideal position (other than your current one), how important would be the following? (Check one box per row.)**

		Of utmost importance 1	Very important2	Of moderate importance 3	Of little importance 4	Of very little or no importance 5
1.	Have sufficient time for your personal or family life					
2.	Have good physical working conditions					
3.	Have a good working relationship with your direct superiors					
4.	Have security of employment					
5.	Work with people who cooperate well with one another					
6.	Be consulted by your direct superior about her/his decisions					
7.	Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level positions					
8.	Have an element of variety and adventure in the position					
9.	Work closely with elected officials					
10.	Have the opportunity to influence the development of the jurisdiction					

C21 **21. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?**

- 1 Never
 2 Seldom
 3 Sometimes
 4 Usually
 5 Always

C22 **22. Based on your experience, how frequently are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?**

- 1 Very seldom/Never
 2 Seldom
 3 Sometimes
 4 Usually
 5 Very frequently/Always

C23 **23. CAOs must necessarily decide the priority of various tasks. Please indicate how much importance you regularly place on each of the tasks listed below. (Check the box under the item on the scale that best describes the level of importance.)**

		Very little or no importance 1	Little importance 2	Moderate importance 3	Great importance4	Utmost importance 5
1.	Solve problems and conflicts of human relationships					
2.	Stimulate cooperation between departments					
3.	Formulate ideas and visions					
4.	Guide subordinate staff in handling specific tasks					

5.	Promote and encourage new projects in the community					
6.	Be informed about the viewpoints of the employees					
7.	Develop and implement new routines and work methods					
8.	Manage fiscal affairs and accounts and maintain budgetary control					
9.	Ensure that rules and regulations are followed					
10	Give legal, fiscal, and other kinds of professional and technical advice to the Mayor					
10 a	Give legal, fiscal, and other kinds of professional and technical advice to the Council					
11	Give the Mayor political advice					
11 a	Give political advice to the Council					
12	Be informed about citizens' viewpoints					
13	Develop and implement norms for the proper roles of elected officials vis-à-vis administrators					
14	Influence decision-making processes in order to secure sensible and efficient solutions					
15	Attract resources from external sources like the national/regional government, foundations, private investors and business					
16	Make sure that resources are used efficiently					

C24 **24. If there is a clash between different considerations in your daily work, what priority do you give to each of the following? (Please place a "1," "2," or "3" in the space provided with "1" being most important.)**

- Observing the established rules and procedures (e.g. laws, regulations and internal procedures)
- Accomplishing tasks efficiently and quickly
- Ensuring everybody involved is satisfied with decision-making processes and their outcomes

C25 **25. What priority do you give to the each of the following aspects of leadership in the work environment? (Please place a "1," "2," or "3" in the space provided with "1" being most important.)**

- Formal power and authority
- Motivation through commendation and reward of the individual
- Personal relations (friendship, respect, trust)

C26 **26. To what extent have you found the following sources useful in developing your leadership skills?** (Check one box per row.)
 [Note order of items]

		Extremely useful1	Very useful2	Somewhat useful3	Of little use4	Of no use5
1.	Guidance from CAOs in other municipalities					
2.	Own schooling/educational background					
3.	Guidance from consultants					
4.	Guidance from training courses, seminars, etc.					
5.	Professional journals, magazines and the like					
6.	General management literature					
7.	Guidance from managers in private business					
8.	The activities and meetings of the International City/County Management Association (ICMA)					
8a. R11	The activities and meetings of the state managers' association					
9.	The activities of other professional associations					
10.	The National League of Cities					
10a. R12	The state leagues					

C27 **27. How would you consider the activities listed below as part of managing organizational change?** (Check one box per row.)

		Of very little or no importance 1	Of little importance 2	Of moderate importance 3	Very important 4	Of utmost importance 5
1.	Involving a wide range of employees					
2.	Preparing carefully with a small number of top managers					
3.	Reorganizing quickly					
4.	Securing employee support					
5.	Achieving incremental reorganization rather than an extensive reform					
6.	Creating a broad consensus among elected officials					

C28 **28. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (Check one box per row.)**

		Strongly agree1	Agree2	Undecided 3	Disagree4	Strongly disagree5
1.	Most people can be trusted					
2.	One can be a good manager without having precise answers to most questions that subordinates may raise about their work					
3.	An organizational structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost					
4.	Competition between employees usually does more harm than good					
5.	The rules of an organization should not be broken—not even when the employee thinks it is in the best interest of the organization					
6.	When people have failed in life it is often their own fault					

C29 **29. Do think that the job as a CAO is more attractive today than it was ten years ago?**

- 1 Yes, much more attractive
- 2 Yes, somewhat more attractive
- 3 More or less the same as ten years ago
- 4 No, the job has become somewhat less attractive
- 5 No, the job has become much less attractive

Please give the reasons for your assessment:

[See codes: 3 responses coded]

R30 **30a. How important is party affiliation to members of the city council?**

- 1 All or most members of the council consider party to be important
- 2 Some consider party to be important
- 3 Few consider party to be important
- 4 None consider party to be important

C30 **30. Does any one party currently have an overall majority of seats on the city council?**

- 1 No party has a majority
- 2 One party has a majority:

Please indicate which party:

- 660 Democratic
- 680 Republican
- 694 Local party

C31 **31. To what extent do conflicts exist between the major political parties in your city regarding local affairs?**

- 1 Many conflicts exist
- 2 Some conflicts exist
- 3 Few conflicts exist
- 4 No conflicts exist

R31 **31a. In general, would you say that there are divisions on the city council that are reflected in votes?**

- 1 No, there are no real divisions within the council.
- 2 Yes, there are some divisions but they are not very strong.
- 3 Yes, there are sharp divisions within the council.

C32 **32. For how many years has the present Mayor held his/her position?**

___ years

C33 **33. How would you evaluate the chances of the Mayor's reelection?**

- 1 The Mayor is almost sure to win reelection
- 2 The Mayor stands the best chance of all candidates but he/she might not run
- 3 The Mayor is almost sure to lose his/her position in the next election
- 4 Don't know

C34 **34. How would you evaluate the Mayor's position within her/his own party?**

- 0 The Mayor is not perceived to be a party leader.
- 1 The Mayor is the unchallenged leader of the party
- 2 The Mayor's position as the leader of the party is under attack but he/she still runs affairs
- 3 The Mayor has a rather weak position within the party
- 4 Don't know

C35 **35. Please indicate the extent to which the following describe the Mayor's behavior. (Check one box per row.)**

		To a very great extent1	To a great extent2	To some extent3	To a little extent4	Not at all5
1.	The Mayor is very much engaged in the details of the daily work of the administration					
2.	The Mayor is a visionary person who constantly initiates new projects and policies in the locality					
3.	The Mayor has excellent relations with the public and knows what concerns the citizens					
4.	The Mayor is primarily engaged in policy making rather than administrative details					
5.	The Mayor merely reacts to the circumstances when new policies are formulated					
6.	The Mayor emphasizes the promotion of the party program and the interests of fellow party members					
7.	<i>The Mayor helps the council adopt policies</i>					

8.	<i>The Mayor promotes communication within the city council</i>					
9.	<i>The Mayor promotes a positive relationship between the council and the CAO</i>					

C36 **36. In your professional judgment, please indicate how much importance council members should attach to each of the following tasks? (Check one box per row.)**

Very little or no importance 1 Little importance 2 Moderate importance 3 Great importance 4 Utmost importance 5

1.	Be informed about citizens' views					
2.	Represent the local government to the outside world					
3.	Create stability for the administration					
4.	Formulate exact goals for the administration					
5.	Defend the local government's decisions and policies to the outside world					
6.	Implement the program on which he/she has been elected					
7.	Be a spokesperson for local groups or individuals who have issues pending before the council					
8.	Decide on major principles to guide policy					
9.	Be a spokesperson for his/her political party					
10.	Have a long-term vision for the local government					
11.	Lay down rules and routines for administration					
12.	Making decisions concerning specific matters					
13.	Be a spokesperson to the press					
14.	Procure resources from higher-level governments					
15.	Secure services for constituents					
16.	Help citizens resolve complaints with the municipal government					

R36 **36a. Based on your experience, please indicate the extent to which council members engage in the following tasks. (Check one box per row.)**

To a very great extent 1 To a great extent 2 To some extent 3 To a little extent 4 Not at all 5

1.	Be informed about citizens' views					
2.	Represent the local government to the outside world					
3.	Create stability for the administration					
4.	Formulate exact goals for the administration					
5.	Defend the local government's decisions and policies to the outside world					
6.	Implement the program on which he/she has been elected					
7.	Be a spokesperson for local groups or individuals who have issues pending before the council					
8.	Decide on major principles to guide policy					
9.	Be a spokesperson for his/her political party					
10.	Have a long-term vision for the local government					
11.	Lay down rules and routines for administration					
12.	Making decisions concerning specific matters					
13.	Be a spokesperson to the press					
14.	Procure resources from higher-level governments					
15.	Secure services for constituents					
16.	Help citizens resolve complaints with the municipal government					

37. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

		Strongly agree 1	Agree 2	Undecided 3	Disagree 4	Strongly disagree 5
1.	It is the council's duty to decide only major issues and not routine matters					
2.	Certain groups in society are so weak that it is the duty of the administration to speak for them					
3.	CAOs should make themselves acquainted with the intentions of the elected officials who appoint them and put forward only proposals in line with these intentions					
4.	The administration must be a prime mover in adapting the local government to changes in society					
5.	It is an advantage if the CAO is of the same political opinion as the majority of the council members					
5a	It is an advantage if the CAO is of the same political opinion as the mayor.					
6.	The administration should not undertake major policy reviews without political direction					
7.	The administration should be nonpartisan and only base its recommendations on expert opinion					
8.	The CAO should be primarily responsible to the political leadership and only secondarily to the local population					
9.	<i>The CAO should assume leadership in shaping municipal policies.</i>					

The following statements (10-18) are for CAOs in mayor-council form of government cities only:

10.	<i>The CAO is increasingly the major agent of the mayor.</i>					
11.	<i>As the CAO is made more responsible to the mayor, he/she tends to be given more power and approaches more nearly the status of second in administrative command.</i>					
12.	<i>The CAO's duties generally expand or decrease as the mayor may determine.</i>					
13.	<i>It is difficult for the CAO to acquire sufficient power to infuse values of professional management into the administration of city government.</i>					
14.	<i>The mayor is not willing to delegate responsibility for administrative detail to the CAO.</i>					
15.	<i>The CAO has difficulty securing the confidence of the mayor.</i>					
16.	<i>Often department heads cannot be persuaded to report to the CAO rather than to the mayor</i>					
17.	<i>Often, the mayor deals with department heads directly rather than through the CAO</i>					
18.	<i>The CAO should be equally accountable to the mayor and the city council</i>					

C38

38. Please indicate the extent to which your ability to perform your job as CAO been affected negatively by the following factors during recent years?

		To a very great extent 1	To a great extent 2	To some extent 3	To a little extent 4	Not at all 5
1.	Financial problems in the municipality					
2.	Lack of clear political goals					
3.	New regulations from upper-level governments					
4.	Citizen demands for better service					
5.	Demographic changes					
6.	Conflicts between the political parties					
7.	Unemployment and social problems					
8.	National and/or state government control of local government finances					
9.	Conflicts between the various departments and/or department heads					
10.	Pressures from local organized interests, business and the like					
11.	Unclear division of labor between elected officials and the administration					
12.	Cuts in grants from higher-level governments					
13.	<i>Anti-government, anti-tax sentiments.</i>					

C39 **39. Has your municipal government privatized or contracted out functions during the last ten years?**
 1 No
 2 Yes

If yes, how important do you think this privatization/contracting out has been in terms of reducing the number of local government employees?

- 1 Of utmost importance
 2 Very important
 3 Of moderate importance
 4 Of little importance
 5 Of very little or no importance

C40 **40. Please indicate whether your local government has become more or less centralized with regard to the amount of discretion delegated to lower levels of the hierarchy over the past ten years.**

- Much more centralized More centralized No change More decentralized Much more decentralized
 1 2 3 4 5

C41 **41. Please indicate whether there has been more or less delegation from elected officials to administrators in your local government over the past ten years.**

- Much more delegation More delegation No change Less delegation Much less delegation
 1 2 3 4 5

C42 **42. Please indicate whether there has been more or less decentralization from state/federal government to local government over the past ten years.**

Much more centralization []₁ More centralization []₂ No change []₃ More decentralization []₄ Much more decentralization []₅

C43 **43. Please indicate whether there have been changes in the importance attached to each of the following factors in setting priorities in local government decision making?**

Much more importance 1 More importance 2 No change 3 Less importance 4 Much less importance 5

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Participation by users/consumers of services					
2.	Citizen participation in program design and/or delivery					
3.	Efficiency of service delivery					
4.	Protection of minority interests					
5.	Speed of decision making					
6.	Equal access to services					
7.	Due process					
8.	Compensatory services to areas with greater need					

C44 **44. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:**

Strongly agree 1 Agree 2 Undecided 3 Disagree 4 Strongly disagree 5

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	The need for change and reorganization of the local government sector has been greatly exaggerated					
2.	The public sector has grown too large compared to the private sector					
3.	In general the private sector is more efficient than the public sector					
4.	There are very few benefits from contracting out or privatizing local government services					
5.	The smaller local governments are too inefficient and ought to be amalgamated into larger units					

C45 **45. Please indicate how influential the following actors are on the budget. Place a check in the column that shows the level of influence on the scale from 1 (high influence) to 5 (no influence).**

High influence 1 2 3 4 No influence 5

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	The mayor					
2.	Private business interests					
3.	The committee chairs					
4.	The local political parties					
5.	The department heads					
6.	The media					
7.	The majority group on the council					
8.	The CAO					
9.	Trade union leaders in the city					

10.	Higher level governments					
11.	Users/clients					
12.	Voluntary associations					
13.	Rank-and-file employees in city government					

C46 **46. Please estimate how influential the following actors are regarding the *economic development of the community*. Place a check in the column that shows the level of influence on the scale from 1 (high influence) to 5 (no influence).**

		High influence 1	2	3	4	No influence 5
1.	The mayor					
2.	Private business interests					
3.	The committee chairs					
4.	The local political parties					
5.	The department heads					
6.	The media					
7.	The majority group on the council					
8.	The CAO					
9.	Trade union leaders in the city					
10.	Higher level governments					
11.	Users/clients					
12.	Voluntary associations					
13.	Rank-and-file employees in city government					

C47 **47. How often do you generally communicate (oral communication including meetings, telephone calls, etc.) with the following persons/groups of persons? (Place a check in the column that most closely reflects the frequency.)**

		Daily 1	2-4 times per week 2	Once a week 3	1-3 times a month 4	Seldom/ never 5
1.	The mayor					
2.	Council members					
3.	Leaders of the political opposition					
4.	Heads of departments in the municipal organization					
5.	Other employees in the municipal organization					
6.	Citizens in the municipality					
7.	Journalists					
8.	CAOs in other municipalities					
8a.17	County officials					
8b.18	Regional councils of governments officials					
9.	State government officials					
10.	Federal government officials					
11.	Officials of other public sector bodies					
12.	Officials from the National League of Cities					
12a.19	Officials from ICMA					
13.	Union representatives regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					

13a.20	Other employees regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					
14.	Union representatives regarding other issues					
14a.21	Other employees regarding other issues					
15.	Private business interests					
16.	Other leading actors, e.g. ,from voluntary and other nonprofit organizations					

C48 **48. To what extent are these relations important for your ability to perform your functions as a CAO?**

		To a very great extent 1	To great extent 2	To some extent 3	To a little extent 4	Not at all 5
1.	The mayor					
2.	Council members					
3.	Leaders of the political opposition					
4.	Heads of departments in the municipal organization					
5.	Other employees in the municipal organization					
6.	Citizens in the municipality					
7.	Journalists					
8.	CAOs in other municipalities					
8a.17	County officials					
8b.18	Regional councils of governments officials					
9.	State government officials					
10.	Federal government officials					
11.	Officials of other public sector bodies					
12.	Officials from the National League of Cities					
12a.19	Officials from ICMA					
13.	Union representatives regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					
13a.20	Other employees regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					
14.	Union representatives regarding other issues					
14a.21	Other employees regarding other issues					
15.	Private business interests					
16.	Other leading actors, e.g. ,from voluntary and other nonprofit organizations					

C49 **49. Relationships to these actors may be marked by more or less conflict or cooperation. How would you describe your relationship with the following persons or groups of persons?**

		Very conflictual 1	Conflictual 2	Neutral 3	Cooperative 4	Very cooperative 5
1.	The mayor					
2.	Council members					
3.	Leaders of the political opposition					
4.	Heads of departments in the municipal organization					
5.	Other employees in the municipal organization					
6.	Citizens in the municipality					
7.	Journalists					
8.	CAOs in other municipalities					

8a.17	County officials					
8b.18	Regional councils of governments officials					
9.	State government officials					
10.	Federal government officials					
11.	Officials of other public sector bodies					
12.	Officials from the National League of Cities					
12a.19	Officials from ICMA					
How would you describe your relationship - continued		Very conflictual1	Conflictual 2	Neutral 3	Cooperative4	Very cooperative5
13.	Union representatives regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					
13a.20	Other employees regarding salaries and other employee-related issues					
14.	Union representatives regarding other issues					
14a.21	Other employees regarding other issues					
15.	Private business interests					
16.	Other leading actors, e.g. ,from voluntary and other nonprofit organizations					

The International City/County Management Association and State Associations

R50 **50. Are you a member of ICMA?**

- ₁ Yes
₂ No

R51 **51. Are you a member of your state managers' association?**

- ₁ Yes
₂ No

C50 **52. Have you been a member of committees, commissions, professional groups, or working groups appointed by ICMA within the last five years?**

- ₁ No
₂ Yes

If yes, please indicate the purpose. (Check all applicable.)

- Influencing national/state legislation
 Implementing national/state legislation
 Internal affairs of ICMA

R52 **53. Have you been a member of committees, commissions, professional groups, or working groups appointed by the state managers' association within the last five years?**

- ₁ No
₂ Yes

If yes, please indicate the purpose. (Check all applicable.)

- Influencing national/state legislation
 Implementing national/state legislation
 Internal affairs of the association

C52

54. How satisfied are you with the way ICMA carries out the following tasks?

		Very satisfied 1	Fairly satisfied 2	Not satisfied 3	Don't know 4	Irrelevant to ICMA 5
1.	Communication to members on current trends and important national initiatives					
2.	Influence the "local government agenda" in the country					
3.	Professional training of members					
4.	Exert influence on the implementation of national laws					
<i>Satisfaction with the way ICMA carries out tasks - continued</i>		Very satisfied 1	Fairly satisfied 2	Not satisfied 3	Don't know 4	Irrelevant to ICMA 5
5.	Exert influence on legislation through membership on committees etc.					
6.	Comments on proposed laws directly to Congress, President, cabinet secretaries, government departments and agencies					
7.	Ensure that members' interests are heard in the media					
8.	Strengthen the professional networks between members					
9.	Promote social relations between members					
10.	Engage in union functions such as negotiations about members' salaries and working conditions					

C53

55. In the future, what priority do you think ICMA should give to these tasks?

		Lower priority 1	Same priority 2	Higher priority 3
1.	Communication to members on current trends and important national initiatives			
2.	Influence the "local government agenda" in the country			
3.	Professional training of members			
4.	Exert influence on the implementation of national laws			
5.	Exert influence on legislation through membership on committees etc.			
6.	Comments on proposed laws directly to Congress, President, cabinet secretaries, government departments and agencies			
7.	Ensure that members' interests are heard in the media			
8.	Strengthen the professional networks between members			
9.	Promote social relations between members			
10.	Engage in union functions such as negotiations about negotiations about members' salaries and working conditions			

C54

56. Finally, in your private life, how important is each of the following to you?

		Of utmost importance 1	Very important 2	Of moderate importance 3	Of little importance 4	Of very little or no importance 5
1.	Personal steadiness and stability					
2.	Thrift					
3.	Persistence (perseverance)					
4.	Respect for tradition					